US ARMY PRIMARY CARE: NURSING PRACTICE ENVIRONMENT, TEAM

PERFORMANCE, AND OUTCOMES

by

MELISSA JEAN MILLER

A Dissertation submitted to the

Graduate School-Newark

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in Nursing Research

written under the direction of

Mary L. Johansen PhD, RN, NE-BC, FAAN

and approved by

Newark, New Jersey

October 2020

Copyright page:

© 2020

Melissa Jean Miller

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

US Army Primary Care: Nursing practice environment, team performance, and outcomes

By MELISSA JEAN MILLER

Dissertation Director:

Mary L. Johansen PhD, RN, NE-BC, FAAN

Rationale: In order to compete with the private sector in retaining highly competent and skilled nurses, it is critical to identify, through rigorous research methods, those system characteristics that contribute to or reduce attrition so that evidenced-based retention strategies can be designed and implemented in US Army primary care settings within the Military Health System.

Hypotheses: This study tested three hypotheses: (a) the nursing practice environment is positively associated with team performance, clinic staff perception of overall patient safety, and staff nurse job satisfaction, and negatively associated with staff nurse intent to leave, (b) team performance is positively associated with clinic staff perception of overall patient safety and staff nurse job satisfaction, and negatively associated with staff nurse intent to leave, and (c) team performance mediates the relationship between the nursing practice environment and clinic staff perception of overall patient safety, staff nurse job satisfaction, and staff nurse job satisfaction.

Method: This is a cross-sectional, correlational study examining secondary data from 2016 representing 39 US Army primary care clinics located in eighteen states and Germany.

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to examine the relationships among the nursing practice environment, team performance, clinic staff perception of overall patient safety, staff nurse job satisfaction, and staff nurse intent to leave in US Army primary care clinics.

Findings: The findings of this study highlight the importance of a positive nursing practice environment, especially nurse manager ability, leadership, and support for nurses to clinic and staff nurse outcomes including intent to leave as an indicator of attrition.

Key words: nursing practice environment, team performance, patient safety, job satisfaction, intent to leave

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the tireless support of my family, committee, and friends throughout this degree program. Tyler, you provided me the perfect dose of rationalism and compassion. Daisy and Amy, mommy is so proud of you. Dr. Johansen, words cannot express my gratitude. Your passion, endurance, and will for me to succeed were my driving force. To my family and friends, thank you. This accomplishment would not have been possible without the opportunity to apply for the Army Medical Department Long Term Health Education and Training scholarship program, funding from the TriService Nursing Research Program, and a vast network of amazing researchers both within and outside of Rutgers University. A special thank you to LTC Swiger, and the Army Nursing Research team. You challenged me to grow, expected my best, and prepared me to soar.

Dedication

I dedicate this dissertation to COL (ret.) Patricia Patrician PhD, RN FAAN, COL (ret.) Bonnie Jennings PhD, RN FAAN, and COL (ret.) Sara Breckenridge-Sproat PhD, RN. Thank you for your service, your dedication, and your personal investment in my individual and professional development. You may not have known that a young lieutenant was listening to your presentations, reading your articles, and following your careers for guidance and direction, but you were instrumental in a special way to my decision to pursue a PhD and a career in nursing research.

Disclosure

This research project is sponsored by the TriService Nursing Research Program, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences; however, the information or content and conclusions do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of, nor should any official endorsement be inferred by, the TriService Nursing Research Program, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, the Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

The views and information presented are those of the author and do not represent the official position of the U.S. Army Medical Department Center and School Health Readiness Center of Excellence, the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, or the Departments of Army, Department of Defense, or U.S. Government

Table of Contents

Title Page	
Copyright Page	
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgement and Dedication	_Error! Bookmark not defined.
Disclosure	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	_Error! Bookmark not defined.
List of Illustrations	X
Chapter One	1
The Problem	1
Phenomenon of Interest	2
Nurse Outcomes	3
Process of Care	4
Organizational Outcome: Overall Patient Safety	5
Significance of the Study	7
Study Purpose	7
Research Questions	
Chapter Two	10
Literature Search Strategy	10
Literature Review	11
Knowledge Gaps	18
Conceptual Model	19

Hypotheses	28
Chapter Three	30
Description of Research Setting	30
Sample	31
Instruments	37
Procedure for Data Collection	43
Operational Definitions	46
Chapter Four	50
Sample Description	50
Statistical Description of Variables	52
Psychometric Properties of Instruments	61
Results of Hypothesis Testing	62
Chapter Five	78
Discussion	78
Usefullness of the Conceptual Model	88
Conclusion	
Chapter Six	90
Summary	90
Limitations	94
Recommendations	95
Conclusions	96
Implications	97
Bibliography	99

Appendices	111
Evidence Table	111
Instruments	188
Mediation Analysis	194

List of Tables

- Table 1. Dimensions of Overall Perception of Patient Safety with Definitions
- Table 2. Army Nurse Corps Primary Care Clinic Sample Descriptives by Military

Treatment Facility

- Table 3. Army Primary Care Clinic Sample Descriptives
- Table 4. Empirical Indicator Original Sample, Validity Testing, and Reliability Coefficients
- Table 5. PES-NWI Skewness and Kurtosis Diagnostics
- Table 6. T-TPQ Skewness and Kurtosis Diagnostics
- Table 7. Military Health System Patient Safety Culture Survey Skewness and Kurtosis Diagnostics
- Table 8. Study Variable Name, Type, and Empirical Indicators
- Table 9. Descriptive Statistics for the Dimensions of Clinic Staff Perception of Overall

 Patient Safety
- Table 10. Descriptive Statistics for Patient Safety Grade and Number of Events Reported
- Table 11. Descriptive Statistics for US Army Primary Care Staff Nurse Job Satisfaction
- Table 12. Descriptive Statistics for US Army Primary Care Nurse Intent to Leave
- Table 13. Descriptive Statistics for the Dimensions of the Nursing Practice Environment
- Table 14. Descriptive Statistics for the Dimensions of Team Performance
- Table 15. Covariate Correlations with Dependent Variables
- Table 16. Alpha Coefficients for Study Instruments
- Table 17. Nursing Practice Environment Dimension Effects on the Dimensions of Team

 Performance

- Table 18. Bivariate Relationships Between the Nursing Practice Environment and Staff

 Nurse Job Satisfaction
- Table 19. Correlations Between the Nursing Practice Environment and the Dimensions of

 Clinic Staff Perception of Overall Patient Safety
- Table 20. Effects of the Nursing Practice Environment on the Dimensions of Clinic Staff

 Perception of Overall Patient Safety
- Table 21. Effects of the Dimensions of the Nursing Practice Environment on the

 Dimensions of Clinic Staff Perception of Overall Patient Safety
- Table 22. Correlations Between the Dimensions of the Nursing Practice Environment and

 Staff Nurse Intent to Leave
- Table 23. Correlations Between the Dimensions of Team Performance and theDimensions of Clinic Staff Perception of Overall Patient Safety
- Table 24. Simple Effect if the Dimensions of Team Performance on the Dimensions of

 Clinic Staff Perception of Overall Patient Safety
- Table 25. Forward Inclusion Effects of the Dimensions of Team Performance on theDimensions of Clinic Staff Perception of Overall Patient Safety.

List of Illustrations

Figure 1. Conceptual Model

Figure 2. Hypothesized Parallel Mediation Model

- Figure 3. Total Effect and Mediation Model for Manager Expectations and Actions Promoting Patient Safety
- Figure 4. Total Effect and Mediation Model for Organizational Learning Continuous Improvement
- Figure 5. Total Effect and Mediation Model for Communication Openness
- Figure 6. Total Effect and Mediation Model for Frequency of Events Reported
- Figure 7. Total Effect and Mediating Model for Staff Nurse Job Satisfaction

Chapter One

The Problem

Military nursing is not immune to nurse attrition. The primary mission of the Army Medical Department is to ensure service members are fit and medically ready to deploy and ensure the preparedness of the medical staff and system to provide care anywhere the service members may be (Defense Health Agency, 2017). The military term for this mission and purpose is "readiness". Nurse attrition hinders the Army Medical Department by diminishing readiness (Army Medicine, 2019). Nurse attrition compromises the Army Medical Department ability to provide care to beneficiaries and ensure service members fit and medically ready to deploy. Nurse attrition has long been defined as the ongoing process of nurse turnover at various career stages which include involuntary, voluntary, internal, and external turnover (Crow & Hartman, 2005). The 2018 national rate of turnover for bedside registered nurses (RNs) is 16.7%, a 2% increase from 2016 (Nursing Solutions Inc., 2018). Licensed practical nurse turnover has been reported as high as 18% (Wisconsin Hospital Association, 2018). The estimated cost of RN turnover is \$38,000 to \$61,000 annually which totals \$4.4 - \$7 million annual loss for hospitals due to RN turnover alone (Nursing Solutions Inc., 2018). Nurse attrition is positively associated with nurse intent to leave, defined as leaving perceptions, which Lake (1998) found to be a significant predictor of actual nurse attrition (Cheng & Loui, 2011; Hayes et al., 2006).

In 2011, the Army Nurse Corps implemented a new framework for nursing called the Patient CaringTouch System. This evidence-based framework was developed to improve patient outcomes, decrease variation in nursing practice, and reduce nurse turnover (Breckenridge-Sproat et al., 2015). Despite the implementation of the framework, pre and post-implementation evaluations of acute care settings indicate a significant increase in staff nurse job dissatisfaction and specifically, intent to leave over time (Breckenridge-Sproat et al., 2017). Reducing the attrition of nurses across the care continuum is a high priority for military nursing to include the Army Nurse Corps (TriService Nursing Research Program, 2018). Therefore, evaluation of the nursing practice environments of US Army primary care clinics in relationship with nurse outcomes to include staff nurse intent to leave are essential.

Phenomenon of Interest

Lake (2002) defines the nursing practice environment as the attributes or characteristics of an organization that either facilitate or impede the professional practice of nurses. It is important to distinguish the nursing practice environment from both the work environment and organizational climate. These terms have been utilized interchangeably across the literature. In the past decade, nurse researchers such as Lake (2007), have reaffirmed that the work environment is a broad concept which encompasses the nursing practice environment as well as the physical work environment and other healthcare organization structures. Organizational climate which amalgamates structures, processes, and outcomes has long been referred to as dated and neglected in the age of research examining organizational culture (Denison, 1996). The physical work environment and the organizational climate of healthcare organizations are not easily modified in contrast to attributes and characteristics of healthcare organizations, such as the nursing practice environment, which possess greater modification potential (Aiken, Clarke, & Sloane, 2002).

Nurse Outcomes

An extensive prior body of research affirms a favorable, or supportive, nursing practice environment is positively associated with staff nurse outcomes to include job satisfaction, engagement, and well-being, and inversely associated with nurses' intent to leave their job (Aiken et al., 2002; Aiken & Patrician, 2000; Foley, Kee, Minick, Harvey, & Jennings, 2002). Research examining nursing practice environments in the past decade have primarily focused on inpatient or acute care settings in both the civilian and military healthcare sectors. Evidence from military samples indicate that unfavorable, or unsupportive, nursing practice environments in acute care settings are associated with negative nurse outcomes to include staff nurse job dissatisfaction, emotional exhaustion, intent to leave, nurse-reported fair to poor quality of care, and nurse-administered medication errors (Breckenridge-Sproat, Johantgen, & Patrician, 2012; Breckenridge-Sproat et al., 2017; Lake, 2002; Patrician et al., 2017; Patrician et al., 2010; Swiger et al., 2018).

Additionally, a few studies have examined the nursing practice environment in civilian sector, specialty ambulatory care settings to include home health, nursing homes, outpatient hemodialysis clinics, and outpatient oncology clinics (Choi, Flynn, & Aiken, 2012; Flynn, 2007; Flynn, Liang, Dickinson, & Aiken, 2010; Flynn, Thomas-Hawking, & Clarke, 2009; Friese & Himes-Ferris, 2013; Jarin, Flynn, Lake, & Aiken, 2014; Nelson-Brantley, Park, & Bergquist-Beringer, 2018b). These findings also indicate that favorable, or supportive, nursing practice environments in specialty ambulatory care settings are associated with positive nurse outcomes including staff nurse job satisfaction, staff nurse intent to stay, nurse-assessed quality of care, and nurse-assessed patient safety (Choi et al., J. Choi et al., 2012; Flynn et al., 2010; Friese & Himes-Ferris, 2013;

Thomas-Hawkins & Flynn, 2015). Inversely, research findings indicate that unfavorable, or unsupportive, nursing practice environments among specialty ambulatory care settings are associated with negative, or adverse nurse outcomes including staff nurse burnout, staff nurse exposure to chemotherapy, and staff nurse intent to leave (Flynn, 2007; Flynn et al., 2009; Friese, Himes-Ferris, Frasier, McCullagh, & Griggs, 2012). A recent meta-analysis examining eight unique observations found a strong, significant relationship between the nursing practice environment and nursing outcomes to include nurse intent to leave (OR = 0.72 [0.65, 0.80], p<.01), nurse job dissatisfaction (OR= 0.68 [0.62, 0.73], p<.01), and nurse burnout (OR= 0.74 [0.64, 0.85], p<.01) (Lake et al., 2019).

Process of Care

In addition to nurse outcomes, the nursing practice environment has been theorized to directly influence process of care (Aiken et al., 2002). The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) defines a process of care as those things that providers do to maintain, improve, or maintain and improve health (AHRQ, 2011). Research findings empirically support a direct, positive relationship between nursing practice environment and process of care (Flynn, 2007; Flynn, Liang, Dickson, Xie, & Suh, 2012; Friese et al., 2012). One study identified a direct relationship between process of care and staff nurse outcomes (OR= 8.75, [4.50, 17.01], p < .001) in a sample of registered nurses working in outpatient hemodialysis clinics (Flynn et al., 2009).

In Army medical treatment facilities, team performance is a process of care which has been defined as the current operational and functional state of a team within an organization (AHRQ, 2010). A team has been defined as a group of at least two or more individuals serving in specialized roles while adaptively, interdependently, and dynamically interacting to accomplish a common goal (Swezey et al., 1992). Therefore, the staff of a US Army primary care clinic are a team of specialized healthcare professionals with the common goal of providing safe patient care. Team performance includes team structure, leadership, situation monitoring, mutual support, and communication (AHRQ, 2010). The Big Five in Teamwork framework posits team performance as a stable concept ideal for comparison across staffs, facilities, and locales (Salas, Sims, & Burke, 2005). A key to earning Primary Care Medical Home (PCMH) certification is effective performance of the interdisciplinary team in coordinating patientcentered, comprehensive, safe, and quality care (The Joint Commission, 2018). An examination of team performance in Army primary care clinics is timely and relevant as these clinics are at various locales on the journey to PCMH certification.

Organizational Outcome: Staff Perception of Overall Patient Safety

Safe, quality care catapulted to the forefront of national healthcare priorities with the release of the 2000 Institute of Medicine report *To Err is Human*. A recent report mandated by the Secretary of Defense revealed renewed concerns regarding safe, quality care in the Military Health System to include the Army Medical Department. Findings from this review revealed generally safe healthcare practices, however, several areas demonstrated opportunities for improvement to include teamwork within units, staffing, and organizational learning (Defense Health Agency, 2014). Unfortunately, the Military Health System lacked the ability to compare the results of this review to civilian or private sector healthcare systems (Defense Health Agency, 2014). The participation of the Military Health System in national healthcare quality and research databases would significantly improve the ability of the system to evaluate, compare, and further investigate evidence-based strategies for improvement. Safe, quality care is an organizational outcome incumbent on the safety culture of the organization. A direct, positive relationship between the nursing practice environment and organizational outcomes to include quality of care, occurrence of adverse patient events, and staff perception of safety has been empirically supported in the literature (Aiekn, Clarke, Sloane, Lake, & Cheney, 2009; Aiken & Poghosyan, 2009; Friese, Siefert, Thomas-Frost, Walker, & Ponte, 2016; Gasparino & Guirardello, 2017; Hinno, Partanen, & Vehviläinen-Julkunen, 2012; Kutney-Lee et al., 2015; Patrician et al., 2010; Panunto & Guirardello, 2013; Shang, Friese, Wu, & Aiken, 2013; Tervo-Heikkinen, Kiviniemi, Partanen, & Vehviläinen-Julkunen, 2009).

The Military Health System, now the Defense Health Agency, Patient Safety Program is guided by the AHRQ Patient Safety Culture Framework and initiatives. The AHRQ adopted the Advisory Committee on the Safety of Nuclear Installations' definition of a safety culture as the combination of individual and group values, attitudes, perceptions, competencies, and behavior patterns in determining organizations' safety commitment, style, and proficiency regarding the management of health and safety (Study Group on Human Factors, 1994). This committee suggested that a positive safety culture is comprised of the characteristics of open communication, mutual trust, shared perception of safety importance, and confidence in preventive measure efficacy. Safety

6

culture domains include communication openness, feedback and communication about error, frequency of events reported, handoff and transitions, management support for patient safety, nonpunitive response to error, organizational learning and continuous improvement, staffing, supervisor/manager expectations and actions promoting patient safety, teamwork across units, teamwork within units, patient safety grade, and number of events reported (AHRQ, 2016). Each of these domains incorporate safety-focused structures and processes.

Significance of the Study

Army primary care clinics are collectively responsible for the care of nearly four million beneficiaries to include active duty military service members, activated reservists, military family members, retirees, and military and retiree dependents. Army nurses constitute a significant proportion of the healthcare professionals providing care to this patient population. This study will inform the development and design of evidence-based retention strategies allowing military nursing to compete with the civilian sector in retaining highly competent and skilled nurses in primary care settings.

Study Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationships among the primary care nursing practice environment, team performance, staff perception of overall safety, and staff nurse job satisfaction with staff nurse intent to leave, as an indicator of potential attrition. Three specific aims include 1) describe staff nurse perception of the nursing practice environment in Army primary care clinics, 2) examine the associations among nursing practice environment, team performance, staff perception of overall safety, staff nurse job satisfaction, and staff nurse intent to leave, and 3) assess the mediating role of team performance in the relationship between nursing practice environment and a) staff perception of overall safety, b) staff nurse job satisfaction, and c) staff nurse intent to leave.

There is a paucity of research examining the nursing practice environment of primary care settings, and importantly, in the unique setting of Army primary care. Military healthcare performs peacetime and wartime missions, often simultaneously. Nursing in Army primary care settings is turbulent due to the regular reassignment and relocation of both staff and beneficiaries. In addition to these regular rotations, staff and beneficiaries are also rotated in and out of clinics due to deployment in support of humanitarian and military operations, military training and education, and civilian training and education opportunities which may last a couple weeks to multiple months. These individuals often maintain a full-time equivalent position in their clinic which places an increased burden to redistribute the workload on clinic staffing. An exploration of the nursing practice environment and team performance in Army primary care clinics with nurse and organizational outcomes is essential to inform strategies for reducing staff nurse attrition and ensuring the provision of safe, quality care in these settings. This study will inform military nursing leaders regarding system characteristics that are associated with staff nurse attrition in Army primary care settings.

Research Questions

- 1. Within primary care clinics located in Army MTFs, is there a significant relationship between nursing practice environment and
 - a. team performance?
 - b. staff perception of overall safety?

- c. staff nurse job satisfaction?
- d. staff nurse intent to leave?
- 2. Is there a significant relationship between team performance and
 - a. staff perception of overall safety among primary care clinics within Army MTFs?
 - b. staff nurse job satisfaction among primary care clinics within Army MTFs?
 - c. staff nurse intent to leave among primary care clinics within Army MTFs?
- 3. Does team performance mediate the relationship between nursing practice environment and
 - a. staff perception of overall safety among primary care clinics within Army MTFs?
 - b. staff nurse job satisfaction among primary care clinics within Army MTFs?
 - c. staff nurse intent to leave among primary care clinics within Army MTFs?

Chapter Two

Literature Search Strategy

To fully describe the concepts included in this dissertation, a literature search was performed utilizing the PubMed and CINAHL databases for the terms "nursing practice environment" or "nurse practice environment" with nurse outcomes to include intent to leave which yielded 334 articles. Abstracts were reviewed and studies were excluded which did not meet the criteria for inclusion which include empirical studies published in the last ten years and available in the English language. Empirical studies examining nursing students and nursing faculty were excluded as there are likely different circumstances responsible for the attrition of nursing students and faculty as compared nurses working in clinical settings. Advanced practice nurses were also excluded due to their adherence to a medical model rather than a nursing model in military settings. Empirical studies examining nurse midwives and nurse anesthetists were also excluded as these professionals provide specialized care following a medical, rather than nursing, model of care. A domain of the nursing practice environment evaluated by staff nurses is nurse manager leadership and support of nurses; therefore, nurse mangers, articles focused on nurse executives, and other nurse administrator roles were excluded from this review. Two literature review articles detailing the history of an empirical measure of the nursing practice environment and two research program evaluations were also excluded. Three psychometric studies were retained which also examined the relationship of the nursing practice environment to nurse outcomes.

Literature Review

Thirty-three articles were retained for analysis and evaluation. Study sample, purpose, study design, conceptual framework, and significant findings for each study are detailed in an evidence table in Appendix A. From 2009 to present, the nursing practice environment has received significant coverage in the literature. Findings from the literature are synthesized and organized by relationship with the phenomenon of interest: nursing practice environment and 1) nurse outcomes, 2) process of care, and 3) organizational outcomes. The methodology employed by these studies is analyzed and evaluated below and knowledge gaps are identified.

