

Title

Why is patient safety a challenge? Insights from the Professionalism Opinions of Medical Students' (PoMS) Research

Authors

McGurgan, P (corresponding author). UWA School of Medicine, Perth, WA.

Calvert, K. King Edward Memorial Hospital, PGME, Perth, WA.

Narula, K. Fiona Stanley Hospital, Perth, WA.

Nathan, E. UWA School of Medicine, Perth, WA

Celenza, A. UWA School of Medicine, Perth, WA

Jorm, C. University of Newcastle, NSW.

Abstract

Introduction

Despite increased emphasis on education and training for patient safety in medical schools, there is little known about factors influencing decision making regarding patient safety behaviours. This study examined the nature and magnitude of factors which may influence opinions around patient safety related behaviours as a means of providing insights into how Australian doctors and medical students view these issues relative to members of the public.

Methods

A national, multicentre, prospective, on-line cross sectional survey was conducted using responses to hypothetical clinical scenarios. Three cohorts were surveyed - Australian enrolled medical students, medical doctors and members of the public.

Participant responses were compared for the different contextual variables within the scenarios and the participants' demographic characteristics – student, doctor, member of the public, gender and age (if public or doctors)/ seniority in the course (if a medical student).

Results

In total there were 2602 medical student participants, 809 doctors and 503 members of the Australian public. Medical doctors were more likely than other cohorts to have statistically significant differences in how they viewed the acceptability of patient safety related behaviours;

doctors were more tolerant of medical students not reporting concerning behaviours. Medical students' opinions frequently demonstrated a 'transition effect', bridging between the doctors and publics' attitudes, consistent with professional identity formation.

Conclusions

Opinions on the acceptability of medical students' patient safety related behaviours were influenced by the demographics of the cohort and the contextual complexity of the scenario. Although the survey used hypothetical scenarios, doctors and medical students' opinions appear to be influenced by cognitive dissonances, biases and heuristics which may negatively affect patient safety.

'Opinion is the medium between knowledge and ignorance' Plato

Introduction

Healthcare is increasingly viewed as a safety-critical industry¹. The importance of education and training for patient safety is now recognised by medical schools²⁻⁴. Despite the increased emphasis on patient safety in health care, there are relatively few studies which examine the factors influencing health professionals' opinions on decision making around patient safety issues⁵⁻¹⁵. This is despite the understanding that patient safety is rarely just a technical issue, and is embedded in culture, organizational and professional politics¹⁶.

The theory of planned behaviour (TPB) has been used as a framework to evaluate medical professionalism and patient safety related behaviours^{5 6 11 17-19}. The TPB is a useful model for explaining behaviours that are under volitional control. It specifies that intentions are the precursors of behaviours; the stronger the intention, the more likely the behaviour will be performed²⁰. Intention is influenced by three variables- the attitudes of the protagonist towards the behaviour, their perceptions of the social norms, and their perceived ability to perform the behaviour. Studies examining TPB and patient safety show that there have to be significant risks to patient safety before doctors raise concerns⁵. Also different health professional groups (doctors, nurses, and allied health) have been shown to have unique behavioural factors which influence their intention to engage in patient safety behaviours¹⁰⁻¹², with doctors, particularly junior clinicians, most influenced by professional peer behaviour, i.e. their colleagues' patient safety behaviours¹¹.

Research on factors that may influence incident reporting and 'speaking up for safety' demonstrate significant differences between patients and clinicians^{12 21}. Patients are more likely to report incidents associated with emotional or psychological harm²¹, with the majority of patients' defined incidents not considered to be patient safety incidents when reviewed by clinicians²². There is little published literature on medical students' opinions on acceptable professional behaviours related to patient safety issues and how these compare with qualified doctors and members of the public^{23 24}.

The Professionalism of Medical Students study (PoMS) was designed as a body of research to examine which factors influenced opinions on medical students' behaviours over a wide range of professionalism scenarios. The research sought to explore the effects of different contexts on professional decision making and assess whether demographic factors influenced opinions on the acceptability of behaviours. Although the scope of the PoMS work was to analyse opinions on a wide range of professionalism dilemmas, a number of these covered patient safety related topics such as fabricating results, infection controls, use of personal protective equipment, escalating concerns or reporting errors and the influence of hierarchy and health professional roles.

The aims of this study were to examine the nature and magnitude of factors which may influence opinions around medical student patient safety related behaviours as a means of providing insights into how Australian doctors and medical students view these issues relative to members of the public.

Methods

Design, ethics, setting and participants

This study was a national, multicentre, prospective, cross sectional survey. Ethical approval was obtained from UWA for each of the three recruitment cohorts: Australian enrolled medical students (HREC RA/4/1/8014), Australian medical doctors (HREC RA/4/1/9195), and Australian public (HREC RA/4/1/9278). We used a convenience sampling approach to survey medical students in Australia and New Zealand, members of the Australian public and Australian medical profession.

The methods and results of the medical student data, and validation of the survey instrument have been previously described in the *Medical Students' opinions on professional behaviours* paper, referred to henceforth as the PoMS-I study¹⁷. As the student only data analysis indicated that national factors had an effect on opinions about students' professional behaviours¹⁷, for this paper we limited our study to Australian populations.

In order to optimise recruiting a wide variety of Australian doctors and members of the public to participate in the study we utilised a range of approaches via conventional and social media. A social media webpage (Facebook Inc., Menlo Park, California) advertising the research project and link to the surveys was produced. To help notify medical doctors about the research project, the Australian Medical Association published information about the survey in their national news publication (*Australian Medicine*), and distributed it through their GP News network. The Australian Confederation of Postgraduate Medical Education Councils sent the survey information to their listed directors of postgraduate medical education for dissemination through their networks.

For the public, in addition to the social media advertising, the Australian Consumers' Health Forum placed information about the research project and survey on their website. The anonymous, online surveys were closed when recruitment had plateaued (less than 10 responses/month for 3 months) in April 2018.

