Randell R, Wilson S, Woodward P. Variations and commonalities in processes of collaboration: the need for multi-site workplace studies. Journal of Computer Supported Cooperative Work 20(1-2), pp.37-59

The final publication is available at www.springerlink.com

Running head: Variations and commonalities in processes of collaboration

Title: Variations and commonalities in processes of collaboration: the need for studies of multiple settings

Authors:

Rebecca Randell[1], University of Leeds

Stephanie Wilson, City University London

Peter Woodward, City University London

[1]Leeds Institute of Molecular Medicine, University of Leeds, Wellcome Trust Brenner Building, St James's University Hospital, Leeds LS9 7TF

Tel: 0113 3438509

r.randell@leeds.ac.uk

Abstract: Workplace studies have made a major contribution to the field of CSCW, drawing attention to subtle practices that enable effective collaboration. However, workplace studies typically focus on a single setting, making it difficult to assess the generalisability of the findings. Through a field study of multiple settings, we explore a specific collaborative process, that of the handover which occurs when a patient is transferred from one hospital or ward to another. The study demonstrates that the term 'handover' captures a variety of collaborative practices that vary in both their form and content, reflecting aspects of the setting in which they occur. Studies of multiple settings are shown to be essential for CSCW, not only generating findings that have relevance beyond a single setting but also focusing attention on aspects of work practice that may otherwise go unnoticed.

Keywords: Workplace studies, ethnography, healthcare, handover

1. Introduction

One of the initial motivations behind the use of workplace studies within CSCW came from recognition that rejection of systems by their intended users typically results from lack of attention to the social context of work practice (Forsythe 1999). While an understanding of the detail of work practice is accepted within CSCW as an essential precursor to design, the exact relationship between workplace studies and design has been much debated. An early contribution to this debate came from Plowman et al. (1995), who discussed the difficulty of translating detailed descriptions of work practice into specific guidelines for design. However, Schmidt (2000) argues that it is not those studies that provide design recommendations for specific systems that have had the strongest influence on the design of such systems but rather those studies that have attempted to question the preconceptions about the organisation of work and how those preconceptions affect design.

In this paper, we contribute to these recent debates by considering what field studies of multiple settings can offer to the CSCW community and how they might inform design, using a study of clinical handover as an example. In the following section, we briefly review the role that workplace studies have played within CSCW and the nature of those studies. We then introduce the topic of patient transfer, the collaborative process that our study was concerned with. We then describe the study we conducted and, for each setting, we describe the process of handover for the transfer of patients into the setting. In the discussion section, we then reflect on how the handovers vary across the settings and the aspects of the setting that this variation could be related to, as well as considering the ways in which the handover process is consistent across the settings. We conclude by discussing the implications of this

research for both technological support of handover and the study of collaborative work.

2. Workplace studies and CSCW

Interest in this debate over the role of workplace studies has recently re-emerged. For example, Dourish (2006; 2007) distinguishes between empirical and analytical contributions, empirical contributions being those that provide the detail of what happens within a particular setting while analytical contributions 'provide us with new ways of imagining the relationship between people and technology' (Dourish 2006, p. 548). Dourish posits 'multi-sited ethnography' as one means of moving to the analytical level and encourages us to think more broadly about what constitutes a 'site', suggesting 'the global technology culture itself, or the intersection between cultures of technology production and consumption' as possible sites.

Schmidt et al. (2007), in presenting an analysis of work practice in two oncology clinics where they sought to capture both the commonalities and the differences across the two clinics, also distinguish between different types of contributions: studies of specific settings for the purpose of developing specific systems for that setting, and studies for the purpose of developing 'more or less generic or standardized technical building blocks' that can form the basis of systems across a range of settings. In the first case, they point to the need to analyse the rationale of observed practice and to include ultra-practical issues such as advantages and disadvantages of different approaches. In the second case, there is a need to identify the 'deep commonalities' that exist across settings despite variations in work practice. While emphasising the different roles of such studies, they also acknowledge how

they can benefit from each other, the studies of particular settings providing a corpus of data for identifying the commonalities across settings.

Certainly, while it is only recently that explicit attention has been given to the relevance of field studies of multiple settings to CSCW, a number of such studies can be found within the literature. There are those which consist of field studies conducted across multiple similar settings. An early example is Bowers et al.'s (1995) study of the print industry, with data collected at three UK sites of the same organisation. As well as reporting the different responses to the introduction of workflow technology in the different sites, they describe the elements of the context that impact how work gets allocated and the order in which jobs are completed. They also describe features of the context that support the monitoring of each other's work. More recently, Yamazaki et al. (2007) conducted studies at three day care centres for the elderly, looking at verbal and non-verbal behaviours surrounding requests in order to inform the development of service robots. The replication encouraged confidence in their findings by demonstrating that they were not unique to a particular day care centre.

There are also field studies across multiple settings where the researchers sought variation in the context in which the process of interest takes place. For example, O'Neill et al.'s (2007) study of digital colour production print shops included six settings in the US and Europe which varied in size, customers, core business and workflow organisation. Such an approach enables an understanding of the impact of context on the processes of collaboration that the researchers seek to understand. There is also the study of two oncology clinics by Schmidt et al. (2007), described above, and work by Balka et al. (2008), who draw together findings from multiple

studies of healthcare settings to identify possible sources of local variability in work practice, alerting designers to factors that they need to consider.