Nurse Practice Environment and Nurse Outcomes

Burnout. Many studies examined nursing outcomes associated with nursing practice environments. Burnout was examined in sixteen of the studies (Aiken et al., 2009; Aiken & Poghosyan, 2009; Flynn et al., 2009; Fuentelsaz-Gallego, Moreno-Casbas, & González-María, 2013; Gasparino & Guirardello, 2017; Kutney-Lee et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2012; Nantsupawat et al., 2017; Patrician, 2010; Panunto & Guirardello, 2013; Alves, Silva, & Guirardello, 2017; Shang et al., 2013; Topçu et al., 2016; Van den Heede et al., 2013; Yurumezoglu & Kocaman, 2016; Zander, Blümel, & Busse, 2013) and operationalized most often as staff nurse responses on the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach, Jackson, Leiter, Schaufeli, & Schwab, 2019). One study operationalized burnout as staff nurse responses on Wharton's seven item emotional exhaustion scale (Gabriel, Erickson, Moran, Diefendorff, & Bromley, 2013; Wharton, 1993). Similar terms examined in individual studies included job related feelings (Hinno et al., 2012), moral distress (Hiler, Hickman, Reimer, & Wilson, 2018), and job stress (Tervo-Heikkinen et al., 2009). A consistent, significant finding in this literature is a strong correlation between nursing practice environment and nurse burnout (Flynn et al., 2009; Panunto & Guirardello, 2013; Zander et al., 2013). When controlling for the nursing practice environment, burnout was a significant predictor of nurse intent to leave among United States nephrology nurses (Flynn et al., 2009), German nurses (Zander et al., 2013), Belgian nurses (Van Bogaert et al., 2014), and Turkish nurses (Topçu et al., 2016).

Intent to leave. The literature demonstrates a tendency for individual researcher definition of intent to leave. Empirical indicators across the studies survey nurses concerning their contemplations of leaving their position, employer, institution, and the profession retrospectively over the past six months to one year (Hiler et al., 2018; Yurumezoglu & Kocaman, 2016), prospectively within the next six months to one year (Aiken et al., 2009; Aiken & Poghosyan, 2009; Blake, Leach, Robbins, Pike, & Needleman, 2013; Flynn et al., 2009; Friese et al., 2016; Fuentelsaz-Gallego et al., 2013; Gabriel et al., 2013; Kutney-Lee et al., 2015; Lee, Kim, Kang, Yoon, & Kim, 2014; Lin, Chiang, & Chen, 2011; Liu et al., 2012; Patrician et al., 2010; Panunto & Guirardello, 2013; Alves et al., 2017; Van Bogaert et al., 2014; Van den Heede et al., 2013), and ever contemplating to leave (Aiken & Poghosyan, 2009; Choi, Cheung, & Pang, 2013; Gasparino & Guirardello, 2017; Hinno et al., 2012; Lavoie-Tremblay, Paquet, Marchionni, & Drevniok, 2011; Shang et al., 2013; Zander et al., 2013). Cheng and Liou (2011) operationalize intent to leave as staff nurse responses on the Anticipated Turnover Scale by Hinshaw and Atwood (1987). Despite the differences in how intent to leave was defined and operationalized, the studies demonstrate similar findings. All but one study

(Shang et al., 2013), empirically support a significant relationship between the nursing practice environment and nurse intent to leave. Shang et al. (2013) delimited their sample for multivariate analysis to nurses reporting mixed and favorable nursing practice environments which resulted in a low percentage of nurses reporting intent to leave. A negative association between nurse intent to leave and job satisfaction is empirically supported across this literature.

Job satisfaction. Nineteen studies examine the relationship between nursing practice environment and nurse job satisfaction; most often operationalized as a single item measure asking nurses to rate how satisfied they are with their current job (Aiken et al., 2009; Choi et al., 2013; Friese et al., 2016; Fuentelsaz-Gallego et al., 2013; Hiler et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2014; Liu et al., 2012; Panunto & Guirardello, 2013; Roche et al., 2016; Tervo-Heikkinen et al., 2009; Van Bogaert et al., 2014; Yurumezoglu & Kocaman, 2016). Job satisfaction was also operationalized as researcher-developed multi-item questionnaires (Gabriel et al., 2013; Numminen et al., 2016; Alves et al., 2017), the Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (Goh & Lopez, 2016b), and the job satisfaction subscale of the Safety Attitudes Questionnaire (Gasparino & Guirardello, 2017). One study examined, more specifically, satisfaction with remuneration or nurse salary and payment (Zander et al., 2013). Nursing practice environment was a consistent predictor of nurse job satisfaction, and job satisfaction was inversely associated with nurse intent to leave across the literature. Four studies examined the contradictory concept, job dissatisfaction, which was associated with unfavorable nursing practice environments and a consistent predictor of nurse intent to leave (Kutney-Lee et al., 2015; Nantsupawat et al., 2017; Patrician et al., 2010; Shang et al., 2013).

Nurse Practice Environment and Organizational Outcomes

Quality of care and patient safety were commonly examined organizational outcomes often assessed by nurses (Aiken et al., 2009; Aiken & Poghosyan, 2009; Friese et al., 2016; Gasparino & Guirardello, 2017; Hinno et al., 2012; Kutney-Lee et al., 2015; Patrician et al., 2010; Panunto & Guirardello, 2013; Shang et al., 2013; Tervo-Heikkinen et al., 2009). Quality of care was examined by eight studies and operationalized as singleitem, ranked measures (Aiken & Poghosyan, 2009; Friese et al., 2016; Patrician et al., 2010; Panunto & Guirardello, 2013; Shang et al., 2013; Tervo-Heikkinen et al., 2009) and multi-item, ranked measures (Aiken et al., 2009; Kutney-Lee et al., 2015). Hinno, Partanen, & Vevilainen-Julkunen (2012) operationalized quality of care as the improvement in care quality over one year. Each of these studies identified a positive relationship between nursing practice environment and quality of care.

Likewise, findings from each of the studies examining patient safety demonstrated a positive relationship between nursing practice environment and patient safety. Two studies examined nurse perceptions of the safety climate operationalized as nurse responses on the Safety Attitudes Questionnaire (Gasparino & Guirardello, 2017; Alves et al., 2017). Several studies examined adverse patient events to include patient and family complaints, patient falls, nosocomial infections, medication errors, thirty day surgical mortality, patient death within thirty days, and failure to rescue (Aiken et al., 2009; Kutney-Lee et al., 2015; Van Bogaert et al., 2014). Liou (2011) examined organizational commitment which they operationalized as nurse responses on the Mowday et al. (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire and found statistically significant associations among organizational commitment, nursing practice environment, and intent to leave in a sample of Asian-born nurses working in United States hospitals.

Nursing Practice Environment and Process of Care

Only four of the thirty-three studies examined associations between nursing practice environment and process of care. The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality defines processes of care as actions which healthcare professionals do, accepted recommendations for clinical practice, and the care that can be expected to improve or maintain health (AHRQ, 2011). Processes of care evaluated in the literature include care left undone (Flynn et al., 2009), nurse-physician communication (Blake et al., 2013), professional competence (Numminen et al., 2016), and safety behaviors and actions (Friese et al., 2016). Care left undone was operationalized as nurse report of necessary care activities left undone, due to a lack of time to complete them, on their last shift worked. Flynn et al. (2009) found, controlling for workload, less supportive practice environments (OR=4.6, [1.96, 10.78], p<.01) and three or more care activities left undone (OR= 2.68, [1.17, 6.14], p<.05) were significant predictors of burnout, and nurse burnout was a significant predictor of staff nurse intent to leave their position (OR=3.0, [1.7, 5.0], p<.01) and employer (OR= 2.70, [1.59, 5.86], p<.01). Nurse-physician communication was operationalized as nurse responses on the ICU Nurse-Physician Communication Questionnaire which were significantly correlated with domains of the nursing practice environment, however, only the nursing manager ability, leadership, and support for nursing domain of the nursing practice environment remained a significant predictor of intent to leave in multivariate analyses (Blake et al., 2013).

Professional competence was defined as "nurses' capacity to act and integrate knowledge, attitudes, and values" in context (Numminen et al., 2016, p. E2). This concept was operationalized as nurse responses on the Nurse Competence Scale which demonstrated a weak, but statistically significant, positive relationship (r = 0.241, p<.001) with the nursing practice environment (Numminen et al., 2016). Numminen et al. (2016) found nurses perceiving a positive practice environment reported high competence, never or seldom intending to leave their job or the profession, satisfaction with quality of care in their work setting, and satisfaction with their job orientation. A two-way effect was identified among the staffing and resource adequacy domain of the nursing practice environment, high satisfaction with quality of care, and low intent to leave either one's job or the nursing profession (Numminen et al., 2016).

Safety behaviors and actions were operationalized as nurses' report on the Safety Organizing Scale on which higher scores are indicative of frequent performance of safety behaviors and actions (Friese et al., 2016). Safety behaviors and actions were found to be significantly associated with the foundations for quality care (β = 0.64, SE 0.10, p<.001), participation in practice affairs (β = 0.18, SE 0.07, p<.01), and collegial nurse-physician relations (β = 0.26, SE 0.10, p=.01) domains of the nursing practice environment (Friese et al., 2016). Participation in practice affairs and collegial nurse-physician relations were also found to be significant predictors of staff nurse intent to stay (Friese et al., 2016). Intent to stay was evaluated rather than intent to leave due to the small percentage (8.2%) of nurses reporting intent to leave.

Methodology

Methodology are reflective of the theoretical concepts and propositions purported to guide this body of literature. Literature appearing atheoretical demonstrate consistency in conceptual terminology and definitions apart from the interchangeable use of the terms "work environment" and "practice environment" and the variability in how intent to leave is defined and operationalized. Most of the empirical studies utilized a quantitative approach. One study employed a qualitative descriptive design (Flinkman & Salanterä, 2015) and two additional studies employed mixed method approaches (Van den Heede et al., 2013; Zander et al., 2013). Three studies conducted robust psychometric testing on the Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index (PES-NWI) (Fuentelsaz-Gallego et al., 2013; Gasparino & Guirardello, 2017) and a researcher-developed measure of the nursing practice environment (Choi et al., 2013) and additionally evaluated the relationship of the nursing practice environment with staff nurse outcomes.

Instruments

The National Quality Forum endorsed the PES-NWI as the gold standard for measurement of the nursing practice environment in 2004 and a new measure specification is currently under review by the Patient Safety Portfolio Standing Committee for continued endorsement (National Quality Forum, 2019). Most of the studies utilized the PES-NWI, a translation, a version, or a modification such as the PES-NWI-Revised (Goh & Lopez, 2016a, 2016b) to examine the nursing practice environment or work environment. Other measures included the Nursing Work Index (NWI) Brazilian version long and short forms (Panunto & Guirardello, 2013; Alves et al., 2017), the NWI-Revised (Hinno et al., 2012; Van Bogaert et al., 2014), and a researcher developed 72-item measure (Choi et al., 2013).

Culture

It is evident across this literature that cultural factors to include orientation, migration, and acculturation have a significant effect on nurses' perception of the nursing practice environment and nurse intent to leave as an indicator of attrition (Cheng & Liou, 2011; Goh & Lopez, 2016b; Zander et al., 2013). Only twelve of the thirty-three studies were performed in the United States (Aiken & Poghosyan, 2009; Blake et al., 2013; Cheng & Liou, 2011; Flynn, Thomas-Hawkins, & Clarke, 2009; Friese et al., 2016; Gabriel et al., 2013; Hiler et al., 2018; Kutney-Lee et al., 2015; Patrician et al., 2010; Shang et al., 2013). It is likely that the associations identified in studies conducted prior to 2009 in the United States encouraged the adaptation and translation of instruments for examining the nursing practice environment in other countries, among other cultures, and outside acute care settings. One study examined Asian-born nurses working in United States hospitals (Cheng & Liou, 2011). Nations represented by the remaining studies include Armenia, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Finland, Germany, Netherlands, Russia, South Korea, Singapore, Spain, Taiwan, Thailand, and Turkey.

Knowledge Gaps

The significant findings and identified gaps in this body of literature support the need for this proposed research examining staff nurse perceptions of the nursing practice environment in ambulatory primary care settings. Only two of the thirty-three studies reviewed from the past decade examined nurses working in ambulatory care settings (Flynn et al., 2009; Friese et al., 2016). The Army Medical Department oversees the

primary care provided to 3.9 million beneficiaries annually by approximately 107 clinics. In comparison to the majority of samples in this body of literature, Army nursing is characterized by higher percentages of male nurses as well as rich racial and ethnic diversity (Patrician et al., 2010). Military and federal civilian rank structures and Army nursing staffing models are unique to this population and may influence nurse perceptions of the nursing practice environment and nurse intent to leave (Patrician et al., 2017; Patrician et al., 2010). An examination of the relationship between nursing practice environment and staff nurse intent to leave, as an indicator of potential attrition, among United States Army primary care clinics will address the identified gaps in this literature.

Conceptual Model

Several theoretical models guided the various studies examining the nursing practice environment and its relationship to patient outcomes, process of care, nurse outcomes, and organizational outcomes. Twenty-two articles appear atheoretical, likely due to word and page restrictions enforced by the publishing journal. Four studies were guided by the Nursing Organization and Outcomes Model (NOOM), however, three of the four do not explicitly name the model (Flynn et al., 2009; Liu et al., 2012; Patrician et al., 2010; Shang et al., 2013). These three studies reference early empirical studies guided by the NOOM (Patrician et al., 2012; 2010; Shang et al., 2013). The American Nurses Credentialing Center's Forces of Magnetism (Aiken & Poghosyan, 2009; Van den Heede et al., 2013), the American Association of Critical Care Nurses' Healthy Work Environment framework (Blake et al., 2013), the Patient Care Delivery Model (Roche et al., 2016), and the Quality Health Outcomes Model (Nantsupawat et al., 2017) were each utilized to guide individual studies. One study reported that the conceptual model guiding

their study integrated the Push-Pull theory of migration with Herzburg's Two-Factor theory (Goh & Lopez, 2016b). Hiler et al. (2018) stated that a transactional model of stress and coping guided their research.

The NOOM is an expansion on Donabedian's Quality Medical Care model (Donabedian, 1966). Donabedian postulates that healthcare quality is the result of structures influencing processes which influence outcomes (Donabedian, 1966). Aiken, Sochalski, and Lake (1997) first introduced a brief description of the NOOM. Another brief narrative and accompanying figure depicting the NOOM was presented by Aiken, Clark, and Sloane (2002) in a research report detailing the International Hospital Outcomes Consortium study. Currently, the NOOM lacks a dedicated theoretical source, however, the model provides the context in which Donabedian's linear structure-processoutcome model operates; specifically, for nursing. The NOOM posits that organizational support for nursing, also known as the nursing practice environment, is directly associated with process of care and staff nurse job outcomes (Aiken et al., 2002; Lake, 2002). The conceptual model for this proposed study is depicted in Figure 1.

Figure 1.





Note. Conceptual model adapted from "Hospital staffing, organization, and quality of care: cross-national findings," by Aiken, Clark, and Sloane, 2002, *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 14, 1, p. 15-13. Copyright 2002 by the International Society for Quality in Health Care and Oxford University Press.

Nursing Organization and Outcomes Model

The NOOM is a middle-range, explanatory nursing framework ideal for conceptualizing the relationships among healthcare structure, organizational support for nursing, process of care, and (a) organizational, (b) staff, and (c) beneficiary outcomes (Aiken et al., 2002). Aiken, Clarke, and Sloane (2002) identify five major concepts and three relational propositions. The brief narrative included in an empirical article excludes nonrelational propositions (Aiken et al., 2002). The figure accompanying the narrative in this research report depicts the identified concepts and relational propositions with additional concepts and unidirectional relationships. Empirical studies published by Aiken prior to and subsequent this seminal research paper demonstrate the same theoretical premise, but lack theoretical clarity (Aiken et al., 2002; Aiken, Sochalski, & Lake, 1997; Aiken, Buchan, Ball, & Rafferty, 2008; Aiken, Clarke, Sloane, Lake, & Cheney, 2008; Aiken & Patrician, 2000; Aiken & Poghusyan, 2009; Aiken, Sloane, Lake, Sochalski, & Weber, 1999; Aiken, Smith, & Lake, 1994). In review of nearly 900 empirical studies examining concepts of this model only ten studies identify the NOOM as the conceptual basis. Eight studies explicitly identify the NOOM as the conceptual basis (Choi, Flynn, & Aiken, 2012; Flynn, 2007; Flynn et al., 2009; McMullan, Thomas-Hawkins, & Shirey, 2017; Nelson & Flynn, 2015; Ogbolu, Johantgen, Zhu, & Johnson, 2015; Thomas-Hawkins & Flynn, 2015; Weaver & Lindgren, 2017). Two studies recognize the NOOM as the International Hospital Consortium Outcomes model (Schubert et al., 2008; Shang et al., 2013).

In 1999, Lake expanded the NOOM to include the nursing practice environment, a contemporary of the organizational support for nursing concept, in an article detailing the construction and psychometric testing of the Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index (PES-NWI) (Lake, 2002). Lake (2002) defines the nursing practice environment as the attributes or characteristics of an organization that either facilitate or impede the professional practice of nurses. The NOOM consists of five concepts to include hospital organization, organizational support for nursing or the nursing practice environment, process of care, nurse outcomes, and patient outcomes (Aiken et al., 2002). The NOOM depicts unidirectional relationships in which the hospital organization affects the nursing practice environment (Aiken et al., 2002). In turn, the nursing practice environment affects nurse outcomes and process of care (Aiken et al., 2002). Likewise, nurse outcomes and process of care affect patient outcomes (Aiken et al., 2002). As depicted in 2002, the hospital organization has three dimensions to include nurse to patient ratios and staffing skill mix, surveillance and early detection, and medical staff qualifications (Aiken et al., 2002). Both Aiken and Lake address nurses as part of the hospital organization structure and posit that nurses are the perpetual surveillance system for early detection of complication (Aiken et al., 2002; Lake, 2002). Nurse staffing to include skill mix and patient to nurse ratios affect the functionality of this early detection mechanism (Aiken et al., 2002). Aiken et al. (2002) explicitly identify three relational propositions to include (a) hospital organization affects nurse and patient outcomes, (b) process of care is affected by hospital organization, and (c) process of care affects patient outcomes.

The NOOM depicts organizational support for nursing as a four-dimensional concept to include resource adequacy, nurse autonomy, nurse control, and nurse-physician relations (Aiken et al., 2002). In contrast, Lake (2002) identified five dimensions of the nursing practice environment to include (a) nurse participation in hospital affairs, (b) nursing foundations for quality of care, (c) nurse manager ability, leadership, and support of nurses, (d) staffing and resource adequacy, and (e) collegial nurse-physician relations. A positive nursing practice environment is one perceived by nurses to represent the five domains (Lake, 2002).

A significant association between the nursing practice environment and nurse outcomes to include nurse intent to leave has been empirically supported across the literature (Aiken, Clarke, Sloane, Lake, & Cheney, 2009; Flynn et al., 2009; Kutney-Lee et al., 2015; Patrician et al., 2010). The NOOM does not purport a direct relationship

between the nursing practice environment and patient outcomes (Aiken et al., 2002), however this relationship has also been empirically supported by the literature (Aiken et al., 2009; Kutney-Lee et al., 2015; Van Bogaert et al., 2014). Several studies examine the association of the nursing practice environment and process of care (Flynn et al., 2009; McMullan et al., 2017; Thomas-Hawkins & Flynn, 2015). One study identified and empirically supported a direct relationship between process of care and nurse outcomes (Flynn et al., 2009) which is an expansion of the original model in which process of care is posited to only affect patient outcomes (Aiken et al., 2002). Hospital characteristics consistently associated with nursing practice environment across the literature include bed size, teaching status, ownership, technology status, Magnet designation, and geographical location (Aiken et al., 2009; Aiken & Poghosyan, 2009; Blake et al., 2013; Choi et al., 2013; Flynn et al., 2009; Hinno et al., 2012; Kutney-Lee et al., 2015; Lee et al., 2014; Van den Heede et al., 2013). Nursing characteristics evaluated include age, gender, experience, education, and tenure (Aiken et al., 2009; Aiken & Poghosyan, 2009; Blake et al., 2013; Cheng & Liou, 2011; Choi et al., 2013; Flynn et al., Flynn et al., 2009; Friese et al., 2016; Goh & Lopez, 2016a; Hiler et al., 2018; Kutney-Lee et al., 2015; Lee et al., 2014; Liu et al., 2012; Patrician et al., 2010; Panunto & Guirardello, 2013; Roche et al., 2016; Alves, et al. 2017; Shang et al., 2013). Only one study examined the association between nursing practice environment and patient characteristics to include race, insurance status, severity of illness, etc. (Schubert et al., 2008).

Aiken et al. (2002) posit that healthcare organizations affect patient outcomes and that nurses are strategically located within the healthcare organization for optimal reporting of these relationships. The NOOM is founded in sociology and one of several expansions on Donabedian's Quality Medical Care model (Aiken et al., 2002; Donabedian, 1966). The International Hospital Outcomes Study, development and refinement of the Nursing Work Index, and seminole work examining Magnet facilities shape an understanding of the worldview through which the authors of the NOOM conceived their conceptual model (Aiken et al., 2002; Aiken & Patrician, 2000; Kramer & Hafner, 1989). The NOOM is not overly prescriptive which presents the opportunity for researchers to conceptualize study variables through the integration of organizing frameworks from nursing and other disciplines. This proposed study seeks to integrate two organizing frameworks for conceptualizing study variables: the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Patient Safety Culture (PSC) and the Big Five in Teamwork frameworks (AHRQ, 2016; Salas et al., 2005).

The Patient Safety Culture Framework

A direct, positive relationship between the nursing practice environment and organizational outcomes has been empirically supported in the literature (Aiken et al., 2009; Aiken & Poghosyan, 2009; Friese et al., 2016; Gasparino & Guirardello, 2017; Hinno et al., 2012; Kutney-Lee et al., 2015; Patrician et al., 2010; Panunto & Guirardello, 2013; Shang et al., 2013; Tervo-Heikkinen et al., 2009). The PSC framework is a middlerange descriptive model ideal for conceptualizing healthcare organization outcomes relating to safe, quality care (AHRQ, 2016). Safe, quality care is an organizational outcome incumbent on the safety culture of an organization. The NOOM posits that nurses are the surveillance system of healthcare organizations for early detection of complications (Aiken et al., 2002). Therefore, nurses are a core component of the safety culture of an organization.
The AHRQ adopted the seminal definition of a safety culture proposed by the Advisory Committee on the Safety of Nuclear Installations which describes safety culture as the combination of individual and group values, attitudes, perceptions, competencies, and behavior patterns in determining the organizations' safety commitment, style, and proficiency regarding the management of health and safety (Study Group on Human Factors, 1994). The committee suggests that a positive safety culture possesses the characteristics of open communication, mutual trust, shared perception of safety importance, and confidence in preventive measure efficacy (Study Group on Human Factors, 1994). The PSC framework describes the domains of a safety culture which may be conceptualized as organizational outcomes operationalized as staff perception of the effectiveness of the structures and processes within these domains, or overall perception of patient safety. The PSC framework includes twelve domains of a safety culture (AHRQ, 2016). Domains and their definitions are provided in Table 1.