Survey instrument

The surveys used in the PoMS research covered a wide variety of professionally challenging situations pertinent to medical students¹⁷. Five of the scenarios related to a patient safety issue. Each scenario had two versions (vignettes) which contained a contextual variable identified *a priori* using the modified Delphi approach¹⁷. For example, the protagonist in the scenarios could be either a junior or senior student, male or female, or another health professional. Likewise the context of the scenario could alter from agreeing/not agreeing to perform a procedure or attending/not attending a clinical placement. The online survey (SurveyMonkey Inc., San Mateo, California) was designed such that each participant received a random version of each scenario to allow comparison of the contextual variables. This provided a means of analysing whether respondents were influenced by unconscious bias; that is, whether the seniority, gender or type of health professional involved influenced the respondents' opinions on the acceptability of the behaviour.

The scenarios were constructed to encourage participants to reflect on the acceptability of behaviours which ranged from serious professionalism breaches to positive examples of professional behaviour. All scenarios ended with the sentence '*This student's behaviour is...*'. Respondents gave their opinions on 'acceptability' using a four point Likert scale, with no option for equipoise. The survey is included in Appendix A; survey scenarios relating to patient safety themes along with their contextual variables are described in Table 1.

Table 1. PoMS survey scenarios relating to patient safety themes (including contextual variables)

Theme	Contextual variable	Scenario <i>[alternative version with contextual variable]</i>
Fabricating results	Medical student seniority	<p>A <i>senior [junior]</i> medical student is working with a doctor in clinic. The student has been taught how to measure patients' blood pressures. Despite not having experienced problems measuring blood pressure (BP) on patients before, today the <i>senior [junior]</i> student is unable to obtain the measurement. As this is a basic skill, the student decides to make up the result and say the BPs are all around 125/70 (normal). This falsehood is detected when the doctor re-checks the patients' blood pressure and discovers that the machine is not working.</p> <p>This students' behaviour is:</p>
Infective illness/ presenteeism	Medical student attendance	<p>A medical student has symptoms suggestive of a viral illness (diahorrhoea and vomiting) in the last 24 hours. They have a full day on the hospital wards and decide they <i>will [will not]</i> attend.</p> <p>This students' behaviour is:</p>
Use of personal protective equipment (PPE)	Medical student use/ non-use of PPE	<p>A medical student is completing their General practice (GP) placement. The student notes that the GP does not use gloves when performing minor operations. The GP later asks the student to perform a minor skin operation to a small lesion on a patients' arm. The student prepares their surgical equipment. When they ask for gloves, the GP replies, "Gloves are unnecessary, this is a minor skin problem- go ahead".</p> <p><i>The student performs the procedure without gloves [The student says they do not wish to proceed without gloves].</i></p> <p>This students' behaviour is:</p>
Failure to report - drug error	Health professional occupation	<p>During a hospital rotation, a student doctor is rostered onto the same shift as his girlfriend, who is a <i>midwife [junior doctor]</i> on the paediatric ward. The student accompanies the <i>midwife [doctor]</i> on a round, and witnesses her accidentally administer a 2 day old baby with an adult dose of Hep B vaccine. The student is aware that the high dose is unlikely to have any serious ill effects, and decides not to say anything as he does not wish to get his girlfriend into trouble.</p> <p>This students' behaviour is:</p>
Failure to report - possible racist comments	Health professional occupation	<p>A medical student is sitting in on a <i>clinic [practice nurse clinic]</i> in a general practice. The <i>GP trainee registrar [nurse]</i> is discussing vaccinations with parents of young children. The student notices that the <i>GP trainee [practice nurse]</i> is providing much more information to the white Australian parents than to parents of other ethnicities, irrespective of their language skills.</p> <p>After the clinic the student asks the <i>GP trainee [practice nurse]</i> about this. The <i>GP trainee [practice nurse]</i> replies, 'Oh , it doesn't matter, these sorts of people always do what we tell them, so we don't need to worry too much about counselling, we can just tell them to do it'. The student considers this behaviour to be racist, but does not report the <i>GP trainee [practice nurse]</i> as the student does not wish to get them into trouble.</p> <p>This students' behaviour is:</p>

Data and statistical analysis

Likert scale responses were combined into binary categories of all 'acceptable' responses against all 'unacceptable' responses and summarized using frequency distributions. The Chi-square or Fisher exact test was used to compare responses for the different contextual variables within the scenarios and the participants' demographic characteristics – student, doctor, member of the public, gender and age (if public or doctors)/ seniority in the course (if a medical student). Null and blank responses were excluded for all questions, as were 'prefer not to say' responses for gender. SPSS Statistics 24 (IBM Corp) was used for data analysis and a p -value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Figures in the Tables provided may not add up to 100 per cent due to rounding (nearest decimal place) and totals may vary due to some participants not completing all of the questions or for example, using option 'prefer not to specify' for gender question.

Results

The demographic details of the survey respondents are presented in Table 2. The participation of all Australian medical schools resulted in larger numbers of student respondents (n=2602) compared to doctors (n=809) or the public (n=503). There were significantly more female participants in all three cohorts ($p<0.001$). We grouped doctors and members of the public according to age; public respondents were significantly older than the doctors who participated in the survey ($p<0.001$). Medical students were classified as 'junior' if they were in the first two years of a post-graduate entry course or in years 1–3 for an undergraduate course; by default, senior students were in the latter years of these courses. By performing subgroup statistical analysis for age and gender we were able to correct for the preponderance of female participants overall, and older public respondents.