However, workplace studies in CSCW have predominantly focused on a single setting. This can be regarded as a result of the role ethnography has played in CSCW. Ethnography gained its prominence in CSCW by being seen as a way of gathering detailed accounts of work practice in a particular setting in order to inform the design of a system for that setting. Thus, while such studies were motivated by a desire to understand the specific setting and the work practice within that setting, understanding how the work practice may vary across settings was not on the agenda. For such studies, the generalisability of findings is not an issue as the findings are not intended to be generalisable. Rather, such studies are judged on the relevance of the findings for design, in terms of the extent to which they explicate the work that the system must support (Crabtree et al. 2000).

A consequence of this focus on single settings is that it can be difficult to assess the generalisability of the insights that workplace studies provide, to determine the extent to which they apply to new settings. Crabtree et al. (2000) argue that the findings of workplace studies are generalisable on the basis that the practices used within a particular setting are not limited to those observed within that setting. They give the example of a library, stating that 'the machinery discovered in one library […] is neither restricted to the members observed nor that particular library'. This attitude of 'generalisable until proven otherwise' ignores the way in which local work practices develop within particular locations and how the context can influence and limit processes of collaboration.

Take for example the concept of mutual monitoring which has had so much impact within the field of CSCW, which describes the subtle ways in which individuals display their work to, and monitor the work of, collocated colleagues. This comes from Heath and Luff's (1992) classic study of London Underground control room operators but its findings have informed recommendations for the design of CSCW systems for a broad range of settings. Yet Reddy et al. (2001) argue, based on their study of collaboration in a surgical intensive care unit, that such coordination does not depend only on the physical proximity of colleagues but also on their familiarity with each other's work practices. By comparing the findings of their study with the findings of Heath and Luff, Reddy et al. begin to draw out which elements of the context impact on the practices of coordination. Similarly, Pettersson et al. (2002), based on their study of emergency service centres, demonstrate that in some settings mutual monitoring is used only in response to 'routine troubles', rather than being a continuous feature of the work practice.

3. Patient transfer

Handovers occur frequently, in a wide range of settings, with varying levels of formality. Handover can be described as a collaborative process, occurring over a period of time, that involves the relinquishing of responsibility for a work object or task by one person or group, acceptance of responsibility for that work object or task by others, and sharing of information about the work object or task (Wilson et al. 2009).

Within health care, handover forms a major part of processes for the coordination of patient care (Junior Doctors Committee 2004). Successful handover is essential for patient safety and failure in this process can lead to errors and harm to patients (Petersen et al. 1994; Grayson et al. 2005). Within the hospital setting, there are two main types of handover: shift handovers and handovers that occur when a patient is transferred from one setting to another, whether inter-departmental (e.g. Accident and Emergency to a ward, an intensive care unit to a high dependency unit) or inter-hospital (e.g. to access specialist facilities not available at the current hospital).

In this paper, we are specifically concerned with patient transfer. The topic of shift handover has been explored in CSCW over recent years, both in studies that focus on the process of handover (Wilson et al. 2006; Tang and Carpendale 2007; Wilson et al. 2007; Randell et al. 2008) and in broader studies of collaboration in healthcare (Bossen 2002; Reddy and Dourish 2002; Munkvold and Ellingsen 2007; Østerlund 2008). By contrast, the topic of patient transfer has received little attention, despite the fact that transfers between hospitals and wards are becoming more frequent due to changes in the organisation of hospital care, particularly increased specialisation. Abraham and Reddy (2008) looked at patient transfer but this focused on the transfer of information to non-clinical staff in order to support the allocation of beds, as opposed to the relinquishing and accepting of responsibility by clinical staff to enable ongoing patient care.

3. The field study

We have undertaken field studies of handover in hospital settings over a two year period. Studies were conducted in eight settings, across five UK hospitals. Settings

were selected to ensure variation not only in the types of handovers that were observed – we wished to observe both medical and nursing shift handovers and patient transfers – but also in the context. The settings vary in size (i.e. number of beds), clinical specialty, severity of patient condition, and patient population (i.e. adult, paediatric).

Data collection involved observation of handovers, with audio recording where appropriate, as well as time spent in the setting in order to understand how handovers fit within the ongoing work. Informal interviews were conducted with staff members. Examples of artefacts used to support handover were gathered, and photographs of the settings were taken. In this paper, we draw on data collected in four of our field studies undertaken in varied settings. Across these four settings, a total of 479 hours of observations, over 47 days, were conducted between May 2007 and July 2008. Research Ethics Committee approval was obtained for this study and written consent was obtained from both staff and patients.

Following each period of observation, fieldnotes were written up and audio recordings transcribed. All handovers were carefully read and annotated by hand, asking questions of the data and paying attention to what was occurring and in what order, what was being accomplished and what strategies were used to achieve this on the basis that handover is a practical accomplishment (Emerson et al. 1995). From this, a series of codes were developed, capturing different aspects of the handovers, and then applied to the data. Indexing the data was treated as a way of engaging with the data on a line by line basis, using the constant comparative method to enable similarities

and differences, both within and across settings, to become apparent (Glaser and Strauss 1967).

3.1 The settings

Setting 1: General medical ward

Setting 1 was a 20-bed general medical ward in a District General Hospital (DGH). Patients principally come to the ward from the emergency assessment unit (EAU), although on occasion a patient may be moved to the ward from another ward, be admitted directly from an outpatient clinic, or be transferred from a different hospital. The majority of patients on this ward are elderly and many require palliative care.

Setting 2: Emergency assessment unit

Setting 2 was a 28-bed EAU in a DGH. Patients come to the ward mainly from Accident and Emergency (A&E) but may come via a General Practitioner (GP) referral. The EAU is a short-stay ward where patients are assessed and either discharged from hospital or transferred to an appropriate ward. Due to the nature of the ward, patients of a wide range of ages and with a broad range of conditions are seen.