Table 1.

Dimension of Patient Safety	Definition		
	Staff freely speaking out concerning circumstances that		
Communication openness	may negatively affect a patient and the freedom to		
	question authority		
Foodbook and	An informed staff concerning errors that occur,		
approximation about arror	feedback concerning subsequent changes, and open		
communication about error	discussion concerning error prevention		
	Includes (a) mistakes caught and corrected prior to error		
Frequency of events	affecting a patient, (b) mistakes lacking potential for		
reported	patient harm, and (c) mistakes with potential for patient		
	harm that have not harmed a patient		
Uandoff and transitions	Important patient information movement across units		
nandon and transitions	and within units		

Dimensions of Overall Perception of Patient Safety with Definitions

Management support for patient safety	The provision of a work climate that promotes patient safety as a top priority by hospital management personnel
Nonpunitive response to error	Staff perception that their mistakes and event reports are not recorded within their personnel file or negatively reflect on them
Organizational learning and continuous improvement	Procedures and systems effective at preventing error and a lack of patient safety problems
Staffing	Adequate personnel to handle the workload and appropriate work hours to provide the best care for patients
Supervisor/Manager expectations and actions promoting patient safety	Supervisor and/or manager consideration of staff suggestions for improving patient safety, praise of staff for following patient safety procedures, and not overlooking patient safety problems
Teamwork across units	The cooperation and coordination of units with one another to provide the best care for patients
Teamwork within units	Staff support, treating one another with respect, and working together as a team
Patient safety grade	The perception of unit performance on patient safety as viewed by healthcare organization unit or clinic staff
Number of events reported	An aggregate number of the mistakes reported over the past year

Note. Definitions from the Patient Safety Culture Framework (AHRQ, 2016).

The Big Five in Teamwork

The Big Five in Teamwork framework posits two teamwork processes including team performance and task objectives (Salas et al., 2005). Team performance has been defined as the current operational and functional state of a team within an organization and is recognized as a stable concept (AHRQ, 2010). Therefore, team performance is best suited for examination across geographical locations, staff, and beneficiaries. The Army Medical Department includes approximately 107 primary care clinics located around the globe (Defense Health Agency, 2014). The military staff in these clinics regularly rotate to new duty positions and locations every two to three years and irregularly participate in deployments for humanitarian and military operations, military and civilian school attendance, and various trainings affecting the continuity of care (Defense Health Agency, 2014). The beneficiaries cared for by each of these clinics are also rotating on regular and irregular bases. Team performance is especially ideal for examination of the transient target population for this study.

Team performance, as a process of care, has not been evaluated in the recent literature for associations with the nursing practice environment and intent to leave, as an indicator of nurse attrition. However, the recent literature empirically supports the theorized relationships among nursing practice environment, process of care, and nurse outcomes to include intent to leave (Friese et al., 2016; Numminen et al., 2016). Processes of care evaluated in the literature include care left undone (Flynn et al., 2009), nurse-physician communication (Blake et al., 2013), professional competence (Numminen et al., 2016), and safety behaviors and actions (Friese et al., 2016). Each of these processes demonstrate a significant, positive relationship with the nursing practice environment and a significant, inverse relationship with nurse intent to leave (Aiken et al., 2009; Flynn et al., 2009; Friese et al., 2016; Numminen et al., 2016).

Hypotheses

Based on the above theoretical rationale, the following hypotheses are proposed:

- 1. US Army primary care clinic nursing practice environments, operationalized as staff nurse responses on the PES-NWI, will be
 - a) Positively associated with team performance; operationalized as clinic staff responses on the TeamSTEPPS Teamwork Perceptions Questionnaire (T-TPQ).

- b) Positively associated with staff nurses' job satisfaction;operationalized as staff nurse responses on a single item measure.
- c) Positively associated with staff perception of overall safety;
 operationalized as clinic staff responses on the Military Health System
 Patient Safety Culture Survey (PSCS).
- Negatively associated with staff nurses' intent to leave;
 operationalized as staff nurse responses on a single item measure.
- US Army primary care clinic team performance, operationalized as clinic staff responses on the T-TPQ, will be
 - a) Positively associated with staff perception of overall safety; operationalized as clinic staff responses on the Military Health System PSCS.
 - b) Positively associated with staff nurses' job satisfaction; operationalized as staff nurse responses on a single item measure.
 - c) Negatively associated with staff nurses' intent to leave; operationalized as staff nurse responses on a single item measure.
- 3. US Army primary care clinic team performance will mediate the relationship between nursing practice environment and
 - a) Staff perception of overall safety.
 - b) Staff nurses' job satisfaction.
 - c) Staff nurses' intent to leave.

Chapter Three

This dissertation research study is a cross-sectional, correlational study examining secondary data collected by the Army Nurse Corps and the Military Health System in fiscal year 2016. Numerous variables may influence staff perception of overall safety, staff nurse job satisfaction, and staff nurse intent to leave. Most importantly, a cross-sectional design examining secondary data is the most feasible for examining the highly mobile and ever-changing military primary care environment. Secondary data were requested from the Army Nurse Corps Chief's office and the DHA Patient Safety Directorate and the Strategy, Planning and Functional Integration Directorate's Analytics and Evaluation Division. The research design and methods will be presented in this chapter.

Description of Research Setting

In accordance with a Data Use Agreement between the Primary Investigator (PI) and the Defense Health Agency and another between the PI and the Army Nurse Corps, the study site for this research is the School of Nursing, Ackerson Hall, at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey on the Newark Campus. Secondary data were secured by the PI, CPT Melissa Miller, through the appropriate channels and maintained on a nonnetwork connected laptop computer secured in a locked file cabinet in the locked office of the dissertation committee chairperson, Dr. Mary Johansen. Access to the locked office and file cabinet is limited to CPT Miller and Dr. Mary Johansen, and access to sign-in on the non-network connected laptop computer is limited to CPT Miller.

Sample

Army Nurse Corps data include responses from active duty military and civilian government service RNs and LPNs assigned to primary care clinics within Army medical treatment facilities. In military samples, composite scores on the PES-NWI demonstrate no statistically significant differences between RNs and LPNs or between inpatient and outpatient care settings (Swiger, Raju, Breckenridge-Sproat, & Patrician, 2017). The former is likely due to the influence of the hierarchical rank structure in Army nursing and the increased responsibility on both RNs and LPNs for continued professional development to include continued military and civilian education, participation on unit and hospital committees, professional development, and the expectation to advance in leadership education, training, and formal leadership roles. The use of both RN and LPN responses for analyses reflects the Army Nurse Corps commitment to the nursing team. The Army Nurse Corps recognizes that both RN and LPN members of the nursing team and their unique skills and abilities are equally necessary for the health and well-being of the fighting force, military families, and all Department of Defense beneficiaries (Breckenridge-Sproat et al., 2015).

The data include nurse responses to questions concerning job satisfaction, intent to leave, and 31 PES-NWI items measuring the nature of their nursing practice environment to include nurse participation in hospital affairs, nursing foundations for quality care, nurse manager ability, leadership, and support for nurses, staffing and resource adequacy, and collegial nurse-physician relations (Lake, 2002). Advanced practice nurses assigned to these clinics were excluded due to their adherence to a medical, rather than nursing, care model and their provider role similar to physicians.

Ambulatory care clinics to include primary care clinics tend to follow a medical model in general, however, nursing care plans and nursing diagnoses utilized in ambulatory care are based on a nursing care model. Nurse officers in charge (military or civilian government service nurse managers) and non-commissioned officers in charge (military or civilian government service assistant nurse managers) were excluded due to their position as first-line leaders of staff nurses and their status as subordinate to a higher level of medical treatment facility management and leadership. Army medics and certified nursing assistants assigned to primary care clinics are supervised by professional nurses assigned to Army primary care clinics and are not required to complete the National Council Licensure Examination. While important members of the primary care team, these non-nurse members were excluded from the study sample. Additionally, nurse managers and assistant managers will participate differently in the organization and are responsible for quality care, leadership and support of nurses, adequate staffing and resources, and ensuring collegial nurse-physician relations – items which the survey measures. Including these leaders may potentiate biased responses. Army Nurse Corps sample descriptives are presented in Table 2.

Table 2.

Army Nurse Corps Primary Care Clinic Sample Descriptives by Military Treatment

Facility

Clinic	Military Treatment Facility Type	Nurse Type	Nurse Role	Service Type
1	Small Hagnital	RN - 67%	Direct - 67%	Military – 67%
1	Siliali Hospital	LPN - 33%	Case Mg – 33%	Civilian – 33%
2	Small Hagnital	RN - 12%	Direct - 96%	Military – 25%
2	Sinan nospital	LPN - 88%	Case Mg – 4%	Civilian – 75%
2	Lange Hegnitel	RN - 38%	Direct - 88%	Military – 22%
5	Large Hospital	LPN - 62%	Case Mg – 12%	Civilian – 78%
4	Small Hagnital	RN - 46%	Direct – 92%	Military – 15%
4	Small Hospital	LPN - 54%	Case Mg – 8%	Civilian – 85%

5	Small Hospital	RN – 25%	Direct – 88%	Military – 12%
		$\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{1} \frac{1}$	Direct -100%	$\frac{\text{Civinan} - 88\%}{\text{Military} - 20\%}$
6	Small Hospital	LPN - 50%	Case $Mg - 0\%$	Civilian – 80%
7	Larga Hagnital	RN - 37%	Direct – 85%	Military – 11%
/	Large Hospital	LPN - 63%	Case Mg – 15%	Civilian – 89%
8	Large Clinic	RN - 46%	Direct – 92%	Military – 15%
0		LPN - 54%	Case Mg – 8%	Civilian – 85%
9	Large Clinic	RN – 54%	Direct – 69%	Military – 8%
_	6	LPN - 46%	Case $Mg - 31\%$	$C_{1}v_{1}l_{1}an - 92\%$
10	Small Hospital	RN - 75%	Direct -75%	Military -50%
	-	$\frac{\text{LPN} - 23\%}{\text{DN} - 670/2}$	Case $Mg = 25\%$	$\frac{1}{1}$
11	Medium Clinic	KIN = 0770 I DN 33%	Direct $= 100\%$	Civilian 67%
		RN = 58%	Direct $= 92\%$	$\frac{\text{Cryman} - 0770}{\text{Military} - 18\%}$
12	Medium Clinic	LPN = 42%	Case $Mg = 8\%$	Civilian $- 83\%$
		RN - 25%	Direct -100%	Military -0%
13	Small Clinic	LPN - 75%	Case $Mg - 0\%$	Civilian – 100%
1.4		RN - 57%	Direct – 86%	Military – 14%
14	Small Clinic	LPN - 43%	Case Mg – 14%	Civilian – 86%
15	Lana Clinia	RN - 35%	Direct - 100%	Military – 13%
15	Large Clinic	LPN-65%	Case Mg – 0%	Civilian – 87%
16	Small Clinic	RN - 67%	Direct - 100%	Military – 33%
10	Sinan Chine	LPN - 33%	Case Mg – 0%	Civilian – 67%
17	Medium Clinic	RN – 22%	Direct – 100%	Military – 0%
17		LPN - 78%	Case Mg – 0%	Civilian – 100%
18	Medium Clinic	RN – 26%	Direct – 96%	Military – 11%
		LPN - 74%	Case $Mg - 4\%$	Civilian – 89%
19	Large Clinic	RN - 67%	Direct -58%	Military -25%
		$\frac{\text{LPN} - 33\%}{\text{DN} - 720/}$	Case $Mg = 42\%$	$\frac{1}{1}$
20	Small Clinic	KIN = 73% I DN 27%	Direct $= 100\%$	Civilian 53%
		RN = 40%	Direct $= 80\%$	$\frac{1}{1} = \frac{1}{20\%}$
21	Medium Clinic	LPN = 60%	Case $Mg = 20\%$	Civilian $- 80\%$
		RN - 45%	Direct -91%	Military – 18%
22	Medium Clinic	LPN - 55%	Case Mg – 9%	Civilian – 73%
22		RN - 100%	Direct - 100%	Military – 0%
23	Small Clinic	LPN - 0%	Case Mg – 0%	Civilian – 100%
24	Small Clinic	RN - 60%	Direct - 100%	Military – 40%
24	Sinan Chine	LPN - 40%	Case Mg – 0%	Civilian – 60%
25	Medical Center	RN - 43%	Direct – 83%	Military – 13%
23		LPN - 57%	Case Mg – 17%	Civilian – 87%
26	Medical Center	RN – 36%	Direct – 86%	Military – 7%
		LPN - 64%	Case $Mg - 14\%$	$C_{1V111an} - 93\%$
27	Medical Center	RN - 43%	Direct -86%	Military -14%
		LPN - 5/%	Case $Mg - 14\%$	$\frac{\text{Civilian} - 86\%}{\text{Military} - 20\%}$
28	Medical Center	KIN = 70%	Direct -100%	1000000000000000000000000000000000000
		RN = 73%	Direct $= 0.3\%$	$\frac{1}{1} = \frac{1}{1} = \frac{1}$
29	Medical Center	LPN = 27%	Case $M\sigma = 7\%$	Civilian -73%
		RN - 33%	Direct -100%	Military – 0%
30	Community-based Medical Home	LPN - 67%	Case $Mg - 0\%$	Civilian – 100%
31	Community-based Medical Home	RN-67%	Direct – 67%	Military – 0%

		LPN - 33%	Case Mg – 33%	Civilian – 100%
22	Community based Medical Home	RN - 20%	Direct - 100%	Military – 10%
52	Community-based Medical Home	LPN - 80%	Case Mg – 0%	Civilian – 90%
22	Community based Medical Home	RN - 33%	Direct - 100%	Military – 0%
	Community-based Medical Home	LPN - 67%	Case Mg – 0%	Civilian – 100%
24	Community based Medical Home	RN - 67%	Direct – 67%	Military – 17%
54	54 Community-based Medical Home		Case Mg – 33%	Civilian – 83%
35	25 Community have d Madical Hama		Direct - 100%	Military – 17%
55	Community-based Medical Home	LPN - 67%	Case Mg – 0%	Civilian – 83%
26	Large Clinic	RN – 29%	Direct – 93%	Military – 21%
30		LPN - 71%	Case Mg – 7%	Civilian – 79%
27	Madical Cantar	RN - 56%	Direct - 100%	Military – 22%
57	37 Medical Center		Case Mg – 0%	Civilian – 78%
29	Community based Medical Home	RN - 33%	Direct - 100%	Military – 0%
38	Community-based Medical Home	LPN - 67%	Case Mg – 0%	Civilian – 100%
30	Community based Medical Home	RN-43%	Direct – 86%	Military – 14%
39	Community-based Medical Home	LPN - 57%	Case Mg – 14%	Civilian – 86%

Note. Direct is direct patient care greater than 50% of the time; Mg. - management

Matched data were available for the analysis of thirty-nine primary care clinics. These clinics represent approximately 35% of the Army's primary care clinics. Army Primary Care clinic descriptives to include clinic name, region, military treatment facility size designation, and percentages of clinic staff respondents by role are presented in Table 3. Just as with the PES-NWI, respondents are asked to evaluate their management and leadership on both the T-TPQ and Military Health System PSCS. Therefore, administration to include management and executive staff, commanders, and officers and non-commissioned officers in charge were excluded from the sample. The inclusion of responses from these clinic staff may introduce response bias. Administration included clerks and receptionists. Technicians and assistants include Army medics, certified nurses' aides, and other medical technicians. Nursing staff included RN and LPN respondents. Providers in Army primary care clinics included Physicians, Physician's Assistants, and Nurse Practitioners. Other clinic staff include other specialty staff specifically assigned to the family practice clinic such as therapists or social workers.

Table 3.

Army Primary Care Clinic Sample Descriptives

ш	E 114 61	Staff		
#	Facility Size	T-TPQ	PSCS	
1	Community-based Medical Home	Nursing – 88.9% Providers – 11.1%	Administrative – 12.5% Nursing – 75.0% Providers – 12.5%	
2	Community-based Medical Home	Technician/Assistant – 5.6% Nursing – 72.2% Providers – 22.2%	Nursing – 93.8% Providers – 6.2%	
3	Community-based Medical Home	Nursing – 85.7% Providers – 14.3%	Nursing – 81.8% Providers – 18.2%	
4	Community-based Medical Home	Administrative – 2.3% Technician/Assistant – 7.0% Nursing – 72.0% Providers – 14.0% Other – 4.7%	Administrative – 22.2% Nursing – 66.7% Providers – 11.1%	
5	Medium Clinic	Administrative – 12.5% Nursing – 62.5% Providers – 25.0%	Administrative – 10.5% Technician/Assistant – 21.1% Nursing – 42.1% Providers – 26.3%	
6	Medium Clinic	Administrative – 3.6% Technician/Assistant – 3.6% Nursing – 75.0% Providers – 14.2% Other – 3.6%	Administrative – 7.7% Technician/Assistant – 7.7% Nursing – 53.8% Providers – 30.8%	
7	Medium Clinic	Technician/Assistant – 6.2% Nursing – 62.5% Providers – 18.8% Other – 12.5%	Administrative – 4.5% Technician/Assistant – 18.2% Nursing –59.1% Providers – 18.2%	
8	Large Clinic	Administrative – 4.8% Technician/Assistant – 19.0% Nursing – 52.4% Providers – 14.3% Other – 9.5%	Administrative – 6.9% Nursing – 69.0% Provider – 24.1%	
9	Large Clinic	Administrative – 16.6% Technician/Assistant – 5.6% Nursing – 50.0% Providers – 22.2% Other – 5.6%	Administrative – 16.6% Technician/Assistant – 5.6% Nursing – 50.0% Providers – 22.2% Other – 5.6%	
10	Small Hospital	Nursing – 66.6% Providers – 16.6% Other – 16.6%	Nursing – 57.1% Providers – 14.3% Other – 28.6%	
11	Medical Center	Administrative – 9.6% Technician/Assistant – 1.9% Nursing – 36.5% Providers – 30.8% Other – 21.2%	Administrative – 4.6% Nursing – 72.7% Providers – 22.7%	
12	Community-based Medical Home	Nursing – 100%	Nursing – 75.0% Providers – 25%	
13	Community-based Medical Home	Technician/Assistant – 16.7% Nursing – 50.0% Providers – 33.3%	Nursing – 88.9% Providers -11.1%	
14	Community-based Medical Home	Nursing – 100%	Nursing – 100%	
15	Small Clinic	Administrative – 4.9 % Nursing – 53.7%	Technician/Assistant – 9.1% Nursing – 72.7%	

		Providers – 18.2%	
L		Other – 12.2%	ļ
		Administrative – 3.3%	Technician/Assistant – 6.3%
16	Medium Clinic	Nursing – 86.7%	Nursing -81.3%
		$\frac{Providers - 6.7\%}{2.2\%}$	Providers – 12.5%
		Other – 3.3%	
		Administrative – 14.5%	
17	Lana Clinia	I echnician/Assistant – 12.9%	Administrative -6.9%
1/	Large Clinic	Nursing -58.0%	Nursing $- 82.8\%$
		$\begin{array}{c} \text{Providers} = 0.5\% \\ \text{Other} 8.1\% \end{array}$	Providers – 10.5%
		$\frac{1}{10000000000000000000000000000000000$	
		Technician/Assistant 0.4%	
18	Large Clinic	Nursing $= 62.3\%$	Nursing – 90.0%
10	Large Chine	Providers $= 17.0\%$	Providers – 10.0%
		Other -3.8%	
		Technician/Assistant – 12 5%	Technician/Assistant – 6.7%
19	Small Hospital	Nursing -75.0%	Nursing – 80.0%
	F	Provider -12.5%	Providers – 13.3%
		Administrative – 20.5%	T 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
20	T TT '/ 1	Technician/Assistant - 7.7%	Technician/Assistant – 8.6%
20	Large Hospital	Nursing – 48.7%%	Nursing $- 1/.1\%$
		Providers – 23.1%	Physician -14.3%
		Administrative – 12.5%	
		Technician/Assistant-6.3%	Administrative – 6.7%
21	Large Hospital	Nursing – 46.8%	Nursing – 53.3%
		Providers – 18.8%	Providers – 40.0%
		Other – 15.6 %	
		Nursing – 73.7%	Administrative – 10.0%
22	Medical Center	Providers – 21.0%	Nursing – 60.0%
		Other – 5.3%	Providers – 30.0%
		Administrative – 7.5%	Administrative – 8.7%
22		Technician/Assistant – 4.7%	Technician/Assistant - 4.3%
23	Medical Center	Nursing -60.4%	Nursing – 65.3%
		Providers -23.6%	Providers – 21.7%
		000000000000000000000000000000000000	
		Technician/Assistant 15.0%	Administrative – 19.3%
24	Medium Clinic	Nursing $= 42.5\%$	Technician/Assistant - 9.7%
27	Weddulli Chille	Physician $= 12.5\%$	Nursing – 58.1%
		Other -10.0%	Providers – 12.9%
		Administrative – 14.3%	
		Technician/Assistant – 19.0%	Administrative – 8.7%
25	Large Clinic	Nursing – 38.1%	Technician/Assistant -4.4%
	5	Providers – 19.0%	Nursing -65.2%
		Other - 9.6%	Providers – 21.7%
		Administrative – 15.4%	
		Technician/Assistant - 3.9%	Nursing - 80.0%
26	Small Hospital	Nursing – 53.8%	Providers $= 20.0\%$
		Providers – 15.4%	110014013 20.070
		Other - 11.5%	
		Administrative – 14.3%	
27	C., 11 TT 1/ 1	I echnician/Assistant – 7.1%	Administrative -10.5%
27	Small Hospital	Nursing -52.4%	$\frac{15.00}{15.00}$
		$\frac{\text{Providers} - 16. /\%}{\text{Otherr} - 0.50}$	Providers – 15.8%
		$\frac{\text{Other} - 9.5\%}{\text{Tashnisian}/\text{Assistant}} = 10.0\%$	
		$\frac{1 \text{ ecnnician}}{\text{ Assistant}} = 10.0\%$	Technician/Assistant - 10.5%
28	Small Hospital	$\frac{110151119 - 00.070}{1000}$	Nursing – 73.7%
		Other -10.0%	Providers – 15.8%
1		0.070	