Table 2. Demographic details of PoMS survey participants: Gender and Age/Seniority[Ⓜ]

Demographic factor: Gender (n)	Gender numbers (%)	
Member of the public (503)	Male = 147 (29.2)	Female = 349 (69.4)
Medical doctors (809)	Male = 200 (24.7)	Female = 599 (74)
Medical students (2602)	Male = 1105 (42.8)	Female = 1439 (55.8)

Demographic factor: Age/Seniority (n)	Age stratification numbers (%)				
	Age <35	Age 36-45	Age 46-55	Age 56-65	Age >65
Member of the public (503)	164 (32.8)	86 (17.2)	93 (18.6)	98 (19.6)	59 (11.8)
Medical doctors (809)	390 (48.4)	242 (30)	98 (12.2)	57 (7.1)	19 (2.4)
Medical students[Ⓜ] (2602)	'Junior' 1214 (50.6)		'Senior' 1184 (49.4)		

[Ⓜ] Medical students were classified as 'junior' if they were in the first two years of a post-graduate entry course or in years 1–3 for an undergraduate course; by default, senior students were in the latter years of these courses.

Influence of participant demographics

Tables 3a and 3b illustrate how different participant demographic factors influenced the opinions expressed for the various scenarios. The demographic group that most frequently differed in their opinions on the acceptability of medical student patient safety related behaviours when compared to other groups were medical doctors (Table 3a).

Half of the scenarios demonstrated a 'transition effect' in which there was either a progressively increasing or decreasing level of acceptability for the behaviour described determined by whether the respondent was a member of the public, medical student or doctor (Table 3a). Transition effects were evident in the scenarios involving attendance at clinical settings with an infective illness, and those related to 'failure to report' situations.

Table 3a. Effect of participants' demographic background on their responses to the PoMS patient safety scenarios

Scenario	Contextual variable	No. of public respondents stating either 'acceptable' or 'mostly acceptable' opinions on protagonist's behaviour/ No. of public respondents (%)	No. of student respondents stating either 'acceptable' or 'mostly acceptable' opinions on protagonist's behaviour/ No. of student respondents (%)	No. of doctor respondents stating either 'acceptable' or 'mostly acceptable' opinions on protagonist's behaviour/ No. of doctor respondents (%)	Comment on statistical significance ^a and if transition effect ^b
Fabricating results	Senior student	9/232 (3.9)	8/1184 (0.7)	2/364 (0.5)	Public significantly more likely to consider it acceptable to fabricate results compared to student or doctor respondents; p=0.001 (students), p = 0.04 (doctors).
	Junior student	10/247 (4.0)	8/1214 (0.7)	3/396 (0.8)	Public significantly more likely to consider it acceptable to fabricate results compared to student or doctor respondents; p<0.001 (students), p = 0.007 (doctors).
Infective illness	Student attends	14/253 (5.5)	144/1208 (11.9)	66/395 (16.7)	Doctors more likely to consider it acceptable to attend compared to student or public respondents. Doctors compared to public, p<0.001; Doctors compared to students, p= 0.002; Students compared to public, p <0.001. Transition effect.
	Student does not attend	201/214 (93.9)	1141/1161 (98.3)	348/348 (100)	Doctors more likely to consider it acceptable NOT to attend compared to student or public respondents. Doctors compared to public, p<0.001; Doctors compared to students, p= 0.022; Students compared to public, p <0.001. Transition effect.
Personal protective equipment (PPE)	Agrees to proceed without PPE	45/235 (19.1)	181/1156 (15.7)	87/394 (22.1)	Doctors had highest rates for acceptability of student proceeding without using appropriate PPE, but no significant differences between demographic groups.
	Refuses to proceed without PPE	198/218 (90.8)	1157/1180 (98.1)	349/351 (99.4)	Doctors had highest rates for acceptability of student refusing to proceed without appropriate PPE. Doctors compared to public, p<0.001; Doctors compared to students, p = N/S; Students compared to public, p <0.001. Transition effect.

Scenario	Contextual variable	No. of public respondents stating either 'acceptable' or 'mostly acceptable' opinions on protagonist's behaviour/ No. of public respondents (%)	No. of student respondents stating either 'acceptable' or 'mostly acceptable' opinions on protagonist's behaviour/ No. of student respondents (%)	No. of doctor respondents stating either 'acceptable' or 'mostly acceptable' opinions on protagonist's behaviour/ No. of doctor respondents (%)	Comment on statistical significance ^a and if transition effect ^b
Failure to report- drug error	Midwife	6/199 (3.0)	71/1126 (6.3)	14/349 (4.0)	No significant differences between demographic groups.
	Junior doctor	16/246 (6.5)	66/1114 (5.9)	39/372 (10.5)	Doctors had highest rates for acceptability of student not reporting a drug error by the junior doctor. Doctors compared to public, p= N/S; Doctors compared to students, p = 0.003; Students compared to public, p= N/S.
Failure to report- racist comments	Practice nurse	40/215 (18.6)	322/1121 (28.7)	111/354 (31.4)	Doctors more likely to consider it acceptable to 'not to report' practice nurse. Doctors compared to public, p= 0.001; Doctors compared to students, p = N/S; Students compared to public, p= 0.002. Transition effect.
	Junior doctor	38/229 (16.6)	361/1094 (33)	148/356 (41.6)	Doctors more likely to consider it acceptable 'not to report' junior doctor. Doctors compared to public, p< 0.001; Doctors compared to students, p = 0.003; Students compared to public, p< 0.001. Transition effect.

^a p-value calculated for combined 'acceptable' opinions for the different versions (vignettes) in each scenario. Chi-squared used for binary variables (Combined Acceptable/Mostly Acceptable vs. Combined Unacceptable/Mostly Unacceptable responses) unless category value <5 in which case Fishers' Exact test performed.