Setting 3: Paediatric surgical ward

Setting 3 was an 11-bed paediatric surgical ward in an inner city teaching hospital. The ward takes both elective and emergency paediatric surgical patients. Patients are transferred from the ward to theatre and then transferred back to the ward following their operations.

Setting 4: Paediatric acute retrieval service

Setting 4 was a paediatric acute retrieval service that transports, by ambulance, critically ill children from DGHs in the south east of England to paediatric intensive care units (PICUs) in a number of hospitals. While all patients are acutely ill, a range of conditions are seen.

4. Findings

Across the four settings, a total of 138 handovers were observed, 75 of which were patient transfers. We observed transfers of patients both into and out of the four settings but, for the purpose of this paper, in the following analysis we focus on those handovers that were received by staff when a patient was transferred into the setting.

4.1 Setting 1: General medical ward

Handovers when a patient is transferred into the general medical ward are usually one to one, involving the nurse who has been looking after the patient on the transferring ward and the nurse who will be looking after the patient on the general medical ward. They may be either face to face or over the telephone, depending on which ward the patient is being transferred from. Patients who come to the ward from the EAU are transferred by a porter following a telephone handover. Patients who are brought to the general medical ward from a ward other than the EAU are escorted by a nurse, following a brief telephone call, allowing a face to face handover.

Co-located handovers take place with both nurses standing at the nurses' station. For telephone handovers, the nurse receiving the handover is again based at the nurses' station. The handovers, whether face to face or via the telephone, are typically brief

but not rushed, lasting a couple of minutes. The content of the handovers is fairly consistent, consisting of name, age, date of admission, presenting complaint, and past medical history where relevant. The amount of information available to hand over depends on how long the patient has been in the hospital. For example, the following fieldnote extract describes the transfer of a patient from an outpatient clinic into the general medical ward:

6:40 p.m. A patient from the Planned Investigations Unit (PIU) is transferred to the general medical ward. He arrives escorted by a nurse from the PIU and a porter. Once he has been moved into his bed, the PIU nurse hands over to one of the ward nurses. They stand at the nurses' station. Name, 'a young man' (pointing at his date of birth on his medical record - he must be in his late 40s or early 50s), had been for endoscopy and has tracheal mass. The ward nurse asks if he's in pain (no). It takes two minutes but is not rushed at all. The PIU nurse hands over the medical record and notes from the endoscopy - the patient hasn't been 'clerked' yet (the process of being assessed by a doctor and admitted to hospital) because he came straight from the outpatient clinic. They then have an informal chat - the PIU nurse says about the number of patients that have arrived in PIU, the ward nurse says, 'You've just had one of ours' (referring to a patient that was moved to PIU).

Whether face to face or over the telephone, a limited number of questions are asked by the nurse receiving the handover, focusing on issues that have relevance for nursing care, e.g. whether the patient has a catheter, their mobility, the diet that is required. The following fieldnote extract, which describes a telephone handover from

the EAU, includes more questions than is typical but gives an indication of the types of questions asked:

2:45 p.m. One of the nurses takes a telephone handover from the EAU. She responds with lots of 'okay's and then asks a series of questions: 'Does he have a catheter?' 'He doesn't have a catheter, he's continent?' 'Has he had his bowels open?' 'Do you know anything about his social situation?' 'Is he being nursed in bed?'

In a face to face handover, the patient's medical record gets handed over at the end of the handover, and occasionally the two nurses will together look through the medical record during the handover. In a telephone handover, the receiving nurse does not have access to the record during the handover and there is a delay between receiving the verbal handover and receiving the written documentation, the medical record arriving with the patient. Whether face to face or via the telephone, the nurse receiving the handover typically makes notes, normally on scrap paper.

4.2 Setting 2: Emergency assessment unit

Before a patient can be transferred from A&E to the EAU, agreement has to be given by the coordinator (a role taken on by one of the nurses for each shift) that there is a bed available. This is done by telephone. During this telephone call, basic information is given: the patient's name, gender and whether they require a 'side room', as opposed to a bed in a multi-bedded bay. When it is agreed that a patient will be moved, the patient's name is written on the whiteboard by the appropriate bed number. Patients are then brought to the EAU from A&E, escorted by a porter and an A&E nurse. They will check the whiteboard to see which bed the patient is to be in,

move the patient to that bed. Once this is done, a handover takes place between the A&E nurse and an EAU nurse.

The handover is face to face, taking place either by the nurses' station or in the corridor, depending on where the EAU nurse is when the A&E nurse finds her. The handover is typically given to the nurse that will be looking after the patient but, if that nurse is not available when the A&E nurse arrives to give the handover, the handover might be given to another nurse on the ward, who then passes this information on. This reflects the need of A&E staff to handover patients quickly and keep the flow of patients through A&E going, in order to meet the Government target of a maximum four hour wait for patients in A&E.