29	Medical Center	Administrative – 5.0% Technician/Assistant – 10.0% Nursing – 70.0% Providers – 10.0% Other – 5.0%	Administrative – 7.7% Nursing – 61.5% Providers – 30.8%
30	Small Clinic	Technician/Assistant – 70.0% Providers – 30.0%	Administrative – 3.6% Technician/Assistant – 35.6% Nursing – 28.6% Providers – 28.6% Other – 3.6%
31	Small Clinic	Administrative – 7.1% Technician/Assistant – 28.6% Nursing – 21.4% Providers – 14.3% Other – 28.6%	Technician/Assistant – 33.3% Nursing – 33.3% Providers – 33.3%
32	Small Clinic	Administrative – 8.1% Technician/Assistant – 16.2% Nursing – 59.5% Providers – 13.5% Other – 2.7%	Administrative – 14.3% Technician/Assistant – 14.3% Nursing – 42.8% Providers – 28.6%
33	Small Clinic	Technician/Assistant – 9.5% Nursing – 38.1% Providers – 52.4%	Technician/Assistant – 15.4% Nursing – 61.5% Providers – 23.1%
34	Small Clinic	Technician/Assistant – 25.0% Nursing – 37.5% Providers – 25.0% Other – 12.5%	Technician/Assistant – 16.7% Nursing – 33.3% Providers – 50.0%
35	Medical Center	Administrative – 3.7% Technician/Assistant – 7.4% Nursing – 59.3% Providers – 22.2% Other – 7.4%	Technician/Assistant – 50.0% Nursing – 25.0% Providers – 25.0%
36	Small Hospital	Administrative – 8.3% Technician/Assistant – 16.7% Nursing – 66.7% Other – 8.3%	Nursing – 100%
37	Medical Center	Administrative – 6.7% Technician/Assistant – 6.7% Nursing – 30.0% Providers – 23.3% Other – 33.3%	Administrative – 4.9% Nursing – 73.2% Providers – 21.9%
38	Community-based Medical Home	Nursing – 70.0% Providers – 20.0% Other – 10.0%	Nursing – 100%
39	Medium Clinic	Nursing – 100%	Administrative – 7.7% Technician/Assistant – 19.2% Nursing – 42.3% Providers – 30.8%

Instruments

Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index

The PES-NWI was first endorsed by the National Quality Forum in 2009 and a new measure specification was endorsed 11 June 2019 by the Patient Safety Portfolio

Standing Committee for continued endorsement (National Quality Forum, 2019). This instrument is a thirty-one item, self-report survey soliciting staff nurses' perception of the five dimensions of their NPE (Lake, 2002). Each of the 31 items ask nurses to assess whether each item is present in their practice environment by responding on a four-point Likert-type scale; strongly disagree, somewhat disagree, somewhat agree, strongly agree (Lake, 2002). The PES-NWI may be used as a composite score for the NPE calculated as the average score of the five subscales or individual subscales may be utilized to represent (a) nursing participation in hospital affairs, (b) nursing foundations for quality and safety, (c) nurse manager ability, leadership, and support of nurses, (d) staffing and resource adequacy, and (e) collegial nurse-physician relations (Lake, 2002). The PES-NWI demonstrates strong internal consistency across the literature with Cronbach's alphas ranging from .94-.96 for samples of staff RNs working in outpatient and ambulatory care settings (Choi et al., 2012; Flynn et al., 2010; Flynn et al., 2012; Flynn et al., 2009; Jarin et al., 2014; Swiger, Raju, Breckenridge-Sproat, & Patrician, 2017). Lake details criterion, content, and construct validity testing in the original article detailing development and psychometric testing (Lake, 2002). In military samples, composite scores on the PES-NWI demonstrate no statistically significant differences between RNs and LPNs or between inpatient and outpatient care settings, however, subscale scores do demonstrate significant differences (Swiger et al., 2017).

TeamSTEPPS Teamwork Perceptions Questionnaire

The T-TPQ is a multidimensional assessment of team performance (AHRQ, 2010). Dimensions of team performance measured by subscales of the T-TPQ include team structure, situation monitoring, mutual support, and communication (AHRQ, 2010).

Each subscale of the T-TPQ is scored individually to render five composite scores of which higher scores are indicative of greater team effectiveness (AHRQ, 2010).

Several TeamSTEPPS experts served as item writers for the development of the T-TPQ (AHRQ, 2010). Iterative review of the item pool resulted in fifty items reviewed during cognitive interviews with five healthcare professionals (AHRQ, 2010). Three of the fifty items were deleted, several items were reworded to reduce confusion (AHRQ, 2010). A small group trial using the resulting forty-seven items and an additional eight items from the Hospital Survey on Patient Safety Culture (HSOPSTM) resulted in moderate agreement (AHRQ, 2010, 2016). The same forty-seven items and an additional four items from the HSOPSTM were administered to 169 healthcare professionals at the completion of a TeamSTEPPS training event and the findings from interitem correlations among this sample resulted in the deletion of twelve additional items (AHRQ, 2010, 2016).

The final version of the T-TPQ includes thirty-five items divided evenly among the five subscales each measuring one of the five domains of team performance (AHRQ, 2010). Convergent validity was tested in comparison to the HSOPSTM work area subscale (AHRQ, 2010, 2016). Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for the T-TPQ composites are presented in Table 2. A 2014 report detailing a confirmatory factor analysis of the T-TPQ in a sample of 1700 Army healthcare professionals demonstrated model fit, validity and Cronbach's alphas for the composite measures comparable to the original reliability testing: .917, .927, .943, .920, and .939 respectively (Keebler et al., 2014).

Military Health System Patient Safety Culture Survey

The MHS PSCS is adapted from the HSOPSTM (AHRQ, 2016). Items remain the same, however, item language is adjusted for military terminology. This survey solicits the perceptions of healthcare staff regarding twelve domains of a safety culture to include communication openness, feedback and communication about error, frequency of events reported, handoffs and transitions, management support for patient safety, nonpunitive response to error, organizational learning and continuous improvement, overall perception of patient safety, staffing, supervisor/manager expectations and actions promoting safety, teamwork across units, and teamwork within units (AHRQ, 2016). In addition, a single-item measure of patient safety grade asks respondents to assess the overall patient safety on a five-point, Likert-type scale; responses include excellent, very good, acceptable, poor, and failing (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2016). A second single-item measure asks respondents to report the number of patient safety events reported in the last year on a Likert-type scale including six responses; no events reported, 1-2 events, 3-5 events, 6-10 events, 11-20 events, and 21 or more events (AHRQ, 2016). The HSOPSTM user guide briefly discusses the development of the survey through an extensive literature review, interviews with patient safety experts and hospital staff, development of an item pool, cognitive interviews, and input from The Joint Commission, researchers, and professional organizations (AHRQ, 2016). A large multilevel psychometric study was performed to examine the dimensionality of the HSOPSTM and findings are presented in Table 4 (Sorra & Dyer, 2010).

Table 4.

Empirical Indicator Original Sample, Validity Testing, and Reliability Coefficients

Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index (PES-NWI)						
Source	Original Sample	Validity	Reliability			
Lake	11.636 Registered	The PES-NWI was	Cronbach's alpha:			
(2002)	Nurses working in	compared to the Nursing	1. Nurse participation in			
~ /	Pennsylvania	Work Index (NWI).	hospital affairs $= .83$			
	acute care settings	Development of the PES-	2. Nursing foundations for			
	- 16 Magnet	NWI occurred concurrently	quality of care $= .80$			
	facilities with	with research efforts to	3. Nurse manager ability,			
	200-300 bed	revise the NWI. The	leadership, and support for			
	capacity	psychometric article	nursing = .84			
	- VA or County	declares significant overlap	4. Staffing and resource			
	hospitals with	(45 items) between items	adequacy = .80			
	700+ bed	selected for the PES-NWI	5. Collegial nurse-physician			
	capacities	and revised NWI (Lake,	relations = .71			
		2002). Further details are	Composite =.82			
		not provided.				
TeamSTE	PPS Teamwork Perce	ptions Questionnaire (T-TPQ)	D 1 1 1 1			
Source	Original Sample	Validity	Reliability			
AHRQ	169 Healthcare	Face Validity (expert	Cronbach's alpha:			
(2010)	Workers	interviews)	1. Team Structure = $.89$			
	- 32.6% nurses	Convergent Validity	2. Leadership = $.95$			
		(HSOPS)	3. Situation Monitoring = .91			
		Composite = .81	4. Mutual Support = .90			
		1. Team Structure = $(4 (n < 01))$	5. Communication = $.88$			
		.64 (p < .01)				
		2. Leadership = $74 (p < 01)$				
		.74 (p < .01) 2 Situation Monitoring –				
		5. Situation Womtornig – $73 (p < 01)$				
		$\frac{1}{4} \text{Mutual Support} =$				
		4. With a Support $-79 (p < 01)$				
		5 Communication =				
		.60 (p < .01)				
Patient Saf	Fety Culture Survey (F	PSCS)				
Source	Sample	Validity	Reliability			
Sorra &	331 Hospitals	Validity assessment for the	Cronbach's alpha:			
Dyer	2,267 Units	original HSOPS survey	Teamwork within units $= .83$			
(2010)	50,513 Staff	reported	Supervisor/manager			
		-	expectations and actions			
	Hospital bed size:		promoting patient safety = .79			
	6-49 beds: 124		Organizational learning –			
	50-199 beds: 117		continuous improvement = .71			
	200-399 beds: 62		Management support for			
	400+ beds: 28		patient safety $= .79$			
			Overall perceptions of patient			
			safety = $.74$			
			Feedback and communication			
			about error $= .78$			
			Communication openness $= .73$			

	Frequency of events reported =
	.85
	Teamwork across units = .79
	Staffing $= .62$
	Handoffs and transitions = .81
	Nonpunitive response to errors
	= .78

In addition to the psychometric testing above for the PES-NWI, two robust psychometric studies were recently conducted to evaluate the reliability of the PES-NWI for use among military nurses (Raju, Su, & Patrician, 2014; Swiger et al., 2017). Findings from these studies suggest that the PES-NWI, especially the composite score, is a reliable measure of the nursing practice environment for use among military nurses (Raju et al., 2014; Swiger et al., 2017). Both studies found that several items may be eliminated from the instrument without affecting the instrument's psychometrics and one study noted significant differences between nurse respondents by group to include acute, or inpatient, compared to ambulatory, or outpatient, environments on certain items (Swiger et al.,2017).

Single Item Measures

Staff nurse job satisfaction and staff nurse intent to leave are operationalized as single item measures previously used in multiple federally funded U.S. and international studies (Aiken et al., 2009; Kutney-Lee et al., 2015; Shang et al., 2013). These single item measures demonstrate strong reliability among military nursing samples (Breckenridge-Sproat et al., 2017; Patrician et al., 2010).

Procedures for Data Collection

In 2011, the Army Nurse Corps implemented a new framework for nursing called the Patient CaringTouch System (PCTS). Voluntary response sampling was utilized for

data collection both pre and post PCTS implementation for a program evaluation which included staff nurses' responses on measures of the nursing practice environment, staff nurse job satisfaction, and staff nurse intent to leave. Data were collected in 2010, 2011, 2013, 2014, 2016, and 2018. In 2016, the Military Health System performed a systemwide survey collecting clinic staff responses through voluntary sampling on the TeamSTEPPS Teamwork Perceptions Questionnaire (T-TPQ) and the Military Health System Patient Safety Culture Survey (MHS PSCS). These secondary data represent military and civilian government service personnel assigned to primary care clinics within Army military treatment facilities. Therefore, the 2016 Army Nurse Corps PCTS data containing staff nurse response on the PES-NWI and two single items measures of staff nurse job satisfaction and intent to leave were requested for this study. Use of these data required the submission of a Data Use Agreement Application through the Defense Health Agency Privacy and Civil Liberties Office and the Army Nurse Corps Chief's office for review and processing. Data use agreements for one limited data set and three de-identified data sets were procured and signed and these data were provided to the primary investigator by secure file transfer.

Four raw data sets were cleaned and merged using the primary care clinic name, Military Expense and Performance Reporting System code, and Defense Medical Information System Identifier. Data quality was assessed prior to aggregation of the data to the clinic level. Missing data in the Army Nurse Corps data set were addressed by deletion. Missing data followed a pattern in which all cases with missing data were missing all 31 items of the PES-NWI. There were no missing data in the T-TPQ data set. This is a surprising finding that raises questions as to whether incomplete surveys were discarded or if methods were employed which did not allow respondents to omit responses. Missing data in the Military Health System PSCS were assessed for patterns and assumed to be missing at random. Therefore, due to high interclass correlation coefficients for each composite measure in each primary care clinic, these data were addressed by multiple imputation. This process utilized repeated estimations both minimizing standard errors and producing more reasonable estimates of standard errors (Patrician, 2002). A disadvantage of multiple imputation is the inability to replicate the results as each imputed data set will differ (Patritican, 2002).

Histograms and normal Q-Q plots were visually inspected for evidence of skewness and kurtosis. Fishers z scores were computed by dividing the skewness statistic by the skewness error which can be modelled:

$$Z = Skewness_{statistic}$$

Error skewness

Similarly, z scores were computed to assess kurtosis by dividing the kurtosis statistic by the kurtosis error, modelled:

$$Z = \frac{\text{Kurtosis statistic}}{\text{Error kurtosis}}$$

Data demonstrated mild to moderate skewness and kurtosis as presented for the PES-NWI in Table 5, the T-TPQ in Table 6, and the Military Health System PSCS in Table 7. Most composites demonstrated negative, or left skewness, indicated by z-scores lower than -1.96. Positive, or right, skewness is indicated by a z-score greater than 1.96. Composites with z-scores falling between -1.96 and 1.96 are not skewed. Composites with a kurtosis z-score less than -.196 are platykurtic, or having a wide distribution, and z-scores higher than 1.96 are leptokurtic, or having a narrow distribution. Composites with kurtosis z-scores falling between -1.96 and 1.96 are mesokurtic, or normally distributed. The primary analyses of this study utilized regression and ordinary least squares regression. Regression analysis does not make assumptions about the distributions of dependent variables or independent predictor variables (Hayes, 2018), therefore these data were not transformed to address skewness and kurtosis.

Table 5.

Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index Skewness and Kurtosis

Diagnostics

Scale	Skewness			Kurtosis		
Scale	Statistic	SE	Z-score	Statistic	SE	Z-score
Participation	011	.122	-0.090	867	.243	-3.568
Foundations	318	.122	-2.607	366	.243	-1.506
Manager	622	.122	-5.098	476	.243	-1.959
Staffing	298	.122	-2.443	531	.243	-2.185
Relations	-1.049	.122	-8.598	.768	.243	3.160
Composite	237	.122	-1.943	498	.243	-2.049

Table 6.

TeamSTEPPS Teamwork Perceptions Questionnaire Skewness and Kurtosis Diagnostics

Saala	Skewness			Kurtosis		
Scale	Statistic	SE	Z-score	Statistic	SE	Z-score
Team Structure	565	.076	-7.434	.331	.152	2.178
Leadership	745	.076	-9.803	.140	.152	0.921
Situation Monitoring	593	.076	-7.803	.725	.152	4.770
Mutual Support	543	.076	-7.145	.691	.152	4.546
Communication	597	.076	-7.855	1.271	.152	8.362

Table 7.

Saala		Skewness			Kurtosis		
Scale	Statistic	SE	Z-score	Statistic	SE	Z-score	
Teamwork within units	904	.098	-9.224	1.094	.196	5.497	
Manager Expectations & Actions Promoting Patient Safety	904	.100	-9.040	.604	.199	3.035	
Organizational Learning – Continuous Improvement	823	.102	-8.069	1.855	.204	9.093	
Management Support for Patient Safety	853	.101	-8.446	.755	.203	3.719	
Overall Perceptions of Patient Safety	481	.100	-4.810	.136	.200	0.680	
Feedback & Communication About Error	447	.100	-4.470	123	.200	-0.615	
Communication Openness	587	.099	-5.929	.090	.198	0.455	
Frequency of Events Reported	627	.105	-5.971	262	.209	-1.254	
Teamwork Across Units	440	.103	-4.272	.008	.205	0.039	
Staffing	002	.102	-0.020	464	.204	-2.275	
Handoffs & Transitions	060	.114	-0.526	489	.227	-2.154	
Nonpunitive Response to Errors	293	.101	-2.901	089	.202	-0.441	

Military Health System Patient Safety Culture Survey Skewness and Kurtosis Diagnostics

Operational Definitions

Dependent variables include staff perception of overall safety, staff nurse job satisfaction, and staff nurse intent to leave. Staff perception of overall safety is operationalized as clinic staff responses on the MHS PSCS. The items on this scale are organized by domain and ask respondents to assess if each item occurs in their clinic by responding on a five point, Likert-type scale; strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, or strongly agree. Often results are presented as percent positive or percent per item or per composite. Negatively worded items are reverse coded so that responses of strongly disagree or disagree are scored higher. For this study, composite averages were calculated, and composite scores were evaluated as ordinal scales like the PES-NWI and T-TPQ measures to assess for linear relationships among these variables. Both staff nurse job satisfaction and intent to leave are operationalized as single item measures previously used in multiple, federally-funded United States and international studies (Aiken et al., 2009; Breckenridge-Sproat et al., 2017; Patrician et al., 2010).

The independent variable of this study is the nursing practice environment which is operationalized as staff nurse responses on the PES-NWI (Lake, 2002). Team performance is evaluated as both an independent variable and mediating variable and is operationalized as clinic staff responses on the T-TPQ (AHRQ, 2010). Covariates identified in the literature include facility characteristics such as size, teaching status, clinic workload, staffing, and staffing skill mix. Army Medicine borrowed an executive leadership model from the Navy and developed the Army Medical Department Health Executive Leadership Organization and Structure implemented from June 2015 to December 2016 (Army Medical Department, 2015; Army Medicine 2020 Campaign Plan, 2013). This model standardized the leadership structure of Army medical treatment facilities as either medical centers, large community hospitals, small community hospitals, large clinics, medium clinics, or small clinics (Army Medical Department, 2015). In addition to these designations are community-based, soldier, or troop medical homes situated in military communities both on and off military installations. These designations operationalize medical treatment facility size. Data collected from the Military Health System Data Repository and Military Health System Mart from 2016 are utilized to describe nurse staffing and workload (Military Health System, 2020).

Nurse characteristics are also examined in the literature, however, the aggregation of survey data to the clinic level for this analysis prevents the inclusion of these variables as covariates. Patient characteristics will not be analyzed in this study. Covariates included in statistical analyses were determined by preliminary correlation analyses.

Study variable name, type, and empirical indicators are detailed in Table 8.

Table 8.

Study	Variable	Name,	Type,	and E	Empirical	Indicators
~			11		1	

Variable Name	Variable Type	Empirical Indicator
	Dependent V	<i>V</i> ariables
Staff nurse intent to leave	Categorical, ordinal	 Single item measure: "If you could, regardless of military obligation (yours or your spouses), would you leave your current position?" 1. No, I'm staying because I want to 2. Yes, within 3 months 3. Yes, within 6 months 4. Yes, within 1 years
Staff nurse job satisfaction	Categorical, ordinal	 4. Tes, within Tyear Single item measure: "Overall, how satisfied are you with your current job?" 1. Dissatisfied 2. Somewhat dissatisfied 3. Somewhat satisfied 4. Very satisfied
Staff perception of overall	Categorical, ordinal	Staff responses on the Military Health System
Safety Patient Safety Culture Survey		
Nursing practice environment	Continuous	Staff nurse (RN and LPN) responses on the Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index
Team Performance	Continuous	Staff responses on the TeamSTEPPS Teamwork Perceptions Questionnaire
	Potential Co	variates
Medical treatment facility characteristics: • Size	Categorical, ordinal	 Community Based Medical Home Small Clinic Medium Clinic Large Clinic Small Hospital Large Hospital Medical Center
Regional Health Command	Categorical, nominal	A, B, C, & D
 Regional Medical Command 	Categorical, nominal	1, 2, 3, 4 & 5
	Continuous	Available RN FTEs

Workload	Continuous	Available LPN FTEs
	Continuous, ratio	Total Nurse Available FTEs to 1000 patient
		encounters
	Continuous, ratio	RN Avail FTEs to 1000 patient encounters
	Continuous, ratio	LPN Available FTEs to 1000 patient encounters
	Continuous	Assigned RN FTEs
Staffing	Continuous	Assigned LPN FTEs

Note. RN- registered nurse; LPN- licensed practical nurse; FTE- full time equivalent

Chapter Four

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship among nursing practice environments, team performance, clinic staff perception of overall patient safety, staff nurse job satisfaction, and staff nurse intent to leave in US Army primary care clinics. Secondary data collected by the Army Nurse Corps and the Military Health System in 2016 contained matched data representing thirty-nine Army primary care clinics. These data contain staff nurse responses on the (a) Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index (PES-NWI), (b) a single item measure of staff nurse job satisfaction, (c) a single item measure of staff nurse intent to leave, (d) clinic staff responses on the TeamSTEPPS Teamwork Perceptions Questionnaire (T-TPQ), and (e) clinic staff responses on the Military Health System Patient Safety Culture Survey (PSCS). The results of this study are presented in this chapter.

Sample Description

Secondary data from 2016 were requested from the Army Nurse Corps Chief's office and the Defense Health Agency Patient Safety and Analytics and Evaluations Directorates. Data quality and normality were assessed using histograms and normal Q-Q plots. Intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs) were estimated using a one-way, random effects model at a 95% confidence interval for the mean of *k* raters. ICC (1, k) for the thirty-nine clinics on the PES-NWI ranged from .76 - .98, on the T-TPQ from .84-.99, and on the Military Health System PSCS from .63-.98. Reliability coefficients are interpreted as poor (< .50), moderate (.50-.75), good (.75-.90), and excellent (> .90) (Koo & Li, 2016). Clinic scores on the PES-NWI, T-TPQ, and PSCS were moderate to excellent, therefore, individual responses were aggregated to the clinic level and matched

by Defense Medical Information System Identifier and Medical Expense/Performance Reporting System codes with clinic command, staffing, and workload data. Individual responses on the single item measures for patient safety grade, number of events reported, staff nurse job satisfaction and staff nurse intent to leave were averaged. Clinic means were compared to the frequencies and proportions of individual responses per clinic. Means comparable to the mode and median of individual responses were considered representative and retained for analysis at the clinic level.