^b Transition effect- noted if there was a pattern of participant responses which demonstrated incremental change from public→ medical student→ doctors

Table 3b. Effect of participants’ sub-group demographic background on their responses to the PoMS patient safety scenarios

Scenario	Contextual variable	Public [Prev Ratio] ^c		Students [Prev Ratio] ^c		Doctors [Prev Ratio] ^c		Comment on statistical significance ^a
		Gender (effect if male)	Age (effect if older)	Gender (effect if male)	Age (effect if senior student ^d)	Gender (effect if male)	Age (effect if older)	
Fabricating results	Senior student	NS ^a	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	Although public significantly more likely to consider it acceptable to fabricate results compared to student or doctor respondents, no significant differences in sub-group comparison for either gender or age/ seniority of respondent.
	Junior student	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	As per Senior student comment.
Infective illness	Student attends	NS	NS	14% vs 10.1%; [1.39]	16.2% vs 6.7%; [2.42]	NS	NS	Student respondents were only cohort to demonstrate that the gender (p=0.038) or seniority (p<0.001) of the student respondent influenced opinions.
	Student does not attend	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	No significant differences in sub-group comparison for either gender or age/seniority of respondent.
Personal protective equipment (PPE)	Agrees to proceed without PPE	28 vs 14.6%; [1.92]	14.2 vs 30.1%; [0.47]	20.0 vs 12.2%; [1.64]	NS	NS	18.1 vs 26.3%; [0.69]	Sub-group comparison for either gender or age/seniority of respondent shows: - age effect with older doctor (p=0.05) and public respondents (p=0.004) being LESS likely to consider it acceptable if student performs procedure without PPE - gender effect with student (p<0.001) and public respondents (p=0.014) being MORE likely to consider it acceptable if student performs procedure without PPE.
	Refuses to proceed without PPE	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	No significant differences in sub-group comparison for either gender or age/seniority of respondent.

Scenario	Vignette comparator	Public [Prev Ratio] ^c		Australian Students [Prev Ratio] ^c		Doctors [Prev Ratio] ^c		Comment on statistical significance ^a
		Gender (effect if male)	Age (effect if older)	Gender (effect if male)	Age (effect if senior student ^d)	Gender (effect if male)	Age (effect if older)	
Failure to report-drug error	Midwife	NS	NS	7.9 vs 4.8%; [1.62]	NS	NS	NS	Sub-group comparison for either gender or age/seniority of respondent shows: - gender effect only for male student respondents (p=0.045) who were MORE likely to consider it acceptable if student did NOT report a drug error by the midwife.
	Junior doctor	NS	NS	NS	NS	17.0 vs 8.4%; [2.03]	NS	Sub-group comparison for either gender or age/seniority of respondent shows: - gender effect only for male doctor respondents (p=0.019) who were MORE likely to consider it acceptable if student did NOT report a drug error by the junior doctor.
Failure to report-racist comments	Practice nurse	28.6 vs 15.3%; [1.87]	NS	NS	35.5 vs 21.4%; [1.66]	NS	NS	Sub-group comparison for either gender or age/seniority of respondent shows: - gender effect only for male public respondents (p=0.029) who were MORE likely to consider it acceptable if student did NOT report the practice nurse - seniority effect only for student respondents (p<0.001) who were MORE likely to consider it acceptable if student did NOT report the practice nurse.
	Junior doctor	NS	NS	NS	42 vs 23.9%; [1.76]	51.1 vs 38.7%; [1.32]	NS	Sub-group comparison for either gender or age/seniority of respondent shows: - gender effect only for male doctor respondents (p=0.038) who were MORE likely to consider it acceptable if student did NOT report the junior doctor - seniority effect only for student respondents (p<0.001) who were MORE likely to consider it acceptable if student did NOT report the junior doctor.

Key:

^a *p*-value calculated for combined ‘acceptable’ opinions for the different versions (vignettes) in each scenario. Chi-squared used for binary variables (Combined Acceptable/Mostly Acceptable vs. Combined Unacceptable/Mostly Unacceptable responses) unless category value <5 in which case Fishers’ Exact test performed. NS used to denote ‘not statistically significant’. i.e. $p \geq 0.05$

^b Transition effect- noted if there was a pattern of participant responses which demonstrated incremental change from public→ medical student→ doctors

^c [Prevalence ratio calculated for values of $p < 0.05$]; Prevalence ratio = [prevalence of respondents stating ‘acceptable’ in demographic group/prevalence of respondents stating ‘acceptable’ in comparison demographic group] (Thompson et al. 1998). For example, the vignette involving a student attending a clinical placement despite recent illness, male students ($p = 0.038$) and senior students ($p < 0.001$) were significantly more likely to consider this acceptable behaviour than female or junior students respectively; such that male and senior students were x1.39 and x2.42 more likely to respond that this behaviour was either ‘acceptable’ or ‘mostly acceptable’.

^d Senior students defined as either undergraduate entry years 4–6 or post-graduate entry years 3–4. Junior students defined as either undergraduate entry years 1–3 or post-graduate entry years 1–2.

Influence of unconscious bias

To assess for possible effects of unconscious bias, each individual participant's survey had a randomly allocated vignette for the scenarios to determine whether participants would be influenced by the contextual variable within that scenario.

The contextual variable for the fabricating results scenario was the seniority of the medical student protagonist. There were no significant differences in opinions for any demographic group (public/student/doctor; Table 3a) or sub-group (respondents' gender/age/seniority; Table 3b).

Conversely the two 'failure to report' scenarios had the student protagonist interacting with people in differing health professional roles. Doctor participants were the only demographic group to have significantly different responses for the acceptability of 'failure to report' behaviour depending on the type of health professional involved for both 'failure to report' scenarios (Table 3a). Male doctor respondents were significantly more likely to consider it acceptable for medical students not to report junior doctors for either drug errors or potentially racist comments (Table 3b).

Discussion

This is the first study to triangulate opinions on a national level from the public, medical students and qualified doctors on a range of patient safety scenarios involving medical students. The results provide a unique insight into the nature and magnitude of factors which influence opinions on patient safety and the challenges in this area for Australian health professionals.