The handovers are typically brief, lasting a couple of minutes, and are often rushed. As in the general medical ward, they are fairly consistent in their content and structure, with the following information being handed over: name, age, presenting complaint, any relevant past medical history, and the plan for care, including any medications that had been prescribed. Often also mentioned is who the patient had so far been seen by, i.e. whether they have seen the EAU/medical team (or whichever other specialty they have been referred to, e.g. surgery) or only the A&E medical team. Any investigations that have been done, most frequently blood tests and x-rays, are mentioned, although the results are typically not available at this stage. If a diagnosis, or a preliminary diagnosis, has been made, this is handed over, although often a diagnosis has not been made by the time the patient is transferred. Information about observations is sometimes given, although this is generally just a comment that the 'obs' are 'stable', 'fine' or 'okay', as is the following fieldnote extract:

4:02 p.m. A patient is wheeled in on a bed from A&E by two porters, with the A&E nurse walking alongside. The patient is moved into one of the side rooms. Once the patient is settled, the A&E nurse comes out and asks who she needs to hand over to. She hands over to one the EAU nurses. A summary of what was said: name, age, pregnant, nauseous, vomiting, diarrhoea (the EAU staff would already have been told about the diarrhoea when A&E gave them the name of the patient because that is why she was given a side room), bloods have been done. As she is going through this information, she is pointing at the relevant parts of the A&E form. She turns to the page where the obs are written but doesn't say anything about them, instead saying, 'So that's it basically.' The EAU nurse looks down at the obs (actually bending her head down, as if trying to read them). At that point, the A&E nurse says, 'Obs are okay.' The EAU nurse questions why they are admitting her: 'Does she need to be in hospital?' The A&E nurse says that the patient is too weak to do anything. […] The EAU nurse didn't make notes during this handover. It took place at the nurses' station.

As in the fieldnote extract above, the A&E nurse typically reads from the A&E form, holding it so that the EAU nurse can also look at it and sometimes pointing to the relevant pieces of information as she mentions them. In contrast to the general medical ward, the EAU nurses generally do not make notes. Following the handover, the EAU nurse then writes on the whiteboard the time at which the patient arrived in the ward and uses information from the A&E form to complete the front page of the EAU nursing form.

4.3 Setting 3: Paediatric surgical ward

When a patient is ready to be transferred from theatre back to the paediatric surgical ward, the recovery suite telephones the ward and a nurse goes to collect the patient as soon after this as is possible, normally leaving in a matter of minutes. A handover is given from one of the theatre nurses to the nurse from the paediatric surgical ward that is looking after the patient. In contrast to the general medical ward and the EAU, the handover takes place in front of the patient, next to the patient's bed in the recovery suite. Also in contrast to the other settings so far considered, the patient will have been on the ward before going to surgery and so the nurse may already have met and looked after the patient. At least one parent is typically present and they may on occasion contribute information or be given information by the theatre nurse.

The handovers are face to face and, as in the other settings, typically very brief, taking three or so minutes. While the order in which information is given varies, the following is normally covered: the reason for the operation and any relevant past medical history, what was done in the operation and any subsequent nursing care such as the application of a dressing, the patient's subsequent observations, any post-operative care that is required, when the patient can be discharged, and details of medications. Discussion of the post-operative care that is required may be brief, as shown in the following fieldnote extract:

At 11 a.m., I go down to theatre with one of the ward nurses, to collect a patient. When we get down to the recovery bay, the patient's father is with her, holding her hand and the theatre nurse is by the bed. The bay is quiet. The patient seems dozy. The theatre nurse asks the ward nurse, 'Did you know her [the patient] before [the

operation]?' The ward nurse says that she had seen her briefly before she went to theatre. The theatre nurse gives the patient's name, age, 'no medical problem', 'lump in her ankle and she can't move the joint', 'observations normal'. The ward nurse asks if the lump was a cyst. Both the father and the theatre nurse answer this question, saying no, the bone was joined. The nurse explains that they cut away some of the bone. Looking at the anaesthetic record, the theatre nurse tells the ward nurse what pain relief was given and when. She says that the surgeons don't want her to have any more morphine. The ward nurse asks, 'Is she written up for anything else?' At this point, the theatre nurse picked up the drug chart and read out the names and amounts of drugs that had been prescribed. The theatre nurse said that the 'surgeon spoke to the parents' and the patient can go home tomorrow. 'Nothing special instructions, just normal protocol [said while looking at the post-op instructions]. And that's it really.' The ward nurse didn't make any notes in the handover. The medical record was handed over and then the nurse went to get a porter to take the patient back to the ward. The handover itself took about 3 minutes.

As shown in the extract above, communication is largely one-way with limited asking of questions. The ward nurses typically do not make notes. The following documents are handed over at the end of the verbal handover: the full medical notes, including a post op plan; the pink anaesthetic form, which gives the anaesthetic record from during the operation in the form of a minute-by-minute chart plotted along with other readings including blood oxygen saturation level, temperature, respiratory readings and other blood gas plots; the fluid chart; and the yellow drug chart. Sometimes the theatre nurses refer to these when handing over, while on other occasions they appear to talk from memory.

Once the verbal handover is complete, any intravenous drugs being given are moved onto the bed, any monitoring equipment is detached from the patient and the medical record is handed over. The ward nurse then escorts the patient back to the paediatric surgical ward, where the ward nurse takes over care of the patient.

4.4 Setting 4: Paediatric acute retrieval service

When a team from the paediatric acute retrieval service (temporarily) takes over care of a child in order to transfer them to a PICU, they receive information about the patient in two stages. If a DGH has a paediatric patient that they consider needs to be transferred to a PICU, typically the specialist registrar (SpR) looking after the patient will telephone the retrieval service. Calls are answered by the administrator who first takes basic details about the patient and details of the person who is calling, before transferring the call to a junior doctor and nurse. In certain situations, such as neurosurgical cases or when the junior doctor has recently joined the service, the on duty consultant also joins the call.

If, on the basis of the information given over the telephone, a decision is made to retrieve the child, a retrieval team will travel to the DGH. The retrieval team is made up of a junior doctor, a nurse, an ambulance technician and, on occasion, a consultant. On arrival at the DGH a further handover takes place, often at the patient's bedside or just outside the patient's room. This involves all of the clinical members of the retrieval team that are present (the junior doctor, the nurse and the consultant if they are attending) and the SpR who has main responsibility for the child, ordinarily a paediatric or neonatal SpR. There may also be other SpRs present, such as a surgical

SpR or anaesthesia SpR. The nurse who has been looking after the child may also be present for some or all of the handover, although they normally have limited involvement in the handover. Members of the child's family may also be present, although they are sometimes asked to leave while the handover takes place.