Studies examining the nursing practice environment in acute, or inpatient, care settings included hospitals having at least ten nurse respondents (Aiken et al., 2002; Aiken et al., 2009). Unit-level analyses of the nursing practice environment in acute, or inpatient, care settings to include military medical-surgical care settings have examined units with as few as five nurse respondents (Breckenridge-Sproat et al., 2012; Swiger et al., 2018; Van Bogaert et al., 2014). Nurse staffing in US Army primary care clinics is based on The Joint Commission Primary Care Medical Home team nursing model which includes one team or treatment RN per provider and three nursing support staff: LPN, medic, or certified nursing assistant (U.S. Army Medical Command, 2014b). Smaller clinics and community-based medical homes may staff fewer than five nurses. A clinic was included if (a) at least three nurses, one of which must be a RN, completed the entire PES-NWI survey, at least three clinic staff completed the T-TPQ and PSCS, (c) the ICCs suggest moderate to excellent interrater reliability, and (d) data were available for military treatment facility characteristics to include command, military treatment facility size, staffing, and workload. The sufficiency of as few as three nurse respondents is

supported by the literature (Hanrahan, 2007; Lake et al., 2016; Lake, Staiger, Edwards, Smith, & Rogowski, 2018)

A power analysis performed using Raosoft calculating software recommended a minimum sample size of sixty-one clinics. Another power analysis using the G Power calculating software recommended a minimum sample size of forty-four clinics. Initial cleaning and data quality analysis resulted in matched data representing thirty-nine Army primary care clinics. The confidence level for this study was set at 95% to ensure control for type I error.

Statistical Description of the Variables

Dependent Variables

Staff Perception of Overall Patient Safety. Military Health System PSCS survey scores were evaluated for missing data. Missing data on the PSCS were assumed to be missing at random and pattern analysis suggested item non-response. Multiple imputation was used to estimate values from random samples of imputed data sets (Patrician et al., 2002; Rubin & Rubin, 2009; von Hippel, 2018). A two-stage pilot analysis was used to estimate the appropriate number of imputations using 5 imputations and then 15 imputations and 10 imputations were determined to be the best number for replicating similar standard errors (von Hippel, 2018). Visual inspection of histograms and Q-Q plots suggested approximately symmetric normal distributions which were not extremely skewed. Skewness and Kurtosis were estimated using Fisher's skewness coefficient, or z score, which suggested moderate negative skewness and a mildly leptokurtic curve. Descriptive statistics for the dimensions of clinic staff perceptions of overall patient safety are presented in Table 9.

Table 9.

Descriptive Statistics for the Dimensions of Clinic Staff Perception of Overall Patient

Safety

Variable	Mean	SD
Teamwork Within Units	3.73	.529
Manager Expectations & Actions Promoting Patient Safety	3.79	.506
Organizational Learning – Continuous Improvement	3.69	.372
Management Support for Patient Safety	3.84	.439
Overall Perceptions of Patient Safety	3.61	.413
Feedback & Communication About Error	3.58	.497
Communication Openness	3.61	.460
Frequency of Events Reported	3.87	.463
Teamwork Across Units	3.56	.445
Staffing	3.19	.429
Handoffs & Transitions	3.60	.470
Nonpunitive Response to Errors	3.37	.525

Two additional dimensions of patient safety include the patient safety grade and number of events reported. These dimensions are operationalized as single-item, Likerttype measures. Patient safety grade is the clinic grade on patient safety as one of five options to include "excellent", "very good", "acceptable", "poor", or "failing" (AHRQ, 2016). Coding for this item was 1-5, respectively. Number of events reported is the number of events a respondent reported in the last twelve months on a six item scale including "no events reported", "1 to 2 event reports", "3 to 5 event reports", "6 to 10 event reports", "11 to 20 event reports", and "21 event reports or more" (AHRQ, 2016). This item was coded 1-6, respectively. These variables were evaluated as ordinal scale variables. (Chyung, Roberts, Swanson, & Hankinson, 2017; Norman, 2010; Sullivan & Artino, 2013). Descriptive statistics for individual responses across US Army Primary Care clinics for patient safety grade and number of events reported are presented in Table

10.

Table 10.

Descriptive Statistics f	for Patient Safety (Frade and Number of	f Events Reported
		./	

Dimension	Response	Frequency	Proportion (%)	Combined (%)
	Failing	6	.9	Negative –
	Poor	26	3.8	4.7%
Patient Safety	Acceptable	125	18.1	Neutral
Grade	Very Good	337	48.8	Positive –
	Excellent	187	27.1	75.9%
	Missing	9	1.3	
	No event reports	374	54.2	
Number of Events Reported	1-2 reports	188	27.2	
	3-5 reports	70	10.1	
	6-10 reports	15	2.2	
	11-20 reports	8	1.2	
	21+ reports	5	.7	
	Missing	30	4.3	

Job Satisfaction. Job satisfaction was operationalized as a single-item, fourresponse measure previously used in federally funded research. The four-response item, or forced Likert-type, requires nurse respondents to decide whether they are very dissatisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, somewhat satisfied, or very satisfied without a neutral response option (Leung, 2011). Eighty-three percent of staff nurse respondents reported being somewhat or very satisfied with their current job. The descriptives for individual staff nurse responses for job satisfaction are presented in Table 11.

Table 11.

Statistia	Sati	sfied	Dissat	isfied
Statistic	Very	Somewhat	Somewhat	Very
Frequency	209	213	60	24
Proportion (%)	41.3	42.1	11.9	4.7

Descriptive Statistics for US Army Primary Care Staff Nurse Job Satisfaction

The most common methodology for analysis of this single item measure across the literature is to dichotomize the responses as either dissatisfied or satisfied and analyze as a binomial categorical variable. This study employs a more granular approach. The use of Likert-type items as ordinal scales is controversial, especially for Likert-type items having less than five response options (Carifio & Perla, 2008; Chyung et al., 2017; Leung, 2011; Norman, 2010; Sullivan & Artino, 2013). However, the literature suggests that due to the robust nature of parametric statistical tests, utilizing a four-response, Likert-type measure as an ordinal scale will produce minimal difference in distribution means (Norman, 2010; Sullivan & Artino, 2013). Furthermore, correlation and regression focus on the variation of a distribution rather than the measures of central tendency, namely the mean, which may be affected by the inclusion of a neutral response (Chyung et al., 2017; Cronbach, 1957, 1975; Norman, 2010).

Intent to Leave. Intent to leave was operationalized as a single-item, fourresponse forced Likert-type measure also used extensively in prior federally funded research studies (Leung, 2011). The options for response include a single response for no intent to leave which reads "no, I am staying because I want to", and three items measuring the urgency of intent to leave to include "yes, within 1 year", "yes, within 6 months", and "yes, within 3 months". The descriptive statistics for staff nurse intent to leave are presented in Table 12.

Table 12.

Descriptive Statistics for US Army Primary Care Staff Nurse Intent to Leave

Statistic	No intent to	Yes, within	Yes, within	Yes, within
	leave	1 year	6 months	3 months
Frequency	334	101	20	50
Proportion (%)	66	20	4	10

As with the single-item measure for job satisfaction, the methodology common across the literature for analysis of this single-item measure is to dichotomize responses as either no intent to leave or intent to leave. However, dichotomizing ordinal variables may lead to a reduction in statistical power (Norman, 2010). The design of the responses on this single-item measure implies an anchoring zero, or no intent to leave, and increasing urgency of intent to leave. Therefore, this single-item, ordinal measure was analyzed as an ordinal scale and recoded numerically from 0-3, respectively.

Independent Variables

Nursing Practice Environment. Average scores greater than or equal to 2.5 on four or five subscales indicate a favorable nursing practice environment, 2.5 or higher on two or three subscales indicate a mixed environment, and one or no subscale averages equal to or greater than 2.5 is indicative of an unfavorable nursing practice environment (Lake & Friese, 2006). US Army primary care nurses perceived a favorable nursing practice environment in thirty of the thirty-nine (74.1%) clinics. Nurses reported mixed nursing practice environments for six clinics (17.9%) and unfavorable nursing practice environments for six clinics (17.9%) and unfavorable nursing practice environments for three clinics (8%). Missing data on the PES-NWI did not appear to be

missing at random. Incomplete surveys were missing all thirty-one items of the PES-

NWI. Therefore, only complete PES-NWI surveys were retained and aggregated to the clinic level. Descriptive statistics for the PES-NWI composite and five subscale measures are presented in Table 13.

Table 13.

Variable	Mean	SD	Tolerance	VIF
Participation in Hospital Affairs	2.66	.424	.125	7.993
Foundations for Quality Care	2.94	.334	.172	5.813
Nurse Manager Ability	3.02	.526	.203	4.920
Staffing & Resource Adequacy	2.79	.440	.370	2.705
Nurse Physician Collegial Relations	3.38	.351	.511	1.956
Composite	2.96	.363	-	-

Descriptive Statistics for the Domains of the Nursing Practice Environment

Data were assessed for compliance with the assumptions for regression analysis to include linearity, homoscedasticity, and independence. Independent variables were assessed for multicollinearity using tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF) measures. A tolerance value less than 0.10 and/or a VIF greater than one suggests collinearity, and a VIF greater than five suggests high collinearity (Daoud, 2017). The tolerance for each variable was greater than 0.10, however, the VIF for three subscales were equal to or greater than five suggesting multicollinearity, or near-linear dependence (Daoud, 2017). Moreover, multiple eigenvalues close to zero with high variance decomposition proportions for these subscales suggests multicollinearity. It is likely that

these subscales contain information belonging to one or the other subscales. Theoretically, the subscale may be measuring information pertaining to multiple dimensions of the nursing practice environment. Methods to address collinearity and multicollinearity include removing variables or combining variables. The subscales are averaged in the composite score of the PES-NWI which was utilized for multiple regression. The PES-NWI subscales were entered into forward inclusion models with covariates to estimate the best predictive models for each outcome variable. The forward inclusion automated regression modeling procedure adds the best single predictor to the model first and only adds subsequent predictors to the model if the R² is significant, the R² is significantly higher than the previous model with the best single predictor, and if subsequent predictors demonstrate the highest semi partial correlation with the dependent variable while controlling for the predictors already included.

Team Performance. Clinic staff perceived high team performance across US Army primary care clinics. Each T-TPQ survey was complete and retained for analysis. It is rare to have survey data without missing responses or items. This raises questions as to why these data are complete and whether incomplete surveys were retained or if measures were implemented to prevent incomplete responses. Higher scores on each composite indicate a more positive impression of the dimension. Average scores across US Army primary care clinics for the dimensions of the T-TPQ are presented in Table 14.

Table 14.

Variable	Mean	SD	Tolerance	VIF
Team Structure	3.73	.272	.336	2.974
Leadership	3.68	.397	.297	3.372
Situation Monitoring	3.74	.274	.123	8.117
Mutual Support	3.81	.297	.174	5.750
Communication	4.04	.223	.328	3.044

Descriptive Statistics for the Dimensions of Team Performance

Note. VIF = variance inflation factor

There are two methods for scoring the T-TPQ (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2010). For this study, an average was computed for each domain. ICCs (1, k) for each clinic demonstrated reliability of the mean measures for analysis of linear relationships with other study variables at the clinic level. T-TPQ data were assessed for compliance with the assumptions for regression analysis. Independent variables were assessed for multicollinearity using tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF) measures. The tolerance for each variable was greater than 0.10. The VIF for two composites were equal to or greater than five suggesting collinearity (Daoud, 2017). High variance decomposition proportions were observed for two dimensions: situation monitoring and mutual support. As with the PES-NWI subscales, these composite measures may be measuring the same information. Unfortunately, the T-TPQ is designed as five composite measures, therefore, combining situation monitoring and mutual support composites does not make sense conceptually. Therefore, forward inclusion automated regression modeling was used to estimate the best predictive models of each outcome including each composite measure of the T-TPQ demonstrating statistically significant bivariate relationships with each outcome.

Covariates. Pearson correlation and ANOVA were used to examine the bivariate relationships among military treatment facility and clinic demographic variables with the dependent variables: clinic staff perception of overall safety, staff nurse job satisfaction, and staff nurse intent to leave. Significant correlations are presented in Table 15.

Table 15.

Dependent Variable	Covariate	Pearson (r)	Significance (p)
Frequency of Events Reported	RN hours per 1000 patient encounters	.358	.025
Teamwork across units	LPN assigned FTEs	348	.030
Handoffs and transitions	LPN assigned FTEs	340	.034
Nonpunitive response to error	LPN assigned FTEs	376	.018
	RN assigned FTEs	343	.033
Staffing	Nurse hours per 1000 patient encounters	.380	.017
Starring	LPN hours per 1000 patient encounters	.353	.027
Job satisfaction	RN assigned FTEs	359	.025
Intent to leave	RN assigned FTEs	.466	.003

Covariate Correlations with Dependent Variables

Note. RN = registered nurse; LPN = licensed practical nurse; FTE = full time equivalent

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was used to estimate the bivariate relationships between military treatment facility size, Regional Health Command, and Regional Medical Command and the dependent variables. Data were examined for compliance with the assumptions for ANOVA. Several outcome variables to include patient safety grade, number of events reported, teamwork across units, and staffing violated the assumption of homogeneity of variance measured by Levene's test and a Welch ANOVA was used to address heterogeneity (Shieh & Jan, 2015). No statistically significant differences were identified among US Army primary care clinics based on military treatment facility size, Regional Health Command, or Regional Medical Command.

Psychometric Properties of Instruments

Instrument reliability was assessed by internal consistency. A reliability coefficient, or Cronbach's alpha, greater than .60 demonstrates acceptable reliability and greater than .80 is exceptional (Ursachi, 2015). Alpha reliability coefficients for the PES-NWI, T-TPQ, and Military Health System PSCS are presented in Table 16. The staffing composite of the Military Health System PSCS demonstrated the lowest reliability (α = .61). Cronbach alphas are typically lower for scales with fewer items. The staffing measure of the PSCS is a four-item composite scale. Additionally, three of the four items on this scale are negatively worded which may threaten the reliability of the measure (Chyung et al., 2018). The lower reliability may also be due to differences among specialties. For example, a doctor may have a difference in opinion compared to a nurse practitioner, RN, LPN, medic, certified nursing assistant, or administrative clinic personnel concerning staffing.

Table 16.

Instrument	Subscale/Composite	Cronbach's Alpha
Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index (PES-NWI)	Composite	.96
	Nurse Participation	.91
	Nursing Foundations	.87
	Nurse Manager	.89
	Staffing & Resource	.76
	Nurse Physician Relations	.84

Alpha Coefficients for Study Instruments
	Team Structure	.92
TeamSTEPPS Teamwork	Leadership	.94
Perceptions Questionnaire	Situation Monitoring	.92
(T-TPQ)	Mutual Support	.96
	Communication	.93
	Teamwork Within Units	.86
	Manager Expectations	.86
	Organizational Learning	.75
	Management Support	.82
Military Health System	Overall Perceptions	.75
Patient Safety Culture	Feedback and Comm.	.83
Survey	Communication Openness	.78
(PSCS)	Frequency Events Reported	.89
	Teamwork Across Units	.83
	Staffing	.61
	Handoffs and Transitions	.82
	Nonpunitive Response	.81

Note. Comm. – communication

Results of Hypothesis Testing

Hypotheses 1-2 were tested using Pearson correlation and linear regression analyses using IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 27. A twotailed test of significance at .05 was used for testing all hypotheses. Simple linear regression models estimated the linear relationships among the nursing practice environment, team performance, clinic staff perception of overall patient safety, staff nurse job satisfaction, and staff nurse intent to leave. Multiple linear regression models estimated how well the nursing practice environment, operationalized as the composite PES-NWI, explains the variation of the dependent variables controlling for covariates. Three subscales of the PES-NWI and two composite measures of the T-TPQ violated the assumption of no collinearity between independent variables, therefore, forward inclusion regression models estimated the effect of the individual dimensions of the nursing practice environment and team performance on clinic staff perception of overall patient safety, staff nurse job satisfaction, and staff nurse intent to leave controlling. The use of forward regression, and stepwise methods in general, as a response to collinearity has been criticized; however, other methods to include ridge regression and principal components regression are also controversial (Dormann et al., 2013; Fox, 2011). Multicollinearity and collinearity cannot be solved within the scope of this study (Dormann et al., 2013). Forward selection modeling was utilized to preserve the observed values and determine the dimensions of the nursing practice environment and team performance most associated with clinic staff nurse perception of overall patient safety, staff nurse job satisfaction, and staff nurse intent to leave.

Hypothesis 3 was tested using the PROCESS macro for IBM SPSS version 3.5 (Hayes, 2018). PROCESS is a tool for conducting conditional process, mediation, and moderation analyses using ordinary least squares regression (Hayes, 2018). This analysis was complicated by the multicollinearity and collinearity identified among independent variable measures and the results should be evaluated with prudence. Simple mediation models were run to examine hypotheses 3a-3c using PROCESS Model 4 with 10,000 bootstrap samples.

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis one stated US Army primary care clinic nursing practice environments, operationalized as staff nurse responses on the PES-NWI, will be (a) positively associated with team performance, (b) positively associated with staff nurse job satisfaction, (c) positively associated with staff perception of overall safety, and (d) negatively associated with staff nurse intent to leave. **Hypothesis 1a.** Pearson correlation was utilized to examine the relationship between the nursing practice environment and the dimensions of team performance. The PES-NWI composite measure was not correlated with the T-TPQ. The nurse participation in hospital affairs dimension of the nursing practice environment was significantly correlated with both team structure (r = .342, p = .004) and leadership (r = .317, p =.050). Nursing foundation for quality care was significantly correlated with team structure (r = .317, p = .050). The nurse manager dimension was significantly correlated with leadership (r = .317, p = .049). Bivariate relationships among the dimensions of team performance with demographic military treatment facility and clinic variables were estimated using Pearson correlation and ANOVA. The leadership dimension of team performance was correlated with LPN hours to 1000 patient encounters (r = ..392, p =.014). No other statistically significant bivariate relationships were found.

Forward inclusions models were used to estimate the dimensions of the nursing practice environment having the greatest effect on the team structure and leadership dimensions of team performance. Nurse participation in hospital affairs was the single greatest predictor of both team structure ($\beta = .209$, t (37) = 2.087, p = .044) and leadership ($\beta = .327$, t (37) = 2.259, p = .030). Models are summarized in Table 17. These findings are a weak support for hypothesis 1a.

Table 17.

Variable]	Feam Structu	re	Leadership			
variable	β	t (37)	Р	В	t (37)	Р	
Constant	3.179	11.814	<.001	2.811	7.222	<.001	
Nurse Participation	.209	2.087	.044	.327	2.259	.030	
\mathbb{R}^2		.105			.121		
F	(1, 37) = 4.355			(1, 37) = 5.102			
Sig.	.044			.030			

Nursing Practice Environment Effect on Composite Measures of Team Performance

Hypothesis 1b. Pearson correlation was utilized to examine the bivariate relationships between the nursing practice environment and staff nurse job satisfaction. The PES-NWI composite and each subscale were positively correlated with staff nurse job satisfaction. Correlations are presented in Table 18. Pearson correlation and ANOVA were used to estimate bivariate relationships between staff nurse job satisfaction and military treatment facility and clinics demographic characteristics and a statistically significant relationship was found between staff nurse job satisfaction and RN assigned FTEs (r = -.359, p = .025).

Table 18.

Bivariate Relationships Between the Nursing Practice Environment and Staff Nurse Job Satisfaction

Statistic Participation Foundation Manager Staffing Relations Composite .758 .749 .678 .740 .665 .428 r <.001 <.001 <.001 р <.001 <.001 .007

A simple linear regression model estimated that the PES-NWI composite had a statistically significant effect on staff nurse job satisfaction (F (1, 37) = 48.694, p < .001)

explaining almost fifty-seven percent of the variance in staff nurse job satisfaction ($R^2 = .568$). This effect remained significant controlling for RN assigned FTEs (F (2, 36) = 24.399, p < .001) in a multiple regression model with a R^2 of .394. Staff nurse job satisfaction increased ($\beta = .673$, *t* (36) = 6.155, p < .001) for every unit increase in perception of the nursing practice environment and decreased ($\beta = .004$, *t* (36) = -.783, p = .439) for each fewer man hour (168 hours) represented by an RN on the clinic's staffing document.

A forward inclusion model was used to estimate the dimensions of the nursing practice environment having the greatest effect on staff nurse job satisfaction. Nurse participation in hospital affairs had the single, greatest effect on staff nurse job satisfaction. A statistically significant equation was found (F (1, 37) = 47.172, p < .001), with an R^2 of .560. These findings support hypothesis 1b.

Hypothesis 1c. Pearson correlation was utilized to examine the bivariate relationships between the nursing practice environment and the dimensions of clinic staff overall perception of patient safety. Several statistically significant bivariate relationships were found. These correlations are presented in Table 19. The negative correlations between the nursing practice environment and patient safety grade indicate that positive nursing practice environments (higher scores) are correlated with higher patient safety grades (lower scores).

Table 19.