The only other study to triangulate the public, students' and doctors' opinions on professional behaviours was performed at a single UK medical centre, and recruited the public by means of approaching people attending a paediatric outpatients²³. The total number of participants surveyed were 130 (54 in the public cohort). Although the scenarios used differed from the PoMS survey, a number of similar themes were covered such as fabricating results and inappropriate attendance at a clinical setting. Brockbank *et al* showed that the public, then doctors, and lastly students appeared to have incrementally increasing tolerance for professionally concerning behaviours by medical students and attributed this to the fact that the public inherently approach and judge professional behaviours from a different perspective to doctors and students²³.

Regarding possible limitations in study design, we used convenience sampling methodology. Selection bias was minimised by using a wide range of methods to promote recruitment and continuing the survey process until there were at least 500 participants in each cohort²⁵. We have no denominator data for the doctor and public participants, but PoMS-I calculated the medical student participation rate to be 15.2% of all Australian enrolled medical students, making it one of the largest medical student datasets in the literature¹⁷.

A third-party perspective was used in the survey's vignettes to minimise respondent's social desirability biases²⁶. This format has also been used and endorsed in other studies^{24,27}. Although asking survey participants' opinions on the protagonist's behaviours could be considered too positivist/empirical an approach for the complex subject of patient safety, many psychological studies of human behaviour have used and validated similar approaches²⁷.

Human behaviour, decision making, and cognitive biases have been the subject of much research, with many questions still unanswered, particularly with respect to healthcare professional behaviours^{6-15,19,28}. To assist with discussing the results of this study and the implications for patient safety, we have provided a summary of key relevant theories and constructs related to human decision making and biases in Table 4.

Table 4. Major theories and constructs related to human decision making and biases

Theory/ Construct	Key paper(s)	Definition/ Key concepts
Heuristics	Simon (1956). <i>Rational choice and the structure of the environment</i> . Psychological Review 63, 129–138.	People function within bounded rationality. Simon coined the term ‘satisficing’; people seek solutions, or accept choices or judgments, that are ‘good enough’ for their purposes, although they could be improved.
Cognitive dissonance	Festinger (1957). <i>A theory of cognitive dissonance</i> . Stanford University Press.	People strive for internal psychological consistency to function and are motivated to reduce cognitive dissonance. They tend to do this either by adding new parts to the cognition causing the psychological dissonance (rationalisation) or by avoiding circumstances and contradictory information likely to increase the magnitude of the cognitive dissonance (confirmation bias).
Professional identity formation	- Merton (1957). The student physician. Harvard University Press. - Piaget (1964). Development and learning. In Ripple and Rockcastle (Eds). Ithaca, NY. Cornell University. - Kegan (1982). The evolving self. Harvard University Press.	‘An adaptive developmental process that happens simultaneously at two levels: (1) at the level of the individual, which involves the psychological development of the person and (2) at the collective level, which involves the socialization of the person into appropriate roles and forms of participation in the community’s work.’ Jarvis-Selinger et al. Competency is not enough: Integrating identity formation into the medical education discourse. Acad Med. 2012;87:1185–1191.
Theory of conformism and agentic state theory	Milgram (1963). Behavioral Study of Obedience". Jnl Abnormal and Social Psychology. 67(4): 371–378.	People lacking the ability or knowledge to make decisions, especially in times of crisis, tend to defer decision making to the group and its hierarchy. The essence of obedience consists in the fact that a person comes to view themselves as the instrument for carrying out another person’s wishes, and they therefore no longer see themselves as responsible for their actions.
Cognitive bias	Kahneman, Tversky (1974). Judgment Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases" Science. 27(9): 1124-1131.	A systematic pattern of deviation from the norm or rationality in judgement that affects the decisions and judgements that people make.
Theory of planned behaviour	Ajzen (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organ Behav Hum Dec. 50(2):179–211.	An individual’s likelihood of engaging in a behaviour is influenced by three factors – their attitudes towards the behaviour, their perceptions of the social norms, and their perceived ability to perform the behaviour.
Moral self-licensing	Monin, Miller (2001). Moral Credentials and the Expression of Prejudice. Jnl of Personality and Social Psychology. 81(1), 33-4.	Type of cognitive bias; the licensing effect is evident when people allow themselves to do something bad (e.g. immoral) after doing something good (e.g. moral) first.

The safety themes examined in this paper covered a wide range of clinical situations (Table 1). The first scenario related to a medical student fabricating the results of patients' blood pressure readings. It is notable that there were very low levels of acceptability for this in any of the survey cohorts (public, students or doctors), no contextual effect (whether it involved a junior or senior student), and sub-group analysis for gender or age/seniority showed no evidence of unconscious bias. However public respondents were significantly more likely to consider it acceptable for the student protagonist to fabricate results compared to the medical student or doctor respondents. This implies that whilst the public appreciates the significance of fabricating results, they are less stringent in their expectations around this compared to doctors or students.

The next survey scenario related to infection control/presenteeism. The doctor respondents' results were the cohort most likely to consider it acceptable behaviour for the medical student protagonist to either attend or not attend a clinical placement after a probable viral gastric illness, depending on which contextual variable they were presented with in the online survey.

Cognitive dissonance typically occurs when individuals experience two or more inconsistent beliefs, or when their behaviour is inconsistent with their beliefs/values⁷ (Table 4). Doctor respondents as a group displayed cognitive dissonance in how they viewed the medical student's behaviour in the infection control/presenteeism scenario. Although doctors were most likely to concur with the correct behaviour (when the student does not attend the clinical setting), when doctors were presented with the contextual alternative of the student attending, they were also the group most likely to consider this behaviour as acceptable. Doctors were more than three times more likely to consider it acceptable for a medical student to attend in these circumstances compared to members of the public. The PoMS data do not provide us with explanations for why this dissonance occurs and what heuristics may be operating, but doctors as a professional group are at high risk of presenteeism^{29 30}.