The initial referral varies in duration, lasting anywhere from 5 minutes to 25 minutes. The face to face handovers at the DGH that we observed varied from a less than one minute brief update and handing over of blood gas results to fuller handovers of approximately ten minutes. It is also difficult to estimate the duration of some of the handovers that were observed because there is not always a clear ending of the handover, with staff continuing to ask questions of and receive information from staff at the DGH while engaged in treating the child.

There is no obvious structure in the information handed over in the initial referral. The retrieval service have a policy of allowing the person calling to say what they felt they need to say and then asking questions to build up a fuller picture, although this is not always what happens. The content of the referrals focuses on 'hard data' about the patient state and details of treatment/care given, as shown in the following fieldnote extract:

3:55 p.m. A referral comes in. Both the junior doctor and nurse take the call in the admin office (the junior doctor facing the wall, while the nurse is at one of the administrators' desks, so that the junior doctor has his back to the nurse), while I stay in the junior doctors' room. The person calling says that the child has chickenpox which the mum had treated at home with nurofen. That morning, he had woken with a

temperature of 39 and had swelling on the right side of his face. Mum took him to the GP. His blood pressure was 88/40. They've given him a bolus. She goes through the drugs that they have given him. He's had a CT scan but they don't have the results yet. His blood pressure is now 68/27. She wants to know if they should carry on with the bolus. She says that the boy is wide awake, talking. The junior doctor asks what his heart rate is, and she says its 125. The junior doctor says that is high for a 9 year old. He asks if the boy has passed urine; yes. He asks if they have given him albomin; no - they want to know if it would be safe to do so and should they give it to him there or should he be moved? The junior doctor says that the boy needs fluids. She then goes through the blood results. The junior doctor asks if she has a lactate level? A blood sugar level? 'These are after the fluid?' 'No, before.' He asks for the urea and creatin. He asks if they have done a 'chest x-ray, scans?' 'No.' 'Neurology wise, he is quite active?' […] The call lasts about 10 minutes.

In the initial referral, there is an asymmetry in the information representations that the person giving the handover and those receiving the handover have access to. The SpR at the DGH has access to the patient record, print outs of blood gases etc. and images such as x-rays, as well as the patient themselves. In contrast, the retrieval team only has access to the verbal information given in the handover. On occasion, the DGH may upload images for staff at the retrieval service to access but they will not be available in the initial referral. During the call, the junior doctor begins to fill in the medical part of the referral form with the information that they are given. The nurses may make notes on scrap paper.

The face to face handover at the DGH is typically led by the local SpR and in such instances the name and age are given, followed by the 'admission story' and information about patient state and treatment given. This information is largely ordered chronologically, rather than by type of content. The following fieldnote extract describes the beginning of one face to face handover:

4:40 p.m. We arrive at the hospital and find the maternity ward. The nurse goes up to the parents, who are stood by the cot, and introduces herself and the junior doctor. The parents are asked to leave while the handover takes place - they go to sit in the visitors' room. The handover takes place by the bed. The DGH SpR says, 'Mum is [mother's full name] […] This is a unbooked pregnancy. Mum's age is (pause) around thirty, thirty three years, she's Caucasian. Um, dad is [father's full name]. Essentially, this is mum's third pregnancy. The first pregnancy two were pretty much normal. This is the second baby from the same relationship. […] So kind of delivered yesterday at home, um, in morning at around eight twenty um where no medical team was involved. […] So the midwife was called for postnatal check today, she went there and found the baby blue. Um, so she couldn't feel any femoral pulses so she kind of er blue lighted him over.'

As in the referral, hard data about the patient state and information about care and treatment given, particularly medications and fluids, is provided. The most frequent information given about the patient state refers to the results of investigations such as x-rays, ultrasound scans and CT scans, blood gases, the result of blood tests and blood pressure. The following extract is from the face to face handover introduced above:

DGH SpR: 'Um, when he came over here he centrally [unclear], [unclear] centrally was within three to four seconds, very cool [peripherally?]. um, both femoral as well as brachial pulses were very weak to palpate. […] Um, there's no murmur as such, he's breathing in air um um spontaneously without any respiratory distress. Was making appropriate noises and er keeping his airway [unclear]. His abdomen was soft […]. His […] post ductule saturation was seventy seven per cent, preductule between seventy five and seventy seven per cent although we picked up saturations only after fifteen to twenty minutes after admission. Um, initial gas showed a ph of seven point two six with [unclear] of six point (pause) six point six. Six point eight nine, C02 of four point one three, [bicarb?] of nineteen point eight and [unclear] minus three point eight. This is a cap gas. Um, we tried to kind of um give head box oxygen and see whether he improves but even at around sixty to seventy per cent head box oxygen, the saturation just remained the same. Um we have, Doctor [name] does paediatric echo, he came around and did an echo and it showed TTA, transmission of [unclear] with VSD and restrictive ASD. Um, so we did [unclear] for sepsis. We've given [drug name] plus gentomycin on 40 mils per kilo per day of ten per cent dextrose. Um, he's got two boluses of ten mils per kilo of normal saline given, one on the advice of the [retrieval service] team. […] So erm, the blood pressure, yeah, the blood pressure's have generally been stable. They have been forty eight, forty nine mean, um initial blood pressure of seventy one..'