Correlations Between the Nursing Practice Environment and the Dimensions of Clinic

Overall Patient Safety		Composite	Participation	Foundation	Manger	Staffing	Relations
	r	391*	394*	449**	347*	318*	212
Safety Grade	р	.014	.013	.004	.030	.048	.194
Event Denert	r	.188	.205	.134	.250	.067	.150
Event Reports	р	.251	.211	.416	.125	.684	.363
Tagana da W(d)	r	.398*	.346*	.349*	.418**	.296	.327*
Teamwork within	р	.012	.031	.029	.008	.067	.042
M. E. A.	r	.499**	.466**	.380*	.550**	.449**	.287
Mgr. Expectations	р	.001	.003	.017	<.001	.004	.077
о т [.]	r	.467**	.420**	.343*	.544**	.333*	.367*
Org. Learning	р	.003	.008	.033	<.001	.039	.021
Management	r	.529**	.522**	.490**	.575**	.396*	.301
Support	р	.001	.001	.002	<.001	.013	.062
	r	.295	.207	.284	.348*	.258	.101
Overall Perception	р	.068	.097	.080	.030	.113	.539
Feedback and	r	.454**	.433**	.350*	.467**	.453*	.243
Comm.	р	.004	.006	.029	.003	.004	.136
Commission	r	.508**	.489**	.459**	.529**	.401*	.323*
Communication	р	.001	.002	.003	.001	.011	.045
Freq. Event	r	.358*	.335*	.413**	.358*	.366*	.072
Reports	р	.025	.037	.009	.025	.022	.661
Teamural: A anaga	r	.476**	.476**	.435**	.521**	.358*	.315
Teamwork Across	р	.002	.002	.006	.001	.025	.051
Staffing	r	.206	.100	.151	.223	.287	.118
Staffing	р	.208	.546	.358	.173	.076	.475
Handoff &	r	.336*	.338*	.301	.371*	.309	.116
Transition	р	.036	.036	.063	.020	.056	.481
Nonpunitive	r	.369*	.346*	.292	.447**	.281	.209
response	р	.021	.031	.072	.004	.083	.201

Staff Perception of Overall Patient Safety

Note: Mgr. – manager, Org. – organization, Freq. – frequency. *p < .05, ** p < .001

Simple linear regression models estimated the effect of the PES-NWI composite score on the dimensions of clinic staff perception of overall patient safety. The PES-NWI composite had a statistically significant effect on each dimension of clinic staff perception of overall patient safety excluding the number of events reported, overall perceptions of patient safety, and staffing dimensions. These models are summarized in

Table 20.

Table 20.

Effects of the Nursing Practice Environment on the Dimensions of Clinic Staff Perception

of Overall Patient Safety

Outraining	Ν	/Iodel Summa	Coefficient		
Outcome	R ²	F (1, 37)	Р	β	t (37)
Patient safety grade	.153	6.664	.014	447	-2.581
Events reported	-	-	-	-	-
Teamwork within units	.159	6.983	.012	.581	2.643
Manager expectations	.249	12.286	.001	.696	3.505
Organizational learning	.218	10.299	.003	.478	3.209
Management support	.280	14.397	.001	.639	3.794
Overall perceptions	-	-	-	-	-
Feedback and communication	.206	9.617	.004	.621	3.101
Communication openness	.258	12.897	.001	.644	3.591
Frequency of event reports	.128	5.438	.025	.457	2.332
Teamwork across units	.237	11.488	.002	.596	3.389
Staffing	-	-	-	-	-
Handoffs & transitions	.113	4.717	.036	.435	2.172
Nonpunitive response	.136	5.846	.021	.534	2.418

Note. Cells marked with a hyphen were not evaluated as these variables did not demonstrate a statistically significant bivariate relationship.

Multiple linear regression models were used to estimate the effect of the nursing practice environment on the dimensions of clinic staff perception of overall patient safety controlling for covariates. The PES-NWI remained a statistically significant predictor of frequency of events reported ($\beta = .389$, t (36) = 2.036, p = .049) controlling for RN hours per 1000 patient encounters ($\beta = .285$, t (36) = 2.038, p = .049). The effect of the nursing practice environment on teamwork across units ($\beta = 507$, t (36) = 2.656, p = .012) remained significant controlling for LPN assigned FTEs. The effect of the nursing practice environment on handoffs and transitions was no longer significant controlling for

LPN assigned FTEs. The effect of the PES-NWI composite score on nonpunitive response to error did not remain significant controlling for LPN and RN assigned FTEs.

Forward inclusion models were used to estimate the dimensions of the nursing practice environment having the greatest effect on the dimensions of clinic staff perception of overall patient safety. Nursing foundations for quality care had the single greatest effect on patient safety grade and frequency of events reported. Nurse manager ability, leadership, and support for nurses had the single greatest effect on teamwork within units, manager expectations and actions promoting safety, organizational learning, management support for patient safety, feedback and communication about error, communication openness, teamwork across units, handoffs and transitions, and nonpunitive response to error. Forward inclusion models are summarized in Table 21. These findings partially support hypothesis 1c.

Table 21.

Nursing		Ν	Aodel Summa	Coefficients		
Practice Environment	Staff Perception of Overall Patient Safety	R ²	F (1, 37)	p	B	t (37)
Nursing	Patient Safety Grade	.202	9.348	.004	558	-3.057
Foundations	Freq. events reported	.171	7.622	.009	.573	2.761
	Teamwork within	.175	7.826	.008	.429	2.798
NT	Manager expectations	.303	16.048	<.001	.540	4.006
Nurse	Org. learning	.296	15.543	<.001	.392	3.942
manager,	Management support	.331	18.303	<.001	.489	4.278
adinty,	Feedback and comm.	.218	10.300	.003	.449	3.209
and support	Communication	.279	14.344	.001	.472	3.787
	Teamwork across	.271	13.756	.001	.449	3.709
101 nurses	Handoffs & transition	.138	5.920	.020	.338	2.433
	Nonpunitive response	.200	9.264	.004	.455	3.044

Effect of Nursing Practice Environment Domains on Overall Patient Safety Dimensions

Note. Freq. = frequency, org. = organization, comm. = communication.

Hypothesis 1d. Pearson correlation was used to examine the bivariate

relationships between the nursing practice environment and staff nurse intent to leave. The PES-NWI composite score and each subscale were negatively correlated with staff nurse intent to leave. Correlations are presented in Table 22.

Table 22.

Correlations Between the Nursing Practice Environment and Staff Nurse Intent to Leave

Statistic	Composite	Participation	Foundation	Nurse Manager	Staffing and Resource	Relations
r	622	475	465	560	529	421
р	< .001	.002	.003	<.001	.001	.008

Pearson correlation and ANOVA were used to evaluate the bivariate relationships between staff nurse intent to leave and military treatment facility and clinic demographic characteristics and a statistically significant correlation was identified between staff nurse intent to leave and RN assigned FTEs (r = .466, p =.003). A simple linear regression model was used to estimate the effect of the PES-NWI composite score on staff nurse intent to leave. The PES-NWI composite score had a statistically significant effect on staff nurse intent to leave (β = -.601, *t* (37) = -4.142, p < .001) explaining almost thirtytwo percent of the variance (R² = .317). This association remained significant (β = -.483, *t* (36) = -3.234, p = .003) controlling for the number of RN assigned FTEs (β = .016, *t* (36) = 2.135, p = .040). Staff nurse intent to leave decreased for every unit increase in perception of the nursing practice environment and increased for every 168 hours represented by a RN on the clinic's staffing document. A forward inclusion model was used to estimate the dimensions of the nursing practice environment having the greatest effect on staff nurse intent to leave. Nurse manager ability, leadership, and support for nurses was had the single greatest effect on staff nurse intent to leave ($\beta = -.421$, t (37) = -4.108, p < .001). The ability, leadership, and support for nurses of the nurse manager explained thirty-one percent ($R^2 = .313$) of the variance in staff nurse intent to leave. These findings support hypothesis 1d.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis two stated US Army primary care clinic team performance, operationalized as clinic staff responses on the T-TPQ, will be (a) positively associated with staff perception of overall safety, (b) positively associated with staff nurses' job satisfaction, and (c) negatively associated with staff nurses' intent to leave.

Hypothesis 2a. Pearson correlation was used to estimate the bivariate relationships between the dimensions of team performance and the dimensions of clinic staff perception of overall patient safety. Correlations are presented in Table 23. Pearson correlation and ANOVA were used to estimate the bivariate relationships between the dimensions of clinic staff perception of overall patient safety and military treatment facility and clinic demographic characteristics. Statistically significant relationships were identified and detailed under hypothesis 1b. Correlations were presented in Table 19 on page sixty-seven.

Table 23.

Correlations Between the Dimensions of Team Performance and the Dimensions of

Patient Safety	Statistic	T-TPQ Dimension				
Dimension	Statistic	Structure	Leadership	Monitoring	Support	Communication
Detiont sofety and a	r	070	118	175	202	.078
Patient safety grade	р	.671	.475	.288	.218	.638
Number of events	r	029	.137	.165	.192	.019
reported	р	.863	.405	.314	.242	.910
Teamwork within white	r	.135	.247	.269	.274	048
Teamwork within units	р	.412	.129	.097	.091	.771
Manager expectations	r	.375*	.354*	.399*	.306	.140
& actions	р	.019	.027	.012	.058	.395
Organizational	r	.201	.311	.347*	.254	.024
learning	р	.220	.054	.030	.119	.886
	r	.262	.221	.216	.205	.107
Management support	р	.108	.175	.186	.210	.515
Overall perceptions	r	.173	.153	.244	.214	.090
	р	.292	.351	.135	.191	.585
Feedback and	r	.232	.231	.285	.217	107
communication	р	.156	.157	.079	.184	.515
Communication	r	.310	.366*	.384*	.300	.033
openness	р	.055	.022	.016	.063	.843
Frequency of events	r	.331*	.199	.225	.255	.258
reported	р	.039	.225	.169	.117	.112
Teemwork eeroes units	r	.118	.265	.202	.178	128
Teamwork across units	р	.475	.104	.218	.277	.438
Staffing	r	.231	.170	.322*	.228	.253
Staffing	р	.158	.301	.046	.163	.120
Handoffs and	r	.147	.221	.224	.207	060
transitions	р	.372	.177	.171	.205	.715
Nonpunitive response	r	.435**	.508**	.502**	.462**	.299
to error	р	.006	.001	.001	.003	.065

Clinic Staff Perception of Overall Patient Safety

Note. T-TPQ = TeamSTEPPS Team Performance Questionnaire *p < .05, **p < .01

Simple linear regression models were used to estimate the effects of the

dimensions of team performance on the dimensions of clinic staff perception of overall

patient safety. Simple regression models are summarized in Table 24.

Table 24.

Dimension -		Ν	/Iodel Summa	Parameter Estimates		
		R ²	F (1, 37)	Р	β	t (37)
	Manager expectations	.141	6.063	.019	.698	2.462
I eam Structure	Frequency event reports	.110	4.558	.039	.564	2.135
Structure	Nonpunitive response	.189	8.617	.006	.837	2.935
	Manager expectation	.125	5.295	.027	.451	2.301
Leadership	Communication	.134	5.735	.022	.424	2.395
	Nonpunitive response	.258	12.847	.001	.670	3.584
	Manager expectations	.159	7.006	.012	.739	2.647
Situation	Organizational learning	.120	5.068	.030	.472	2.251
Monitoring	Communication	.384	6.387	.016	.646	2.527
	Nonpunitive response	.252	12.436	.001	.962	3.527
Mutual Support	Nonpunitive response	.214	10.062	.003	.818	3.172

Simple Effect of Team Performance Dimensions on Overall Patient Safety Dimensions

A multiple linear regression model estimated the effect of team structure on frequency of events reported controlling for RN hours per 1000 patient encounters. Both team structure ($\beta = .530$, t (36) = 2.118, p = .041) and the number of RN hours per 1000 patient encounters ($\beta = .137$, t (36) = 2.314, p = .026) had a significant effect on the frequency of patient safety events reported. Simple and multiple regression models are detailed in Table 25.

Table 25.

Effects of Team Structure on Frequency of Patient Safety Events Reported

Variables	Simple Regression			Multiple Regression			
	β	t (36)	р	β	t (37)	Р	
Constant	1.770	1.791	.082	1.483	1.573	.124	
Team Structure	.564	2.135	.039	.530	2.118	.041	
RN hours	-	-	-	.137	2.314	.026	
R^2	.110 .225						
F	4.558			4.558 5.225			
Significance		.039			.010		

Forward inclusion modelling was used estimate the dimensions of team performance having the greatest effect on the dimensions of clinic staff perception of overall patient safety. The leadership dimension of team performance had the single greatest effect on nonpunitive response to error. Situation monitoring had the single greatest effect on communication openness and manager expectations and actions promoting patient safety. Forward inclusion models are summarized in Table. 26. These findings partially support hypothesis 2a.

Table 26.

Forward Effect of Team Performance Dimensions on Overall Patient Safety Dimensions

Team Clinic Staff Perceptio		М	odel Summ	ary	Coefficients		
Performance of Patient S	of Patient Safety	\mathbb{R}^2	F (1, 37)	Р	В	t (37)	
Leadership	Nonpunitive response	.258	12.847	.001	.670	3.584	
Situation	Communication	.588	52.806	<.001	.626	7.267	
Monitoring	Manager expectations	.159	7.006	.012	.739	2.647	

Hypothesis 2b. Pearson correlation was used to estimate the bivariate relationships between staff nurse job satisfaction and the dimensions of team performance. A statistically significant correlation was found between team structure and staff nurse job satisfaction (r = .416, p = .008). Pearson correlation and ANOVA were used to estimate the bivariate relationships between staff nurse job satisfaction and military treatment facility and clinic demographic characteristics and a statistically significant correlation was found with RN assigned FTEs (r = .359, p = .025).

A simple linear regression model was used to estimate the effect of team structure on staff nurse job satisfaction. Team structure had a statistically significant effect on staff nurse job satisfaction ($\beta = .519$, t (37) = 2.786, p = .008) and explained seventeen percent of the variance ($R^2 = 173$). The effect of team structure on staff nurse job satisfaction ($\beta = .487, t (36) = 2.758, p = .009$) remained significant controlling for RN assigned FTEs ($\beta = -.015, t (36) = -2.318, p = .026$). These findings marginally support hypothesis 2b.

Hypothesis 2c. Pearson correlation was used to estimate the bivariate relationship between the dimensions of team performance and staff nurse intent to leave. No statistically significant relationships were found between the dimensions of team performance and staff nurse intent to leave. Therefore, hypothesis 2c was not supported. *Hypothesis 3*

Hypothesis three stated US Army primary care clinic team performance will mediate the relationship between the nursing practice environment and (a) staff perception of overall safety, (b) staff nurses' job satisfaction, and (c) staff nurses' intent to leave. Unfortunately, multicollinearity among the subscales of the PES-NWI and collinearity between two composite measures of the T-TPQ violated the assumptions for regression and the PROCESS macro utilizes ordinary least squares regression (Hayes, 2018). Excluding the subscales of the PES-NWI measuring individual dimensions and examining only the PES-NWI composite score was possible to overcome the multicollinearity issue. However, the T-TPQ is not designed to be utilized as a single composite score and the collinearity between the situation monitoring and mutual support composite measures could be problematic utilizing ordinary least squares regression. The hypothesized parallel mediation model is depicted in Figure 2.

Figure 2.

Hypothesized Parallel Mediation Model



Statistically, it is possible to run mediation models examining the mediating effect of the dimensions of team performance found to have single greatest effect on the dimensions of clinic staff perception of overall patient safety and staff nurse job satisfaction. The results of this analysis are presented in Appendix C. While this analysis is statistically possible, it is also theoretically problematic. It is possible to overcome multicollinearity or collinearity for complex statistical analysis by combining variables or excluding variables (Fox, 2011; Kim, 2019). However, the PES-NWI and T-TPQ have been extensively evaluated and demonstrate reliability for examining complex, multidimensional theoretical concepts. Alterations and exclusions of dimensions result in the evaluation of only a portion of the intended theoretical concept. No statistically significant mediating effects were identified. Findings should be evaluated with caution and further psychometric analysis of the PES-NWI and the T-TPQ for measurement of the nursing practice environment and team performance, respectively, in US Army primary care clinics is indicated.

Conclusions

The findings from this analysis scarcely supported hypothesis 1a. Hypotheses 1b, 1c, and 1d were supported. Hypothesis 2a and 2b were also supported. Hypothesis 2c was not supported and the partial analysis of hypothesis 3 resulted in no statistically significant mediation relationships. The interpretation of these findings is presented in chapter five.

Chapter Five

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships among the nursing practice environment, team performance, staff perception of overall safety, staff nurse job satisfaction, and staff nurse intent to leave. Guided by the Nursing Organization and Outcomes Model (NOOM), this study hypothesized that the nursing practice environment would be associated with organizational and staff nurse outcomes in US Army primary care clinics. It was also hypothesized that the nursing practice environment would be associated with team performance as a process of care. Furthermore, it was hypothesized that team performance as a process of care would mediate the associations between the nursing practice environment and organizational and staff nurse outcomes.

Discussion of Findings

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis one stated that the nursing practice environment would demonstrate a positive association with team performance, clinic staff perception of overall patient safety, and staff nurse job satisfaction and a negative association with staff nurse intent to leave. Military nurses had a generally favorable (79.5%) perception of the nursing practice environment of US Army primary care clinics. Mixed nursing practice environments were reported by 17.9% of the clinics and only one clinic reported an unfavorable nursing practice environment. This finding is similar to the findings of other studies performed among military nurses working in acute, or inpatient, and ambulatory care settings (Patrician et al., 2010; Swiger et al., 2018; Swiger, Patrician, et al., 2017; Swiger, Raju, et al., 2017). The PES-NWI was designed as a measure for hospital registered nurses (Lake, 2002). However, this measure has demonstrated internal

consistency across care settings (Flynn, 2007; Flynn, Thomas-Hawkins, & Bognar, 2016; Flynn et al., 2009; Friese et al., 2012; Friese & Manojlovich, 2012). Adaptations of the PES-NWI for ambulatory care settings have been proposed and tested and one military review of the PES-NWI recommended adaptation of the PES-NWI for use among military nurses (Friese, 2012; Swiger et al., 2017). The findings of this study suggest that the PES-NWI further validity and reliability evaluation among US Army primary care nurses is indicated.

Hypothesis 1a. The nurse participation in hospital affairs domain of the nursing practice environment had a statistically significant effect on the leadership and team structure dimensions of team performance. The NOOM purports that the nursing practice environment has a direct relationship with process of care (Aiken et al., 2002). This relationship has been supported by the empirical literature examining the nursing practice environment and process of care (Breckenridge-Sproat et al., 2012; Flynn et al., 2009; Kutney-Lee et al., 2015). The relationship of clinic level care processes, such team performance, have not been examined among military nurses working in primary care settings. One study examined unfinished nursing care at the US Army Burn Center and found a high prevalence of this process of care positively associated with staffing, specifically the presence of float staff (VanFosson, Jones, & Yoder, 2018). Further research is required to compare the effects of the nursing practice environment on clinic-or unit-level processes of care in military treatment facilities to include US Army primary care clinics.

Additionally, the findings from this analysis seem conceptually reversed. It is expected that team structure and leadership would promote nurse participation in hospital

affairs, however, this study identified that nurse participation in hospital affairs has a significant effect on team structure and leadership. It is possible that nurse participation in hospital affairs, or the opportunities for nurses to interact with leadership, provides leadership real-time information regarding performance, resources, conflicts, and concerns. This timely information may enable leadership to optimize team structure resulting in higher perceptions of leadership among primary care clinic staff. Further research is required to examine the nature of these relationships.

The inclusion of thirty-nine individual clinics of various size and location is substantial, however, it did not meet the recommendation from either power analysis. Therefore, a larger representation of US Army primary care clinics may impact the results of this study. Primary care clinics are an understudied population within the military. This population may perceive the nursing practice environment, team performance, and overall perception of patient safety differently than acute, or inpatient, and specialty ambulatory care populations. The findings of this study support further evaluation of the validity and reliability of the PES-NWI, T-TPQ, and Military Health System PSCS for examining the nursing practice environment, team performance, and overall perception of patient safety, respectively, among military primary care environments to include US Army primary care clinics.

Hypothesis 1b. The nursing practice environment had a strong association with staff nurse job satisfaction. The nurse participation in hospital affairs dimension of the nursing practice environment had the single greatest effect on staff nurse job satisfaction. The theorized relationship between the nursing practice environment, especially nurse participation in hospital affairs, and nurse outcomes is extensively supported by the empirical literature among both acute, or inpatient, and specialty ambulatory care settings. It is likely that there are additional concepts which affect military primary care nurse job satisfaction. The findings from this study support the importance of this association for US Army primary care nurses. The nursing practice environment, explained almost 58% of the variance in US Army primary care nurse job satisfaction, controlling for RN assigned FTEs.

Hypothesis 1c. Moderate associations were observed between the nursing practice environment and dimensions of clinic staff perception of overall patient safety. The theorized relationship between the nursing practice environment and organizational outcomes, such as US army primary care clinic staff perception of overall patient safety, is an extension of the NOOM supported by the empirical literature (Aiken et al., 2009; Aiken & Poghosyan, 2009; Tervo-Heikkinen et al., 2009). Often, the perception of patient safety has been evaluated as a nurse outcome due to the inclusion of only nurse responses on measures of these concepts (Sillero-Sillero & Zabalegui, 2020; Smith, Lapkin, Sim, & Halcomb, S. Smith, Lapkin, Sim, & Halcomb, 2020; White, Woodford, Britton, Newberry, & Pabico, 2020). This study evaluated the entire clinic staff perception to include physicians, nurse practitioners, physicians assistants, administrative personnel, registered nurses, licensed practical nurses, certified nursing assistants, medics, and several other specialty personnel primarily assigned to the clinics included in this study. Despite the professional diversity of this sample, the nursing practice environment, and specifically nurse manager ability, leadership, and support for nurses, has a strong relationship with this clinic-level outcome. This finding demonstrates the importance of a positive nursing practice environment and the role of the nurse manager

to US Army primary care clinic staff perception of overall patient safety. The importance of nurse manager ability, leadership, and support for nurses is echoed in the literature (Friese et al., 2016; Grubaugh & Flynn, 2018; Khan, Jackson, Stayt, & Walthall, 2019).

Hypothesis 1d. The nursing practice environment had a strong, negative association with staff nurse intent to leave which remained significant controlling for RN assigned FTES. RN assigned FTEs was also a significant predictor of staff nurse intent to leave. Among this sample, RNs reported higher intent to leave compared to LPNs. The nurse manager ability, leadership, and support for nursing dimension of the nursing practice environment had the greatest effect on staff nurse intent to leave. This finding is consistent with previous findings highlighted in a recent literature review examining factors influencing nurses' intent to leave (Khan et al., 2019). Staff nurse job dissatisfaction is a consistent predictor of staff nurse intent to leave (Kutney-Lee et al., 2015; Nantsupawat et al., 2017; Patrician et al., 2010; Shang et al., 2013). The exceptionally high job satisfaction among staff nurses working in US Army primary care clinics may contribute to their lack of or low urgency of intent to leave. Higher numbers of RN man hours (1 FTE = 168 hours) were associated with increased urgency of intent to leave. This finding warrants further investigation to determine why increased nurse staffing is associated with increased urgency of staff nurse intent to leave.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis two stated US Army primary care clinic team performance, operationalized as clinic staff responses on the T-TPQ, would be positively correlated with clinic staff perception of overall safety, positively associated with staff nurses' job satisfaction, and negatively associated with staff nurses' intent to leave.

