Social Network Analysis
MEASURING CHANGES IN THE LEVEL OF CONNECTIONS AMONG EMERGENCY DEPARTMENT PHYSICIANS AND NURSES IN THE KOOTENAY BOUNDARY

OUR AIM
A core aim of the Emergency Medicine Network project was to improve inter-collegial relationships and communications between primary and secondary sites in the Kootenay Boundary.

CONTEXT
• The Kootenay Boundary (KB) region is made up of 7 geographically dispersed emergency department (ED) sites. 5 EDs feed into 2 larger sites, 1 of which is our regional hospital.
• This isolated rural setting means that small teams or solo practitioners respond to stressful trauma cases and require strong communication, trust, and efficiency with colleagues in referral centres.

STRATEGY
• A pre-post social network analysis was used to measure changes in relationships.
• Baseline results helped identify where and how connections could be cultivated within and between EDs.

KEY RELATIONSHIP BUILDING ACTIVITIES:
Local Engagements: a site-specific opportunity for nurses and physicians to connect and team-build in an informal setting. Six of seven KB EDs took part, May - August 2019.
Emergency Medicine Regional Retreat: 2-day event held November 2019, brought together ED practitioners and partners from across the KB in dialogue, team-building, and learning.
Project Meetings: brought key stakeholders together on a regular basis

PROCEDURES
• Baseline data collected in September 2018 and follow up data in December 2019 with a roster-based online survey using Checkbox*.
• The baseline & follow-up survey utilized the same question and procedure.
• All physicians, nurses, and nurse managers who worked regularly in a Kootenay Boundary ED were invited to participate.
• Network data was de-identified and imported into Gephi, an open source network mapping software tool.

SOCIAL NETWORK ANALYSIS:
• Method for studying the structure of relationships
• Includes two fundamental elements: nodes (individual people within the network) and edges (the ties or interactions that connect them)
• Sociogram Graph: visual representation of the network data (Saqr et al. 2018)

SURVEY QUESTION
Please indicate the strength of your connections with other ED care providers in this way:

Tier 1: These people are your closest professional connections
Tier 2: These people are your second closest professional connections
Tier 3: These are people you know or have heard of but are not a close professional connection for whatever reason
Tier 4: These are people you have not interacted with or have not yet met.

THE RESULTS
• Statistics show a more closely knit network at follow up, in comparison to our baseline (table 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network Statistic</th>
<th>Pre-sample</th>
<th>Post-sample</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graph density</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>The network increased in density. Half of the nodes were connected to each other at follow up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network diameter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The distance between the furthest nodes decreased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average path length</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>The average distance between all pairs of nodes decreased.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LIMITATIONS
• Sample size and changes in the staff roster from each ED meant that the baseline and follow up results were not truly comparable.
• Second analysis completed using only the nodes (individuals) who completed both the baseline and follow up survey (n=29).
• These results also showed a much more closely knit network (table 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network Statistic</th>
<th>Pre-sample</th>
<th>Post-sample</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graph density</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>The network increased in density. Half of the nodes were connected to each other at follow up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network diameter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The distance between the furthest nodes decreased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average path length</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>The average distance between all pairs of nodes decreased.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY LESSONS & SUSTAINABILITY
• Social network analysis tells us where connections can be improved in a confidential way.
• Baseline results can be used to plan project activities.
• Overall results showed how implementing relationship building activities into a health region can achieve measurable and improved connections between ED staff.
• Asking the more connected people to have a more active voice in the network may have led to better results.
• With staff turnover, the work gone into improving relationships may not be sustainable after the project concludes.

Sustainability: The next step is to determine a plan to sustain these results. Future directions include looking at how to implement an annual ongoing regional event, with funding opportunities and planning partners being explored.

Questions? | Get in touch
Leila Dale, Project Evaluator
ldale@divisionsbc.ca
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