In describing the care and treatment provided, the SpRs explain their reasoning, something not observed in the other settings. While this is in part related to the complexity of the condition, the absence of previous collaboration means that it is necessary to make such reasoning explicit, rather than assuming that such reasoning

would be inferred. The SpRs also describe the opinions expressed by colleagues, making visible the collaborative nature of the work. As those giving and receiving the handover are not familiar with the organisations in which each other work, and the people working within those organisations, it is necessary to explicate who was involved and what their role was in relation to the patient, another contrast with the other settings.

A noticeable feature of the handovers from the local hospital is the use of acknowledgement tokens by the retrieval team - 'okay', 'u-huh', 'alright', 'excellent', 'sure'. These show that the team have heard and understand, but the use of positive terms such as 'excellent' also works towards building a positive relationship with the local team.

The retrieval team take the referral form with them to the DGH. In most cases no notes are made by the retrieval team during the face to face handover at the DGH. Once they arrive at the DGH, the retrieval team also have access to the patient and information provided, for example, via monitoring equipment. Print outs of blood tests get handed over as they become available. X-rays and CT scans may be viewed. Photocopies of all patient notes and drug charts are made by staff at the DGH and images are copied on to CD. The retrieval team take these with them when they leave. However, these typically are not looked at by the retrieval team while at the DGH.

5. Discussion

The accounts of handover presented above demonstrate that the term 'patient transfer' describes a range of practices that vary in their form and content and therefore how

misleading analysis of only one setting could be. While all the handovers are concerned with the transfer of responsibility for, and information about, a patient and involve both written and verbal communication, we see variation in the types of information transferred, the amount of information, how that information is organised (a standard structure versus the chronological presentation of information), who participates and where the participants are located, access to and use of artefacts, and the nature of the communication such as the extent to which questions are asked.

One could argue that, rather than undertaken field studies of multiple setting, what is needed is to look for commonalities across studies undertaken separately (Schmidt et al. 2007). However, it is not only that studies of multiple settings can enable us to identify commonalities, but seeing the differences across settings focuses our attention on aspects of work practice that we otherwise may not notice. For example, it was in comparing handovers across settings that our attention was drawn to the differing goals across the settings of those participating in the handovers. In the EAU, the A&E nurses are concerned with keeping the flow of patients moving, while the EAU nurses appear as gatekeepers, often questioning the need for the patient to be admitted to hospital. Where those collaborating have not done so before or do not collaborate frequently, particular goals can become important which are not visible in other contexts, so that in handovers from the DGH to the paediatric acute retrieval service, members of the retrieval team use the handover to build a relationship with the staff at the DGH.

Below we consider a particular aspect of the settings, that of the level of heterogeneity between those giving and receiving the handover, and the implications that this for the

handover process. We then make suggestions for the conduct of field studies of multiple settings and how they can feed into design.

5.1 Heterogeneity and patient transfer

Heterogeneity and what it means for processes of collaboration is a topic that has previously been explored in CSCW studies of health care. For example, in their study of a surgical intensive care unit, Reddy et al. (2001) describe the different views of patient data required by different clinical roles in order to reflect their different priorities and to support their different tasks, while Fitzpatrick (2004) describes how the flexibility of the working medical record supports a range of clinicians, with a variety of forms providing different clinician-centric views of work.

In comparing handovers across the settings, we began to consider the heterogeneity amongst those participating in the handover and the consequences that had for how the handover took place. While all participants in the handovers in the general medical ward, the EAU and the paediatric surgical ward are nursing staff, those giving and receiving the handover work in different clinical areas and so can be expected to have different concerns. However, this does not appear to present problems for the participants in the handover. Within these handovers, those receiving the handover ask limited questions, suggesting that they receive the information that they require; the standard structure of the handover appears to be enough to bridge the gap between their different clinical areas. This is in contrast to previous studies collaboration between different clinical roles and units that highlight the difficulties involved in heterogeneous collaboration and the articulation work needed to support that collaboration (Færgemann et al. 2005).

Linked to the issue of heterogeneity is the frequency with which the collaboration takes place. In the general medical ward, the EAU and the paediatric surgical ward, they collaborate frequently with those that they receive handovers from. The routine nature of their collaboration, supported by standard artefacts that all participants are familiar with, makes the standard structure of the handover possible. Due to this frequent collaboration, shorthand descriptions are often adequate, such as referring simply to the need for 'routine post-op care' in the handover to the paediatric surgical ward, rather than having to give a detailed account of what is meant by that. It is not just that the stable condition of the patient means that a description of the vital signs as 'okay' is adequate but also that both those giving and receiving the handover have a similar understanding of what is meant by 'okay'.

In this respect, the paediatric acute retrieval service is very different from the other three settings that we studied. They receive handovers from a high number of DGHs and are often collaborating with clinicians with whom they have had no previous contact. During the field study, the junior doctors and consultants in the retrieval service talked of the difficulty of judging the adequacy of the SpR's assessment of the patient. While in other settings a limited number of questions are asked and these appear to focus on gathering further detail on information already provided, the junior doctor in the retrieval service has to work harder to get the information that s/he requires. Without having previously collaborated and without any shared standard structure or artefacts to guide the handover, it is difficult for the SpR to anticipate what information is required. It is not just that the SpRs do not always offer the necessary information but that they sometimes do not have that information available;

if they are unable to anticipate the information that the retrieval service need, the necessary blood tests and patient observations may not have been done.

Our findings suggest that when designing to support collaboration in healthcare it is not enough to simply distinguish between homogenous and heterogeneous groups. Collaborators may have different roles and priorities yet frequent collaboration and standard processes enable that collaboration to occur with little difficulty. Thus we suggest that a more fine-grained analysis of the nature of the heterogeneity is required. We should be concerned with the extent to which collaborators know and understand each other's work, the frequency with which they collaborate and the structures in place to support that collaboration.