82

Hypothesis 2a. Moderate associations were found between the dimensions of team performance and manager expectations and actions promoting patient safety, organizational learning, communication openness, frequency of events reported, and nonpunitive response to error. Situation monitoring has the single greatest effect on manager expectations and actions promoting safety and communication openness. Leadership has the single greatest effect on non-punitive response to error. Team structure and RN assigned FTEs had a significant effect on frequency of events reported.

In 2014, the Army shifted from a healthcare system to a system for health (U.S. Army Medical Command, 2014a). As part of this system-wide restructure, the Army adapted the Joint Commission's model for primary care medical homes to establish Soldier Centered Medical Homes and Community Based Medical Homes. These medical homes house three to five primary care managers (PCMs), or providers; medical doctor, doctor of osteopathy, or nurse practitioner (U.S. Army Medical Command, 2014b). These PCMs are assigned a team of support staff in a 3 to 1 ratio consisting of a team or treatment RN with any combination of LPN, medic, or certified nursing assistant (U.S. Army Medical Command, 2014b). A critical training requirement for the primary care team is Team Strategies and Tools to Enhance Performance and Patient Safety (TeamSTEPPS). TeamSTEPPS are the processes of care collectively known as team performance. Situation monitoring is the ability of a team, or clinic staff, to develop common understandings of the clinic environment and employ care strategies for monitoring the performance of their care team (King, 2008). It is interesting to note that of the five dimensions of team performance, situation monitoring has the strongest association with manager expectations and actions promoting safety and communication

openness. Nurses and nurses' assistants to include medics make up the largest portion of the US Army primary care team. The NOOM purports that nurses are the surveillance system of the medical facility (Aiken et al., 2002). The findings of this study support that theoretical proposition.

Leadership, as a process of care, is the ability to facilitate and coordinate team activities, evaluate team performance, delegate tasks, develop team knowledge, skills and abilities, conduct planning and organization, and create a positive atmosphere, or practice environment (King, 2008). Leadership had a significant effect on manager expectations promoting patient safety, communication openness, and nonpunitive response to error and the single greatest effect on nonpunitive response to error. It is possible the team leadership approach to assessing error in US Army primary care provides a more complete understanding of the multiple structures and processes surrounding negative outcomes. Staff may perceive this big picture approach to addressing negative outcomes as less punitive. The leadership team of US Army primary care clinics include a clinic officer in charge (clinic manager), a noncommissioned officer in charge (assistant clinic manager), a medical director, a practice manager, and a clinical nurse officer in charge (nurse manager). The clinic officer in charge may be any provider type, therefore, the medical director position may or may not be filled dependent upon whether an experienced physician is the clinic officer in charge. It is also important to note that all but one member of the leadership team is a military officer superior in rank to the noncommissioned officer in charge, or clinic assistant manager. The non-commissioned officer in charge is a role typically filled by an active duty military, mid-grade enlisted licensed practical nurse.

Hypothesis 2b. Team structure had a significant effect on staff nurse job satisfaction which remained significant controlling for RN assigned FTEs. Team structure is the only dimension of team performance not explicitly defined in the literature. Questions assessing this composite include "the skills of staff overlap sufficiently so that work can be shared when necessary," "staff are held accountable for their actions," "staff within my unit share information that enables timely decisionmaking by the direct patient care team," "my unit makes efficient use of resources," "staff understand their roles and responsibilities," "my unit has clearly articulated goals," and "my unit operates at a high level of efficiency" (AHRQ, 2010). Therefore, team structure is the capacity of staff to understand, articulate, and operate within their defined roles and responsibilities to efficiently utilize resources to accomplish unit goals. If nurses are the surveillance system of the medical facility, it is intuitive that a wellresourced and efficient team of professionals operating within their scope of practice would bolster the job satisfaction of nurses.

Registered nurse staffing, or the number of RN assigned FTEs, has a significant negative effect on staff nurse job satisfaction. Perhaps RNs compared to LPNs perceive lower job satisfaction among US Army primary care clinics. Though this effect is small, further research is merited to determine the nature of the association between higher RN staffing and lower staff nurse job satisfaction as this finding is counterintuitive.

Hypothesis 2c. Team performance was not associated with staff nurse intent to leave. The hypothesized relationship between process of care and nurse outcomes is based on an extension of the NOOM identified and supported in the empirical literature (Flynn et al., 2009). It is possible that a clinic process of care, such as team performance,

may not have as strong of an association with nurse outcomes as a nursing-specific process of care. A larger sample of clinics may be required to observe a smaller effect size of team performance on staff nurse outcomes.

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis three stated US Army primary care clinic team performance will mediate the relationship between nursing practice environment and clinic staff perception of overall team performance, staff nurses' job satisfaction, and staff nurses' intent to leave. Evaluation of the assumptions for regression revealed multicollinearity between variables which suggests non-linear dependence. Theoretically, dimensions of the nursing practice environment and dimensions of team performance are expected to represent portions of the larger concept. Operationally, when the instrument for measurement of the dimensions measures similar information, we cannot be certain that we are accurately representing the individual dimensions as conceptualized.

The nursing practice environment was operationalized as staff nurse responses on the PES-NWI. This measure was initially designed and evaluated for use among acute, or inpatient, staff nurses working in hospitals (Lake, 2002). Use of the instrument has expanded to specialty ambulatory care settings to include oncology clinics, hemodialysis clinics, home health, and nursing homes (Flynn, 2007; Flynn et. al., 2010; Flynn et al., 2009; Friese, 2012; Friese & Himes-Ferris, 2013; Friese et al., 2012; Friese & Manojlovich, 2012; Friese et al., 2016; Lake, 2002; Thomas-Hawkins & Flynn, 2015; Thomas-Hawkins, Flynn, Lindgren, & Weaver, 2015). However, the findings from this study support further psychometric evaluation of the PES-NWI for use among primary care environments, especially US Army primary care clinics. A recent psychometric analysis of the PES-NWI among a large sample of military nurses also recommended a modified four factor PES-NWI rather than the original five factor measure for use among military nurses (Swiger et. al., 2017). Our study found multicollinearity and high correlations among nurse participation in hospital affairs, nursing foundations for quality care, and nurse manager ability, leadership, and support for nurses. Robust psychometric analysis would need to be conducted to determine the loading of items on these subscales.

Team performance was operationalized as clinic staff responses on the T-TPQ. This measure was evaluated for validity and reliability on a large sample of diverse medical professionals (Keebler et al., 2014). It is primarily intended for use as a tool for evaluating team performance prior to and after completion of TeamSTEPPS training and refresher courses (AHRQ, 2010). This study utilized the measure as a cross-sectional representation of team performance. This instrument is composed of five composite measures representing the five dimensions of team performance: team structure, leadership, situation monitoring, mutual support, and communication. Evaluation of the assumptions for regression revealed multicollinearity. The findings suggest that the composite measures for situation monitoring and mutual support may be measuring similar information. Forward regression analysis revealed significant associations between situation monitoring and outcomes, however, mutual support was not included in the best predictive models. Mutual support is defined as the ability to anticipate team needs based on knowledge regarding team member responsibilities and shift the workload to balance among team members during periods of high volume or pressure (King, 2008). In US Army primary care practice environments, situation monitoring and

mutual support may be synonymous. For example, a potential mistake might be recognized by monitoring one another's performance (situation monitoring) followed by providing caution to a fellow staff member (mutual support) to mitigate danger; these activities may occur simultaneously. Further psychometric evaluation of the measure among primary care staff may reveal the need for refinement or modification of the measure for use among primary care settings.

It was statistically possible to examine the mediating effect of the single best predictor among the five dimensions of team performance on each outcome for its mediating potential in the relationship between the nursing practice environment, operationalized as the composite PES-NWI, and clinic staff overall perception of patient safety, staff nurse job satisfaction, and staff nurse intent to leave. No statistically significant mediating effects were found. The use of only the best predictor of nurse and organizational outcomes in mediation analysis provides only fragmentary information that is convoluted. To utilize a measure representing a dimension of a multi-dimensional theoretical concept such as team performance which may contain information for or from another dimension of the same concept is substandard science, therefore, further analysis of hypothesis 3 was not included in the body of this dissertation. Further analysis testing hypotheses 3a and 3b is included in Appendix C.

Usefulness of the Conceptual Framework

The NOOM was originally utilized to guide empirical studies evaluating nurses in acute, or inpatient, care settings working in hospitals (Aiken et al., 2002). The empirical literature guided by the NOOM demonstrates the usefulness of this model outside the hospital setting (Aiken et al., 2002; Flynn, 2007; Flynn te al., 2010; Flynn et al., 2012;

Thomas-Hawkins & Flynn, 2015). The NOOM posits that nurses are the internal surveillance system of the hospital and the findings of this study suggest that this proposition is also true in US Army primary care clinics (Aiken et al., 2002).

The hypothesized relationships between the nursing practice environment and (a) process of care, (b) organizational outcomes, and (c) nurse outcomes were supported. In addition, a significant relationship was identified between process of care and organizational outcomes. The NOOM was an ideal guide for conceptualizing the relationships among organizational, or clinic, structures, the nursing practice environment, process of care, organizational outcomes, and nurse outcomes. The integration of the Patient Safety Culture Framework and the Big Five in Teamwork models as organizing frameworks to conceptualize clinic staff perception of overall patient safety and team performance, respectively, was seamless and appropriate.

Conclusion

Positive nursing practice environments and nurse manager ability, leadership, and support for nursing are important to US Army primary care clinic patient safety and nurse outcomes to include intent to leave as an indicator of potential attrition. High team performance is a precursor to staff perceptions of patient safety and staff nurse job satisfaction in US Army primary care clinics; however, it is not associated with staff nurse intent to leave. Implications of these findings for nursing, recommendations, limitation of the study, and conclusions are presented in chapter six.

Chapter Six

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships among the nursing practice environment, team performance, clinic staff overall perception of patient safety, staff nurse job satisfaction, and staff nurse intent to leave in US Army primary care clinics. Theoretical propositions were derived from the Nursing Organizations and Outcomes Model (NOOM) and paired with the Patient Safety Culture Framework and the Big Five in Teamwork model to conceptualize the clinic staff perception of overall patient safety as an organizational outcome and team performance as a process of care, respectively (AHRQ, 2016; Aiken et al., 2002; Salas et al., 2005).

Summary

Theoretical Relationships

The nursing practice environment, defined as the attributes or characteristics of an organization which facilitate or impede the professional practice of nurses, is a multidimensional concept including nurse participation in hospital affairs, nursing foundations for quality care, nurse manager ability, leadership and support for nurses, staffing and resource adequacy, and collegial nurse physician relations (Lake, 2002). According to the NOOM, the nursing practice environment has a direct effect on process of care, nurse outcomes, and patient outcomes.

Team performance was conceptualized as a process of care and defined as clinic staff's perceptions of team skills and behaviors (AHRQ, 2010; Aiken et al., 2002). Team performance is a multi-dimensional concept including team structure, leadership, situation monitoring, mutual support, and communication (AHRQ, 2010). In the NOOM,

process of care is subsequent organizational structures and the nursing practice environment and antecedent to outcomes (Aiken et al., 2002).

Clinic staff perception of overall safety was conceptualized as an organizational outcome, or clinic outcome, and defined as staff perceptions of the clinic's provision of safe, quality care (AHRQ, 2016; Aiken et al., 2002). The NOOM suggests direct relationships between the nursing practice environment and process of care with nurse and patient outcomes (Aiken et al., 2002). Organizational outcomes are an addition to this conceptual model supported by the empirical literature (Aiken et al., 2009; Aiken & Poghosyan, 2009; Friese et al., 2016; Gasparino & Guirardello, 2017; Hinno et al., 2012; Kutney-Lee et al., 2015; Patrician et al., 2010; Panunto & Guirardello, 2013; Shang et al., 2013; Sillero-Sillero & Zabalegui, 2020; Smith et al., 2020; Tervo-Heikkinen et al., 2009; White et al., 2020).

Staff nurse job satisfaction and staff nurse intent to leave were conceptualized as nurse outcomes and defined as the level of satisfaction nurses perceive with their current job and nurses' intent to leave their current job, respectively. Nurse outcomes are subsequent the nursing practice environment according to the NOOM (Aiken et al., 2002). One empirical research study identified a significant direct relationship between process of care and nurse outcomes (Flynn et al., 2009). This relationship is an addition to the NOOM evaluated in this study.

Hypotheses

Upon thorough review of the theoretical and empirical literature pertaining to the phenomena of interest the following hypotheses were developed for evaluation in this study:

- 1. US Army primary care clinic nursing practice environments, operationalized as staff nurse responses on the PES-NWI, will be
 - a) Positively associated with team performance; operationalized as clinic staff responses on the TeamSTEPPS Teamwork Perceptions Questionnaire (T-TPQ).
 - b) Positively associated with staff nurses' job satisfaction; operationalized as staff nurse responses on a single item measure.
 - c) Positively associated with staff perception of overall safety;
 operationalized as clinic staff responses on the Military Health System
 Patient Safety Culture Survey (MHS PSCS).
 - Negatively associated with staff nurses' intent to leave; operationalized as staff nurse responses on a single item measure.
- 2. US Army primary care clinic team performance, operationalized as clinic staff responses on the T-TPQ, will be
 - a) Positively associated with staff perception of overall safety; operationalized as clinic staff responses on the MHS PSCS.
 - b) Positively associated with staff nurses' job satisfaction; operationalized as staff nurse responses on a single item measure.
 - c) Negatively associated with staff nurses' intent to leave; operationalized as staff nurse responses on a single item measure.
- US Army primary care clinic team performance will mediate the relationship between nursing practice environment and
 - a) Staff perception of overall safety.

- b) Staff nurses' job satisfaction.
- c) Staff nurses' intent to leave.

Sample Description

The sample for this study included thirty-nine US Army primary care clinics representing military treatment facilities located in eighteen of the United States (33) and Germany (6). Medical treatment facilities included community-based medical homes (8), small clinics (6), medium clinics (6), large clinics (5), small hospitals (6), large hospitals (2), and medical centers (6). These facilities represented four Regional Health Commands: Atlantic (17), Central (12), Europe (6), and Pacific (4). Five Regional Medical Commands were also represented: Northern (11), Southern (12), Western (8), Europe (6), Pacific (2).

Instruments

Secondary data collected in 2016 containing US Army primary care clinic staff responses on the Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index (PES-NWI), the TeamSTEPPS Teamwork Perceptions Questionnaire (T-TPQ), and the Military Health System Patient Safety Culture Survey (PSCS) were requested from the office of the Chief of the Army Nurse Corps and the Defense Health Agency Patient Safety and Analytics and Evaluations directorates (AHRQ, 2010; Lake, 2002). These data were paired with staffing and workload data from 2016 maintained by the Defense Health Agency Analytics and Evaluations directorate.

Results

Hypothesis one and two were tested using Pearson correlation and regression analyses. Hypothesis 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 2a, and 2b were partially or completed supported. Hypothesis 2c was not supported. Hypothesis 3 was not supported. Independent variables and mediator variables demonstrated multicollinearity and collinearity which limited the evaluation of hypothesis three.

Limitations

Controlling the healthcare environment is often challenging in a military population where the scheduled turnover of staff for relocation and frequent turnover due to military operations, training, and education are standard practice. Military and many federal civilian healthcare staff rotate every two to three years to a different organization, deploy in support of humanitarian and military missions, and regularly attend training and education courses outside of the clinical setting. The utilization of a cross-section of secondary data limited the control of data collection methods, measurement selection, and variable definition in addition to other study design aspects. Measures utilized in this study to examine the nursing practice environment, team performance, clinic staff perception of overall patient safety, staff nurse job satisfaction, and staff nurse intent to leave relied on self-report and self-report measures are prone to inflation or common method variance which may introduce bias and impact validity (Cooper et al., 2020).

Additionally, there are likely numerous variables associated with clinic staff perception of overall patient safety, staff nurse job satisfaction, and staff nurse intent to leave which were not evaluated in this study. This study only evaluated military treatment facility size, regional medical command, regional health command, and clinic level staffing and workload variables. Unmeasured confounders may alter results in a way unknown to the investigator. US Army primary care clinics are a unique micro-

94

organization within Army Medicine. The generalizability of the findings from this study may be limited to primary care clinics operating in military treatment facilities.

Recommendations

Based on the findings from this study the following recommendations are presented for nursing practice, policy, and future research:

- Thorough evaluation of the current procedure for appointment, education, and training for the preparation and continued development of the military nurse manager, especially in US Army primary care clinics, to ensure military officers and civilians serving in these roles have the tools needed to successfully lead, manage, and resource their clinics.
- Further evaluation, refinement, and robust psychometric testing of the PES-NWI, T-TPQ, and Military Health System PSCS for use among specific care environments to include US Army primary care clinics.
- 3. The mediating potential of clinic processes of care to include team performance between the nursing practice environment and organizational and nurse outcomes in US Army, and all military, primary care clinics merit further evaluation. Larger sample sizes gathered through primary data collection techniques are recommended for future studies.
- 4. A standard measure for primary care nursing workload evaluation would enhance understanding, increase practical interpretation, and allow for the comparison of military and civilian sector primary care settings. Currently, no standardized measure of nursing workload for primary care settings has been identified.

5. Future research to evaluate the defined staffing ratios in primary care clinics implemented as part of the Army primary care medical home structure is recommended, especially in relation to the nursing practice environment, process of care, and outcomes.

Conclusions

The nursing practice environment has a unique relationship with US Army primary care clinic processes of care, organizational outcomes, and nurse outcomes to include nurse intent to leave as an indicator of potential attrition. The dimensions of the nursing practice environment evaluated in acute, or inpatient, care settings and specialty ambulatory care settings may differ from the dimensions of the nursing practice environment in US Army primary care settings. The findings from this study support the importance of a positive nursing practice environment, especially nurse manager ability, leadership, and support for nurses, to clinic outcomes such as the perception of overall patient safety and nurse outcomes to include job satisfaction and intent to leave as an indicator of attrition.

Team performance is a complex collection of care processes. The nursing practice environment has a small, but significant effect on team performance as a clinic process of care. However, the processes evaluated within team performance may require further evaluation among US Army primary care clinic environments. Dimensions of this concept did not appear to remain independent, however, dimensions of team performance demonstrated statistically significant effects on staff nurse job satisfaction and several dimensions of clinic staff perception of overall patient safety. Team performance did not mediate the relationship between the nursing practice environment and (a) clinic staff perception of overall patient safety, (b) staff nurse job satisfaction, and (c) staff nurse intent to leave as an indicator of potential attrition.

Implications for Nursing

The relationships and propositions purported by the NOOM and tested in this study were supported. Nurses and their support teams to include medics and nursing assistants are the largest proportion of the workforce in US Army primary care clinics (U.S. Army Medical Command, 2014b). The findings from this study support that this team of professionals serve as the surveillance system of US Army primary care clinics. Furthermore, a positive practice environment promotes positive outcomes for US Army primary care nurses. Findings from this study support continued evaluation of US Army primary care nurse practice environments to determine the factors most important to military primary care nurses which facilitate or impede their professional practice (Lake, 2002).

The role of the nurse manager and their ability, leadership, and support for nurses is important to both staff nurse and clinic-level outcomes. This dimension of the nursing practice environment had the single greatest effect on nine of the twelve dimensions of clinic staff overall perception of patient safety and staff nurse intent to leave. The preparation and competency of the nurse manager in US Army primary care clinics promotes higher perceptions of overall patient safety. These higher perceptions of patient safety may be reasonably linked to actual patient safety. Additionally, nurse manager ability, leadership, and support for nurses promotes positive staff nurse outcomes to include lower intent to leave as an indicator of potential attrition. Findings from this study demonstrate the importance of formal education, training, and initial and iterative

97
competency measurement of nurses serving as managers in US Army primary care clinics. US Army primary care clinics experiencing high attrition of staff nurses may consider implementing interventions which support the nurse manager as a means to retain highly competent and skilled staff nurses.

Bibliography

- Adolfo, C. S. (2019). Quality and safety of the nurse practice environment: Implications for management commitment to a culture of safety. *Nurs Forum*, 54(4), 537-544. doi:10.1111/nuf.12367
- Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. (2010). TeamSTEPPS Teamwork Perceptions Questionnaire Manual. In C. f. Q. I. a. P. Safety (Ed.).
- Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. (2011). Types of Health Care Quality Measures. Retrieved from

http://www.ahrq.gov/talkingquality/measures/types.html

- Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. (2016). AHRQ Hospital Survey on Patient Safety Culture: Users Guide. In D. o. H. a. H. Services (Ed.), (Vol. 15(16)-0049-EF).
- Aiken, Clarke, S. P., & Sloane, D. M. (2002). Hospital staffing, organization, and quality of care: cross-national findings. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 14(1), 5-14. doi:10.1093/intqhc/14.1.5
- Aiken, H. L., Sochalski, T. J., & Lake, T. E. (1997). Studying Outcomes of Organizational Change in Health Services. *Medical Care*, 35(11 Suppl), NS6-NS18.
- Aiken, L. H., Buchan, J., Ball, J., & Rafferty, A. M. (2008). Transformative impact of Magnet designation: England case study. J Clin Nurs, 17(24), 3330-3337. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2702.2008.02640.x
- Aiken, L. H., Clarke, S. P., & Sloane, D. M. (2002). Hospital staffing, organization, and quality of care: Cross-national findings. *Nursing Outlook*, 50(5), 187-194. doi:10.1067/mno.2002.126696
- Aiken, L. H., Clarke, S. P., Sloane, D. M., Lake, E. T., & Cheney, T. (2008). Effects of hospital care environment on patient mortality and nurse outcomes. *J Nurs Adm*, 38(5), 223-229. doi:10.1097/01.NNA.0000312773.42352.d7
- Aiken, L. H., Clarke, S. P., Sloane, D. M., Lake, E. T., & Cheney, T. T. (2009). Effects of Hospital Care Environment on Patient Mortality and Nurse Outcomes. *JONA: The Journal of Nursing Administration, 39*(7/8 Suppl), S45-S51. doi:10.1097/NNA.0b013e3181aeb4cf
- Aiken, L. H., & Patrician, P. A. (2000). Measuring organizational traits of hospitals: the Revised Nursing Work Index. *Nurs Res*, 49(3), 146-153.
- Aiken, L. H., & Poghosyan, L. (2009). Evaluation of 'Magnet Journey to Nursing Excellence Program' in Russia and Armenia. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 41(2), 166-174. doi:10.1111/j.1547-5069.2009.01268.x
- Aiken, L. H., Sloane, D. M., Lake, E. T., Sochalski, J., & Weber, A. L. (1999). Organization and outcomes of inpatient AIDS care. *Med Care*, *37*(8), 760-772.
- Aiken, L. H., Smith, H. L., & Lake, E. T. (1994). Lower Medicare mortality among a set of hospitals known for good nursing care. *Med Care, 32*(8), 771-787.
- Ambani, Z., Kutney-Lee, A., & Lake, E. T. (2020). The nursing practice environment and nurse job outcomes: A path analysis of survey data. *J Clin Nurs*, 29(13-14), 2602-2614. doi:10.1111/jocn.15283

Army Medical Department. (2015). Health Executive Leadership Organization Implementation. In (Vol. OPORD 16-08).