Medical student respondents who were male and in the latter stages of the course were more likely to consider that the behaviour of the recently unwell protagonist attending the clinical placement was acceptable, and hence more congruent with qualified doctors' responses. This change in the medical students' opinions as they progress through the course is a good example of the 'transition effect'. Research on medical professionalism and sociology supports the concept and recognises the importance of professional identity formation (PIF, Table 4)^{31 32}. Merton in 1957 was one of the first to describe this phenomenon, when he noted medical education's core function to "*shape the novice into the effective practitioner of medicine, to give him the best available knowledge and skills,*

and to provide him with a professional identity so that he comes to think, act, and feel like a physician”³³.

PIF requires the individual to accept the norms of behaviour established by the community they wish to identify with³⁴. Some discretion is given for personal habits/beliefs, but the core attitudes and beliefs of the community are essentially nonnegotiable, resulting in either sanctions or exclusion from their community of practice³⁴⁻³⁶. Each medical student’s journey is unique and will be influenced by their role models, mentors and experiential learning^{31-33 36-38}.

Medical students, like doctors, will be cognisant of the patient safety implications of attending a clinical area when recently unwell, yet more than 10% of student respondents stated that it was acceptable for the protagonist to attend in these circumstances. As previously noted, the study data do not provide us with explanations for why medical students’ opinions change as they progress through the course, but it may be a hidden curriculum effect³² with students mirroring doctors’ presenteeism behaviours, or related to moral self-licensing (Table 4); by attending the placement, the student perceives that they are helping the clinical team, which mitigates the possible harm caused by attending.

These complexities in human decision making were also evident in the PPE scenario- the student protagonist either agreeing or refusing to perform a minor surgical procedure if their preceptor did not provide them with appropriate PPE. Incongruous opinions were expressed again by the doctor cohort. Doctors were the group most likely to accord with the correct behaviour (the student protagonist refusing to perform the procedure without appropriate PPE), but when they were presented with the contextual alternative of the student agreeing to perform the procedure without PPE, doctors were the group most likely to consider the behaviour as acceptable. Analogous to the infection control/presenteeism scenario, male medical students were significantly more likely to align with the doctors’ responses.

The possible factors influencing these cohorts’ opinions merit discussion as they provide useful insights into patient safety psychology. In the scenario, the student observes their GP preceptor not using gloves when operating, so one factor could be the student protagonist modelling their preceptor’s behaviour. Several studies have found strong relationships between observation and participation in terms of unprofessional behaviour; medical students were more likely to perceive unprofessional behaviours as being ‘acceptable’ if the student had either observed or participated in the activity^{39,40}. Students may try to normalise the professionalism breaches that they witness or participate in, a process which Monrouxe described as ‘*habituation*’³⁸, or manage the dissonance by

emotional trading- the benefits of gaining the clinical experience being offered outweigh the potential risks to the patient or student of not using PPE ⁷.

Another factor may relate to positional obedience; the protagonist's actions may be justified as the instruction was given by an authority figure. Milgram's classic studies ⁴¹ on the factors influencing obedience and conformism demonstrate that the perception of a legitimate authority is a powerful influencer on behaviour (Table 4). There are relatively few studies which specifically examine obedience behaviours in health care ^{28 42-44}, but most support Milgram's findings that people lowest in the hierarchy are most susceptible to following orders, despite the irrationality of the instructions ⁴¹. In our study, public respondents were the cohort least likely to consider it acceptable for the protagonist to refuse to follow their GP preceptor's instructions. This implies that the public, the cohort which have been described in healthcare as suffering from epistemic injustice – injustice related to a lack of knowledge ²², may be most susceptible to the positional obedience effect.

The influence of the type of health professional involved in a professionalism dilemma and the context of what is 'reportable' were explored in the two 'failure to report' scenarios. The first scenario involved a drug error- an incorrect dose of vaccine is administered to a newborn, further complicated by the student protagonist being in a relationship with the health professional involved. Table 3a shows that whilst the public and medical students did not appear to factor in the type of health professional involved when making decisions about the acceptability of reporting drug errors, qualified doctors were significantly less likely ($p < 0.001$) to consider it acceptable to report the health professional if the individual was a doctor.

Analysis of the results of doctors' opinions in both failure to report scenarios indicates that doctors were the cohort most likely to consider it acceptable 'not to report' for both these scenarios. This suggests that doctors have a cognitive bias towards not reporting other doctors. Social psychologists describe the phenomenon of 'in-group' bias to describe the bias of individuals who identify as being part of a group to favour their group ¹³. Most studies examining the effects of implicit bias in health care have focused on implicit bias towards patients, but there is a growing literature on the factors which influence speaking up for patient safety and/or whistleblowing ^{5 8-12 14 15 45}.

Blenkinsopp *et al*'s systematic review on 'Whistleblowing over patient safety and care quality' ¹⁴ noted that research in this area almost exclusively focussed on nurses rather than doctors (>80% of the studies) and attributed this to the emphasis in nursing on patient advocacy. Their paper documented the effect of organisational and occupational cultures on incident reporting, a phenomenon also described in Australian health care ^{11 46}. 'In-group' bias may be the most deleterious effect of professional identity formation. Wakefield *et al* and Jorm both describe doctors

as often being disconnected and at odds with the system they work in ^{11 46}, with a medical culture *'characterised by focussing on individual concepts of clinical work, clinical purism and opaque accountability'*, and junior doctors being *'quickly socialised to these values and behaviours'* ¹¹.

The PoMS survey results validate the effects of occupational culture on opinions for patient safety behaviours ^{5 8-12 21 28 38 44 45}. The scenario involving possible racist comments shows significant transition effects; the public, junior then senior medical students, and finally doctors demonstrate progressively increasing tolerance for not reporting a junior doctor in these circumstances. The overall result is that doctors are more than 2.5 times more likely to consider it acceptable not to report compared to public respondents. These findings resonate with O'Hara *et al's* research on patient self-reporting of what they perceive to be reportable safety issues ²¹; patients were significantly more likely than clinicians to consider dignity and respect issues as being within the remit of patient safety reporting. In this PoMS scenario, the public appear to be more sensitive and less tolerant of the lack of respect shown to non-Caucasian patients by the health professional protagonists.