5.2 Implications for workplace studies

A call for studies of multiple settings naturally raises questions of the number of settings required and what data should be collected within them. We do not intend to give strong recommendations on the number of settings as such decisions are more likely to be determined by the practicalities of resources and access. However, through a study in just two organisations, de Souza and Redmiles (2007) were able to draw out several factors that can impact on the collaborative practices of software development teams, demonstrating that adding just one additional setting can result in important findings.

A more important issue is how to approach the analysis of data from studies of multiple settings. Ethnomethodology, the predominant methodological influence on workplace studies, is a perspective which focuses on explication of the detail of work

practice and argues against sociological theorising (Garfinkel 1967). We consider that understanding the detail of work practice is essential for the creation of workable systems. However, we are suggesting that such detail is sought across multiple settings and, having explicated that detail, an attempt is then made to compare findings from across the settings. Here we are not talking of seeking to make an analytical contribution in the way that Dourish proposes, but instead seeking the commonalities and differences between settings (although elsewhere we have described how our studies led us to reconceptualise handover (Wilson et al. 2009), which may be closer to Dourish's notion of an analytical contribution).

In thinking about how to undertake such between-case analysis, we do not wish to give a predefined list of the features of the settings that should be considered. Again, it is useful to consider the ethnomethodological perspective. It has been argued that ethnomethodology's focus on the moment–by–moment interaction tends to underestimate the influence of contextual factors (Chalmers 2004). In fact, what ethnomethodology rejects is what has been referred to as the 'bucket theory of context' (Drew and Heritage 1992), where some pre-established set of categories, such as gender or class, are viewed as determining or at least explaining members' actions. Thus, rather than treating members as 'cultural dopes' in this way, ethnomethodology chooses to restrict its concern to those elements of context that those in the setting treat as relevant (Garfinkel 1967). We argue for use of the constant comparative method (Glaser and Strauss 1967), to enable similarities and differences in the collaborative process of interest to become apparent, focusing on differences in the observable features of the work and paying particular attention to those elements of the context that those in the setting attend to. Through comparing findings from

across multiple settings, the haecceity (or the 'just thisness') of a particular process within a particular setting becomes apparent, satisfying one of the objectives of ethnomethodological studies of work practice (Lynch 1993).

5.3 Implications of studies of multiple settings for design

This paper began by reviewing some of the arguments about the relationship between workplace studies and design. Having made an argument for studies of multiple settings, in terms of the understanding of work practice that they offer, it is appropriate to consider what the consequences of this would be for design. We consider that field studies of multiple settings provide a means through which we can give designers tools that enable them to anticipate what the needs of a particular setting might be, by highlighting features of a setting that impact the collaborative process of interest.

Taking the example of patient transfer, our findings suggest that a 'one size fits all' approach to technological support is not appropriate. For example, we can contrast the paediatric acute retrieval service with the other settings, in terms of the level of detail of information required and how that should be structured. In the EAU and the paediatric acute retrieval service, we see less certainty in the information, for example in terms of the diagnosis, so that for these settings an important issue is how such uncertainty, and the voice of different participants, is represented and dealt with by the system. At a more abstract level, but with important implications for design, we also see how the goals to be supported by the system vary according to the setting, as described above.

A key issue when thinking about technological support for patient transfer is the level of heterogeneity and, consequently, the ease with which those receiving the handover are able to gather the information that they need to enable them to care effectively for the patient. Where collaboration is frequent, technologies may focus on supporting electronic handover of information, using structures already provided by and used within existing paper-based artefacts. Where collaboration is infrequent, and particularly where collaboration is at a distance, technology could firstly support those giving the handover in gathering the necessary information. Alternatively, it could provide those receiving the handover with direct access to the patient information, such as laboratory results and patient observations, rather than relying on those giving the handover to draw out the necessary information.

6. Summary

To conclude, this paper has presented the findings from a study of patient transfer conducted across a range of clinical settings. Through this analysis we have demonstrated the potential for studies of multiple settings to contribute to CSCW, enabling designers to anticipate the needs of a particular setting by highlighting features of a setting that impact the collaborative process of interest.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the staff members in the settings who have supported this work, as well as the patients who agreed to let us observe the handovers where they were discussed. This project is funded by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC), grant number: (EP/D078636/1).

References

Abraham, J. and M. C. Reddy (2008). Moving patients around: a field study of coordination between clinical and non-clinical staff in hospitals. Proceedings of the ACM 2008 conference on Computer supported cooperative work, San Diego, CA, USA, ACM.

Balka, E., P. Bjorn and I. Wagner (2008). Steps toward a typology for health informatics. Proceedings of the ACM 2008 conference on Computer supported cooperative work, San Diego, CA, USA, ACM.

Bossen, C. (2002). The parameters of common information spaces: the heterogeneity of cooperative work at a hospital ward. Proceedings of the 2002 ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work. New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, ACM.

Bowers, J., G. Button and W. Sharrock (1995). Workflow From Within and Without: Technology and Cooperative Work on the Print Industry Shopfloor. Proceedings of the Fourth European Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work, Stockholm, Sweden.

Chalmers, M. (2004). A Historical View of Context Comput. Supported Coop. Work 13(3-4): 223-247.

Crabtree, A., D. M. Nichols, J. O'Brien, M. Rouncefield and M. B. Twidale (2000). Ethnomethodologically Informed Ethnography and Information System Design. Journal of the American Society for Information Science 51(7): 666-682.

de Souza, C. R. B. and D. Redmiles (2007). The Awareness Network: *To Whom* Should I Display My Actions? And, *Whose* Actions Should I Monitor?

ECSCW'07: Proceedings of the Tenth European Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work, Limerick, Ireland, Springer.

Dourish, P. (2006). Implications for design. Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human Factors in computing systems, Montréal, Québec, Canada ACM.

Dourish, P. (2007). Responsibilities and implications: further thoughts on ethnography and design. Proceedings of the 2007 conference on Designing for User eXperiences, Chicago, Illinois, ACM.

Drew, P. and J. Heritage (1992). Analyzing talk at work: an introduction. Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings. In: P. Drew and J. Heritage. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge**:** 3-65.

Emerson, R., R. Fretz and L. Shaw (1995). Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Færgemann, L., T. Schilder-Knudsen and P. Carstensen (2005). The Duality of Articulation Work in Large Heterogeneous Settings – a Study in Health Care. ECSCW 2005: Proceedings of the Ninth European Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work, Paris, France.

Fitzpatrick, G. (2004). Integrated care and the working record. Health Informatics Journal 10(4): 291-302.

Forsythe, D. E. (1999). "It's Just a Matter of Common Sense": Ethnography as Invisible Work. Comput. Supported Coop. Work 8(1-2): 127-145.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). Studies in Ethnomethodology. Polity Press, Cambridge.

Glaser, B. G. and A. L. Strauss (1967). The Discovery of Grounded Theory: strategies for qualitative research. Aldine Publishing Company, New York.

Grayson, D., S. Boxerman, P. Potter, L. Wolf, C. Dunagan, G. Sorock and B. Evanoff (2005). Do Transient Working Conditions Trigger Medical Errors? Advances in Patient Safety 1: 53-64.

Heath, C. and P. Luff (1992). Collaboration and Control: Crisis Management and Multimedia Technology in London Underground Line Control Rooms. Journal of Computer Supported Cooperative Work 1(1): 24-48.

Junior Doctors Committee (2004). Safe handover: safe patients. London, British Medical Association.

Lynch, M. (1993). Scientific practice and ordinary action: Ethnomethodology and social studies of science. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Munkvold, G. and G. Ellingsen (2007). Common Information Spaces along the illness trajectories of chronic patients. ECSCW'07: Proceedings of the Tenth European Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work, Limerick, Ireland.

O'Neill, J., D. Martin, T. Colombino, J. Watts-Perotti, M. A. Sprague and G. Woolfe (2007). Asymmetrical collaboration in print shop-customer relationships. ECSCW'07: Proceedings of the Tenth European Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work, Limerick, Ireland, Springer.

Østerlund, C. S. (2008). Documents in Place: Demarcating Places for Collaboration in Healthcare Settings. Comput. Supported Coop. Work 17: 195-225.

Petersen, L. A., T. A. Brennan, A. C. O'Neil, E. F. Cook and T. H. Lee (1994). Does Housestaff Discontinuity of Care Increase the Risk for Preventable Adverse Events? Annals of Internal Medicine 121(11): 866-872.

Pettersson, M., D. Randall and B. Helgeson (2002). Ambiguities, awareness and economy: a study of emergency service work. Proceedings of the 2002 ACM

conference on Computer supported cooperative work, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, ACM.

Plowman, L., Y. Rogers and M. Ramage (1995). What Are Workplace Studies For? Proceedings of the Fourth European Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work, Stockholm, Sweden.

Randell, R., P. Woodward, S. Wilson and J. Galliers (2008). Public yet private: the status, durability and visibility of handover sheets. 21st IEEE International Symposium on Computer-Based Medical Systems, Jyväskylä, Finland.

Reddy, M. and P. Dourish (2002). A Finger on the Pulse: Temporal Rhythms and Information Seeking in Medical Work. Proceedings of the 2002 ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, ACM.

Reddy, M. C., P. Dourish and W. Pratt (2001). Coordinating heterogeneous work: information and representation in medical care. ECSCW 2001: Proceedings of the seventh conference on European Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work. Bonn, Germany, Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Schmidt, K. (2000). The critical role of workplace studies in CSCW. Workplace Studies: Recovering Work Practice and Informing System Design. In: P. Luff, J. Hindmarsh and C. Heath. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Schmidt, K., I. Wagner and M. Tolar (2007). Permutations of cooperative work practices: a study of two oncology clinics. Proceedings of the 2007 international ACM conference on Supporting group work, Sanibel Island, Florida, USA, ACM.

Tang, C. and S. Carpendale (2007). An Observational Study on Information Flow during Nurses' Shift Change. Proceedings of ACM CHI 2007 Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, San Jose, California, ACM.

Wilson, S., J. Galliers and J. Fone (2006). Not All Sharing Is Equal: The Impact of a Large Display on Small Group Collaborative Work. Proceedings of the 2006 20th anniversary conference on Computer supported cooperative work, Banff, Alberta, Canada, ACM.

Wilson, S., J. Galliers and J. Fone (2007). Cognitive Artifacts in Support of Medical Shift Handover: An In Use, In Situ Evaluation. International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction 22(1): 59 - 80.

Wilson, S., R. Randell, J. Galliers and P. Woodward (2009). Reconceptualising Clinical Handover: Information Sharing for Situation Awareness. European Conference on Cognitive Ergonomics Otaniemi, Helsinki metropolitan area, Finland.

Yamazaki, K., M. Kawashima, Y. Kuno, N. Akiya, M. Burdelski, A. Yamazaki and H. Kuzuoka (2007). Prior-to-request and request behaviors within elderly day care: Implications for developing service robots for use in multiparty settings. ECSCW'07: Proceedings of the Tenth European Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work, Limerick, Ireland, Springer.