From a theory of planned behaviour (TPB) perspective ^{6 19 20}, the individual's attitudes, the subjective norms and perceived behaviour controls all influence behavioural intention. Hence it follows that the more ambiguous/contextually complex the dilemma, the more likely that there will be a multitude of factors affecting the three drivers of behavioural intention. The PoMS scenarios illustrate how increasing the contextual complexities related to decision making for professional dilemmas leads to an increased range for what participants considered to be 'acceptable' behaviours. For example, compare the relatively homogenous responses from the survey cohorts for the fabricating results scenario to the failure to report scenarios, which demonstrate significant differences between the cohorts and sub-group analysis (Table 3b).

Overall, this paper's findings reveal several concerning results. Specifically, how leniently doctors viewed some of the patient safety related behaviours by medical students, the negative effects of professional identity formation, and possible cognitive biases which appear to influence opinions. Modern health care relies on functional teams and hierarchies, and significant medical errors tend to occur in complex environments ⁴⁷. The Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care defines safety culture as *'a product of individual and group values, attitudes, perceptions, competencies and patterns of behaviour that determine the commitment to, and the style and proficiency of an organisation's health and safety management'* ⁴⁸. This paper illustrates the complexities of patient safety- that it is intrinsically linked to organisational and professional politics ¹⁶ with often significant divergences in how the public and doctors view these issues. Health care

providers and educators need to factor in the cognitive biases that exist within the individual and groups as a means of managing the complexity of personal beliefs, professional norms and work place cultures to improve patient safety^{6-15 47}.

Conclusions

This research demonstrates that opinions on the acceptability of behaviours related to patient safety themes by medical students are influenced by the demographics of the participant, and the contextual complexity of the scenario. The Australian doctors, and to a lesser degree, medical students who were surveyed, had differing opinions regarding medical student patient safety related behaviours than members of the public. This was most apparent when related to infection control issues such as attending health care settings when recently unwell, refusing to comply with instructions, or reporting concerns or errors that involved a doctor. Medical students' opinions on professional behaviours often bridged the attitudes of the Australian public and doctors, adding further support to the concept of medical student professional identity formation³¹⁻³³.

The GMC states that '*Professionalism is not about doing the minimum – it is about doing what is necessary to protect patients*'⁴. Although this study was directed towards hypothetical medical student behaviours, our results indicate that the cognitive dissonances, biases and heuristics which appear to influence doctor's opinions on medical students' behaviours may present significant challenges to patient safety in clinical practice. We suggest that efforts to improve patient safety should recognise these factors and consider how best to address them to ensure that patient care is protected.

References

1. Lwears R. Rethinking healthcare as a safety-critical industry. *Work* 2012;41:4560-63.
2. Oates K, Wilson I, Hu W, et al. Changing medical student attitudes to patient safety: a multicentre study. *BMC Med Educ* 2018;18(1):205.
3. Standards for Assessment and Accreditation of Primary Medical Programs by the Australian Medical Council Kingston, ACT, Australia: Australian Medical Council Limited 2012. Available from: <https://www.amc.org.au/accreditation-and-recognition/accreditation-standards-and-procedures/> (accessed July 2021).
4. Achieving good medical practice: guidance for medical students. GMC 2016. Available from: <https://www.gmcuk.org/education/standards-guidance-and-curricula/guidance/student-professionalism-and-ftp/achieving-good-medical-practice> (accessed July 2021).
5. Rich A, Viney R, Griffin A. Understanding the factors influencing doctors' intentions to report patient safety concerns: a qualitative study. *J R Soc Med* 2019;112(10):428-37.
6. Rich A, Medisauskaite A, Potts HWW, et al. A theory-based study of doctors' intentions to engage in professional behaviours. *BMC Med Educ* 2020;20(1):44.
7. Klein J, McColl G. Cognitive dissonance: how self-protective distortions can undermine clinical judgement. *Med Educ* 2019;53(12):1178-86.
8. Øvretveit J. Understanding and improving patient safety: the psychological, social and cultural dimensions. *J Health Org Man* 2009;23(6):581-96.
9. Gambashidze N, Hammer A, Wagner A, et al. Influence of Gender, Profession, and Managerial Function on Clinicians' Perceptions of Patient Safety Culture: A Cross-National Cross-Sectional Study. *J Patient Saf* 2021;17(4):e280-e87.
10. Hewitt T, Chreim S, Forster A. Sociocultural Factors Influencing Incident Reporting Among Physicians and Nurses: Understanding Frames Underlying Self- and Peer-Reporting Practices. *J Patient Saf* 2017;13(3):129-37.
11. Wakefield JG, McLaws M-L, Whitby M, et al. Patient safety culture: factors that influence clinician involvement in patient safety behaviours. *Qual Saf Health Care* 2010;19(6):585-91.
12. Nacioglu A. As a critical behavior to improve quality and patient safety in health care: speaking

up! *Safety in Health* 2016;2(1):10.

13. Mannion R, Thompson C. Systematic biases in group decision-making: implications for patient safety. *Int J Qual Health Care* 2014;26(6):606-12.

14. Blenkinsopp J, Snowden N, Mannion R, et al. Whistleblowing over patient safety and care quality: a review of the literature. *J Health Org Man* 2019;33(6):737-56.

15. Jones A, Blake J, Adams M, et al. Interventions promoting employee “speaking-up” within healthcare workplaces: A systematic narrative review of the international literature. *Health Policy* 2021;125(3):375-84.

16. Dixon-Woods M. Why is patient safety so hard? A selective review of ethnographic studies. *J Health Serv Res Policy* 2010;15 Suppl 1:11-6.

17. McGurgan P, Calvert KL, Narula K, et al. Medical students’ opinions on professional behaviours: The Professionalism of Medical Students’ (PoMS) study. *Med Teach* 2020;42:3, 340-350.

18. Jha V, Brockbank S, Roberts T. A Framework for Understanding Lapses in Professionalism Among Medical Students: Applying the Theory of Planned Behavior to Fitness to Practice Cases. *Acad Med* 2016;91(12):1622-27.

19. Godin G, Bélanger-Gravel A, Eccles M, et al. Healthcare professionals' intentions and behaviours: a systematic review of studies based on social cognitive theories. *Implement Sci* 2008;3:36.

20. Ajzen I. The theory of planned behavior. *Organ Behav Human Dec Proc* 1991;50(2):179-211.

21. O’Hara JK, Reynolds C, Moore S, et al. What can patients tell us about the quality and safety of hospital care? Findings from a UK multicentre survey study. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2018;27(9):673-82.

22. Fitzsimons B, Cornwell J. What can we learn from patients’ perspectives on the quality and safety of hospital care? *BMJ Qual Saf* 2018;27(9):671-72.

23. Brockbank S, David TJ, Patel L. Unprofessional behaviour in medical students: a questionnaire

based pilot study comparing perceptions of the public with medical students and doctors. *Med Teach* 2011;33(9):e501-8.

24. Finnegan C, Gauden V. Medical Student Views of Acceptable Professional Behavior: A Survey. *J Med Regul* 2016;102(3):5-17.

25. Frey B. Convenience sampling. Encyclopedia of survey research methods. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc. California, 2018.

26. Lavrakas PJ. Social desirability. Encyclopedia of survey research methods. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc. California, 2008.

27. Gawronski B, Armstrong J, Conway P, et al. Consequences, Norms, and Generalized Inaction in Moral Dilemmas: The CNI Model of Moral Decision-Making. *J Personal Soc Psych* 2017;113(3):343-76.

28. Hollins Martin CJ, Bull P. What features of the maternity unit promote obedient behaviour from midwives? *Clin Eff Nurs* 2006;9:e221-e31.

29. Imai C, Hall L, Lambert SB, et al. Presenteeism among health care workers with laboratory confirmed influenza infection: A retrospective cohort study in Queensland, Australia. *Am J Infect Control* 2020;48(4):355-60.

30. Walsh G, Hayes B, Freeney Y, et al. Doctor, how can we help you? Qualitative interview study to identify key interventions to target burnout in hospital doctors. *BMJ Open* 2019;9(9):e030209.

31. Cruess RL, Cruess SR, Steinert Y. Amending Miller's Pyramid to Include Professional Identity Formation. *Acad Med* 2016;91(2):180-85.

32. Hilton SR, Slotnick HB. Proto-professionalism: how professionalisation occurs across the continuum of medical education. *Med Educ* 2005;39(1):58-65.

33. Merton RK, Reader G, Kendall PL, eds. *The student physician: Introductory studies in the sociology of medical education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 1957.

34. Wenger E. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1998.
35. Cruess SR, Cruess RL, Steinert Y. Supporting the development of a professional identity: General principles. *Med Teach* 2019;41(6):641-49.
36. Skorikov VB, Vondracek FW. Occupational Identity. In: Schwartz SJ, Luyckx K, Vignoles VL, eds. *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research*. New York, NY: Springer New York 2011:693-714.
37. Sinclair S. *Making Doctors: An Institutional Apprenticeship*. London: Bloomsbury Academic; 1997.
38. Monrouxe LV, Rees CE, Dennis I, et al. Professionalism dilemmas, moral distress and the healthcare student: insights from two online UK-wide questionnaire studies. *BMJ Open* 2015;5(5):e007518.
39. Kulac E, Sezik M, Asci H, et al. Medical students' participation in and perception of unprofessional behaviors: comparison of preclinical and clinical phases. *Adv Physiol Educ* 2013;37(4):298-302.
40. Franco RS, Franco CAG, Kusma SZ, et al. To participate or not participate in unprofessional behavior – Is that the question? *Med Teach* 2017;39(2):212-19.
41. Milgram S, Gudehus C. *Obedience to authority*. Ziff-Davis Publishing Company, 1978.
42. Hofling CK, Brotzman E, Dalrymple S, et al. An experimental study in nurse-physician relationships *J Nerv Ment Dis* 1966;143(2):171-80.
43. Rank SG, Jacobson CK. Hospital nurses' compliance with medication overdose orders: a failure to replicate. *J Health Soc Behav* 1977;18(2):188-93.
44. Barzallo Salazar MJ, Minkoff H, Bayya J, et al. Influence of surgeon behavior on trainee willingness to speak up: a randomized controlled trial. *J Am Coll Surg* 2014;219(5):1001-7.
45. Johnson L, Malik N, Gafson I, et al. Improving patient safety by enhancing raising concerns at medical school. *BMC Med Ed* 2018;18(1):171.

46. Jorm C. *Reconstructing medical practice : engagement, professionalism, and critical relationships in health care*. Farnham, Surrey, England ; Burlington, VT: Gower 2012.

47. Braithwaite J, Runciman WB, Merry AF. Towards safer, better healthcare: harnessing the natural properties of complex sociotechnical systems. *Qual Saf Health Care* 2009;18(1):37-41.

48. Patient safety culture. AAQHC Sydney 2019. Available from:

[https://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/our-work/indicators-measurement-and-reporting/patient-](https://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/our-work/indicators-measurement-and-reporting/patient-safety-culture#positive-patient-safety-culture)

[safety-culture#positive-patient-safety-culture](https://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/our-work/indicators-measurement-and-reporting/patient-safety-culture#positive-patient-safety-culture) (accessed July 2021).