Army Medicine 2020 Campaign Plan. (2013). Retrieved from

- Army Medicine. (2019). Mission. Retrieved from
 - https://www.army.mil/armymedicine#org-about
- Bagnasco, A., Dasso, N., Rossi, S., Timmins, F., Watson, R., Aleo, G., . . . Sasso, L. (2020). A cross-sectional multisite exploration of Italian paediatric nurses' reported burnout and its relationship to perceptions of clinical safety and adverse events using the RN4CAST@IT-Ped. J Adv Nurs. doi:10.1111/jan.14401
- Blake, N., Leach, L. S., Robbins, W., Pike, N., & Needleman, J. (2013). Healthy Work Environments and Staff Nurse Retention. *Nursing Administration Quarterly*, 37(4), 356-370. doi:10.1097/NAQ.0b013e3182a2fa47
- Breckenridge-Sproat, S., Freeman, J. J., Belew, D. L., Loan, L. A., McCarthy, M. S., & Patrician, P. A. (2015). A nursing care redesign framework for system wide improvement: The patient caringtouch system. *Clinical Nursing Studies*, 3(4), 72-78.
- Breckenridge-Sproat, S., Johantgen, M., & Patrician, P. A. (2012). Influence of Unit-Level Staffing on Medication Errors and Falls in Military Hospitals. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 34(4), 455-474. doi:10.1177/0193945911407090
- Breckenridge-Sproat, S., Swiger, P. A., Belew, D. L., Raju, D., Patrician, P. A., & Loan, L. A. (2017). A program evaluation of the Patient CaringTouch System: A preand postimplementation assessment. *Nursing Outlook*, 65, S109-S119. doi:10.1016/j.outlook.2017.06.011
- Carifio, J., & Perla, R. (2008). Resolving the 50-year debate around using and misusing Likert scales. *Medical education*, 42(12), 1150-1152. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2923.2008.03172.x
- Chang, Y. P., Lee, D. C., Chang, S. C., Lee, Y. H., & Wang, H. H. (2019). Influence of work excitement and workplace violence on professional commitment and turnover intention among hospital nurses. *J Clin Nurs, 28*(11-12), 2171-2180. doi:10.1111/jocn.14808
- Cheng, C.-Y., & Liou, S.-R. (2011). Intention to leave of Asian nurses in US hospitals: does cultural orientation matter? *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 20(13-14), 2033-2042. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2702.2010.03594.x
- Cheng, L., Cui, Y., Chen, Q., Ye, Y., Liu, Y., Zhang, F., . . . Hu, X. (2020). Paediatric nurses' general self-efficacy, perceived organizational support and perceived professional benefits from Class A tertiary hospitals in Jilin province of China: the mediating effect of nursing practice environment. *BMC Health Serv Res*, 20(1), 12. doi:10.1186/s12913-019-4878-3
- Cho, H., & Han, K. (2018). Associations Among Nursing Work Environment and Health-Promoting Behaviors of Nurses and Nursing Performance Quality: A Multilevel Modeling Approach. J Nurs Scholarsh, 50(4), 403-410. doi:10.1111/jnu.12390
- Choi, J., Flynn, L., & Aiken, L. H. (2012). Nursing Practice Environment and Registered Nurses' Job Satisfaction in Nursing Homes. *Gerontologist*, 52(4), 484-492. doi:10.1093/geront/gnr101

- Choi, S., Cheung, K., & Pang, S. (2013). Attributes of nursing work environment as predictors of registered nurses' job satisfaction and intention to leave. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 21(3), 429-439. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2834.2012.01415.x
- Chyung, S. Y., Barkin, J. R., & Shamsy, J. A. (2018). Evidence-Based Survey Design: The Use of Negatively Worded Items in Surveys. *Performance Improvement*, 57(3), 16-25. doi:10.1002/pfi.21749
- Chyung, S. Y. Y., Roberts, K., Swanson, I., & Hankinson, A. (2017). Evidence-Based Survey Design: The Use of a Midpoint on the Likert Scale. *Performance improvement (International Society for Performance Improvement), 56*(10), 15-23. doi:10.1002/pfi.21727
- Cooper, B., Eva, N., Zarea Fazlelahi, F., Newman, A., Lee, A., & Obschonka, M. (2020).
 Addressing common method variance and endogeneity in vocational behavior research: A review of the literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 121, 103472. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103472
- Cronbach, L. J. (1957). The two disciplines of scientific psychology. *American Psychologist, 12*(11), 671-684. doi:10.1037/h0043943
- Cronbach, L. J. (1975). Beyond the two disciplines of scientific psychology. *American Psychologist*, *30*(2), 116-127. doi:10.1037/h0076829
- Crow, S. M., & Hartman, S. J. (2005). Nurse attrition as a process. *Health Care Manager*, 24(3), 276-283. Retrieved from https://login.proxy.libraries.rutgers.edu/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=c8h&AN=106543082&site=ehost-live
- Daoud, J. (2017). Multicollinearity and Regression Analysis.
- Defense Health Agency. (2014). Military Health System Review. Retrieved from

Defense Health Agency. (2017). Stakeholder Report. Retrieved from

- https://www.health.mil/About-MHS/OASDHA/Defense-Health-Agency Denison, D. R. (1996). What is the Difference Between Organizational Culture and
- Organizational Climate? A native's view on a decade of paradigm wars. *Academy* of Management Review, 21(3), 619-654. doi:10.5465/AMR.1996.9702100310
- Dols, J. D., Chargualaf, K. A., & Martinez, K. S. (2019). Cultural and Generational Considerations in RN Retention. J Nurs Adm, 49(4), 201-207. doi:10.1097/nna.00000000000738
- Donabedian, A. (1966). Evaluating the Quality of Medical Care. *The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, 44*, 166-206.
- Dormann, C. F., Elith, J., Bacher, S., Buchmann, C., Carl, G., Carré, G., . . . Lautenbach, S. (2013). Collinearity: a review of methods to deal with it and a simulation study evaluating their performance. *Ecography (Copenhagen), 36*(1), 27-46. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0587.2012.07348.x
- Flinkman, M., & Salanterä, S. (2015). Early career experiences and perceptions a qualitative exploration of the turnover of young registered nurses and intention to leave the nursing profession in Finland. *Journal of Nursing Management, 23*(8), 1050-1057. doi:10.1111/jonm.12251
- Flynn, L. (2007). Extending Work Environment Research into Home Health Settings. Western Journal of Nursing Research, 29(2), 200-212. doi:10.1111/0193945906292554

- Flynn, L., Liang, Y., Dickson, G. L., & Aiken, L. H. (2010). Effects of nursing practice environments on quality outcomes in nursing homes. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 58(12), 2401-2406. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2010.03162.x
- Flynn, L., Liang, Y., Dickson, G. L., Xie, M., & Suh, D.-C. (2012). Nurses' Practice Environments, Error Interception Practices, and Inpatient Medication Errors. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 44(2), 180-186. doi:10.1111/j.1547-5069.2012.01443.x
- Flynn, L., Thomas-Hawkins, C., & Bognar, L. (2016). Continuing Nursing Education. Work Environment Characteristics Valued by Outpatient Hemodialysis Unit Nurse Managers. *Nephrology Nursing Journal*, 43(5), 403-446. Retrieved from https://login.proxy.libraries.rutgers.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/log in.aspx?direct=true&db=c8h&AN=118640474&site=ehost-live
- Flynn, L., Thomas-Hawkins, C., & Clarke, S. P. (2009). Organizational Traits, Care Processes, and Burnout Among Chronic Hemodialysis Nurses. Western Journal of Nursing Research, 31(5), 569-582. doi:10.1177/0193945909331430
- Foley, B. J., Kee, C. C., Minick, P., Harvey, S. S., & Jennings, B. M. (2002). Characteristics of nurses and hospital work environments that foster satisfaction and clinical expertise. *J Nurs Adm*, 32(5), 273-282.
- Fox, J. (2011). Collinearity. In *Regression Diagnositcs* (pp. 11-21). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Friese, C. R. (2012). Practice Environments of Nurses Employed in Ambulatory Oncology Settings: Measure Refinement. Oncology Nursing Forum, 39(2), 166-172. Retrieved from
 - https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3296284/pdf/nihms-281909.pdf
- Friese, C. R., & Himes-Ferris, L. (2013). Nursing Practice Environments and Job Outcomes in Ambulatory Oncology Settings. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 43(3), 149-154. doi:10.1097/NNA.0B013e318283dc3f
- Friese, C. R., Himes-Ferris, L., Frasier, M. N., McCullagh, M. C., & Griggs, J. J. (2012). Structures and processes of care in ambulatory oncology settings and nursereported exposure to chemotherapy. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, 21(9), 753-759. doi:10.1136/bmjqs-2011-000178
- Friese, C. R., & Manojlovich, M. (2012). Nurse-Physician Relationships in Ambulatory Oncology Settings. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 44(3), 258-265. doi:10.1111/j.1547-5069.2012.01458.x
- Friese, C. R., Siefert, M. L., Thomas-Frost, K., Walker, S., & Ponte, P. R. (2016). Using Data to Strengthen Ambulatory Oncology Nursing Practice. *Cancer Nursing*, 39(1), 74-79. doi:10.1097/NCC.0000000000240
- Fuentelsaz-Gallego, C., Moreno-Casbas, M. T., & González-María, E. (2013). Validation of the Spanish version of the questionnaire Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 50(2), 274-280. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2012.08.001
- Gabriel, A. S., Erickson, R. J., Moran, C. M., Diefendorff, J. M., & Bromley, G. E. (2013). A Multilevel Analysis of the Effects of the Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index on Nurse Outcomes. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 36(6), 567-581. doi:10.1002/nur.21562

- Gasparino, R. C., & Guirardello, E. B. (2017). Validation of the Practice Environment Scale to the Brazilian culture. *J Nurs Manag*, 25(5), 375-383. doi:10.1111/jonm.12475
- Gasparino, R. C., & Guirardello, E. d. B. (2017). Validation of the Practice Environment Scale to the Brazilian culture. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 25(5), 375-383. doi:10.1111/jonm.12475
- Goh, Y. S., & Lopez, V. (2016a). Acculturation, quality of life and work environment of international nurses in a multi-cultural society: A cross-sectional, correlational study. *Applied Nursing Research*, 30, 111-118. doi:10.1016/j.apnr.2015.08.004
- Goh, Y. S., & Lopez, V. (2016b). Job satisfaction, work environment and intention to leave among migrant nurses working in a publicly funded tertiary hospital. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 24(7), 893-901. doi:10.1111/jonm.12395
- Grubaugh, M. L., & Flynn, L. (2018). Relationships among Nurse Manager Leadership Skills, Conflict Management, and Unit Teamwork. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 48(7-8), 383-388. doi:10.1097/NNA.000000000000633
- Halcomb, E., & Bird, S. (2020). Job Satisfaction and Career Intention of Australian General Practice Nurses: A Cross-Sectional Survey. J Nurs Scholarsh, 52(3), 270-280. doi:10.1111/jnu.12548
- Hallowell, S. G., Rogowski, J. A., & Lake, E. T. (2019). How Nurse Work Environments Relate to the Presence of Parents in Neonatal Intensive Care. Adv Neonatal Care, 19(1), 65-72. doi:10.1097/anc.00000000000431
- Hanrahan, N. P. (2007). Measuring inpatient psychiatric environments: psychometric properties of the Practice Environment Scale-Nursing Work Index (PES-NWI). *The international journal of psychiatric nursing research, 12*(3), 1521.
- Hayes, A. (2018). Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis: A regression-based approach (D. A. Kenny Ed. 2nd ed.). New Yrok, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Hayes, L., O'Brien-Pallas, L., Duffield, C., Shamian, J., Buchan, J., Hughes, F., ... Stone, P. W. (2006). Nurse turnover: a literature review. *Int J Nurs Stud*, 43(2), 237-263. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2005.02.007
- Hiler, C. A., Hickman, J. R. L., Reimer, A. P., & Wilson, K. (2018). PREDICTORS OF MORAL DISTRESS IN A US SAMPLE OF CRITICAL CARE NURSES. *American Journal of Critical Care, 27*(1), 59-66. doi:10.4037/ajcc2018968
- Hinno, S., Partanen, P., & Vehviläinen-Julkunen, K. (2012). The professional nursing practice environment and nurse-reported job outcomes in two European countries: a survey of nurses in Finland and the Netherlands. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences, 26*(1), 133-143. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6712.2011.00920.x
- Huang, X., Wang, L., Dong, X., Li, B., & Wan, Q. (2020). Effects of Nursing Work Environment on Work-Related Outcomes among Psychiatric Nurses: A Mediating Model. J Psychiatr Ment Health Nurs. doi:10.1111/jpm.12665
- Jarin, O., Flynn, L., Lake, E. T., & Aiken, L. H. (2014). Home Health Agency Work Enivronments and Hospitalizations. *Medical Care, 52*(10).
- Keebler, J. R., Dietz, A. S., Lazzara, E. H., Benishek, L. E., Almeida, S. A., Toor, P. A., .
 . . Salas, E. (2014). Validation of a teamwork perceptions measure to increase patient safety. *BMJ Qual Saf, 23*(9), 718-726. doi:10.1136/bmjqs-2013-001942

- Khan, N., Jackson, D., Stayt, L., & Walthall, H. (2019). Factors influencing nurses' intentions to leave adult critical care settings. *Nurs Crit Care, 24*(1), 24-32. doi:10.1111/nicc.12348
- Kim, J. H. (2019). Multicollinearity and misleading statistical results. Korean journal of anesthesiology, 72(6), 558-569. doi:10.4097/kja.19087
- King, H., Battle, J., Baker, D., Alonso, A., Salas, E., Webster, J., Toomey, L., Salisbury, M. (2008). TeamSTEPPS: Team Strategies and Tools to Enhance Performance and Patient Safety. In B. J. Henriksen K, Keyes MA, et al. (Ed.), *Performance and Tools* (Vol. 3). Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.
- Knupp, A. M., Patterson, E. S., Ford, J. L., Zurmehly, J., & Patrick, T. (2018). Associations Among Nurse Fatigue, Individual Nurse Factors, and Aspects of the Nursing Practice Environment. *J Nurs Adm*, 48(12), 642-648. doi:10.1097/nna.00000000000693
- Koo, T. K., & Li, M. Y. (2016). A Guideline of Selecting and Reporting Intraclass Correlation Coefficients for Reliability Research. *Journal of chiropractic medicine*, 15(2), 155-163. doi:10.1016/j.jcm.2016.02.012
- Koy, V., Yunibhand, J., Angsuroch, Y., Turale, S., & Rojnawee, S. (2020). Registered nurses' perceptions of factors influencing nursing care quality: A structural equation modeling study. *Nurs Health Sci, 22*(1), 91-98. doi:10.1111/nhs.12653
- Kramer, M., & Hafner, L. P. (1989). Shared values: impact on staff nurse job satisfaction and perceived productivity. *Nurs Res*, 38(3), 172-177.
- Kutney-Lee, A., Stimpfel, A. W., Sloane, D. M., Cimiotti, J. P., Quinn, L. W., & Aiken, L. H. (2015). Changes in patient and nurse outcomes associated with magnet hospital recognition. *Medical Care*, 53(6), 550-557. doi:10.1097/MLR.00000000000355
- Lake, E. T. (2002). Development of the practice environment scale of the nursing work index[†]‡. *Research in Nursing & Health, 25*(3), 176-188. doi:10.1002/nur.10032
- Lake, E. T. (2007). The Nursing Practice Environment. *Medical Care Research and Review*, 64(2_suppl), 104S-122S. doi:10.1177/1077558707299253
- Lake, E. T., & Friese, C. R. (2006). Variations in Nursing Practice Environments: Relation to Staffing and Hospital Characteristics. *Nursing Research*, 55(1), 1-9. doi:10.1097/00006199-200601000-00001
- Lake, E. T., Hallowell, S. G., Kutney-Lee, A., Hatfield, L. A., Del Guidice, M., Boxer, B. A., . . . Aiken, L. H. (2016). Higher Quality of Care and Patient Safety Associated With Better NICU Work Environments. *Journal of Nursing Care Quality*, 31(1), 24-32. doi:10.1097/NCQ.00000000000146
- Lake, E. T., Sanders, J., Duan, R., Riman, K. A., Schoenauer, K. M., & Chen, Y. (2019). A Meta-Analysis of the Associations Between the Nurse Work Environment in Hospitals and 4 Sets of Outcomes. *Medical Care*, 57(5), 353-361. doi:10.1097/MLR.00000000001109
- Lake, E. T., Staiger, D., Edwards, E. M., Smith, J. G., & Rogowski, J. A. (2018). Nursing Care Disparities in Neonatal Intensive Care Units. *Health Services Research*, 53(S1), 3007-3026. doi:10.1111/1475-6773.12762

- Lasater, K. B., Sloane, D. M., McHugh, M. D., & Aiken, L. H. (2019). Quality of End-of-Life Care and Its Association with Nurse Practice Environments in U.S. Hospitals. J Am Geriatr Soc, 67(2), 302-308. doi:10.1111/jgs.15671
- Lavoie-Tremblay, M., Paquet, M., Marchionni, C., & Drevniok, U. (2011). Turnover intention among new nurses: a generational perspective. *Journal for Nurses in Staff Development*, 27(1), 39-45. doi:10.1097/NND.0b013e31819945c1
- Lee, M. A., Ju, Y. H., & Lim, S. H. (2020). A study on the intent to leave and stay among hospital nurses in Korea: A cross-sectional survey. *J Nurs Manag*, 28(2), 332-341. doi:10.1111/jonm.12929
- Lee, S.-Y., Kim, C.-W., Kang, J.-H., Yoon, T.-H., & Kim, C. S. (2014). Influence of the nursing practice environment on job satisfaction and turnover intention. *Journal* of Preventive Medicine & Public Health, 47(5), 258-265. doi:10.3961/jpmph.14.002
- Leung, S.-O. (2011). A Comparison of Psychometric Properties and Normality in 4-, 5-, 6-, and 11-Point Likert Scales. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 37(4), 412-421. doi:10.1080/01488376.2011.580697
- Li, B., Li, Z., & Wan, Q. (2019). Effects of work practice environment, work engagement and work pressure on turnover intention among community health nurses: Mediated moderation model. *J Adv Nurs*, 75(12), 3485-3494. doi:10.1111/jan.14130
- Liao, R. W., Yeh, M. L., Lin, K. C., & Wang, K. Y. (2020). A Hierarchical Model of Occupational Burnout in Nurses Associated With Job-Induced Stress, Self-Concept, and Work Environment. *J Nurs Res*, 28(2), e79. doi:10.1097/jnr.00000000000348
- Lin, S.-Y., Chiang, H.-Y., & Chen, I.-L. (2011). Comparing nurses' intent to leave or stay: Differences of practice environment perceptions. *Nursing & Health Sciences*, 13(4), 463-467. doi:10.1111/j.1442-2018.2011.00640.x
- Liu, K., You, L.-M., Chen, S.-X., Hao, Y.-T., Zhu, X.-W., Zhang, L.-F., & Aiken, L. H. (2012). The relationship between hospital work environment and nurse outcomes in Guangdong, China: a nurse questionnaire survey. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 21(9-10), 1476-1485. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2702.2011.03991.x
- Lumillo-Gutierrez, I., Romero-Sánchez, J. M., D'Agostino, F., Paramio-Cuevas, J. C., Fabrellas, N., Moreno-Corral, L. J., & Paloma-Castro, O. (2019). Nurses' characteristics and practice environments: Comparison between clusters with different attitude and utilisation profiles regarding nursing diagnosis. *J Nurs Manag*, 27(1), 93-102. doi:10.1111/jonm.12652
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., Leiter, M. P., Schaufeli, W. B., & Schwab, R. L. (2019). Maslach Burnout Inventory. Retrieved from https://www.mindgarden.com/117maslach-burnout-inventory
- McMullan, S. P., Thomas-Hawkins, C., & Shirey, M. R. (2017). Certified Registered Nurse Anesthetist Perceptions of Factors Impacting Patient Safety. *Nursing Administration Quarterly*, 41(1), 56-69. doi:10.1097/NAQ.00000000000204
- Military Health System. (2020). MDR, M2, ICDs Functional References and Specifications. Retrieved from https://www.health.mil/Military-Health-

Topics/Technology/Support-Areas/MDR-M2-ICD-Functional-References-and-Specification-Documents/?type=All&page=4#pagingAnchor

- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(2), 224-247. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(79)90072-1
- Nantsupawat, A., Kunaviktikul, W., Nantsupawat, R., Wichaikhum, O. A., Thienthong, H., & Poghosyan, L. (2017). Effects of nurse work environment on job dissatisfaction, burnout, intention to leave. *International Nursing Review*, 64(1), 91-98. doi:10.1111/inr.12342
- National Quality Forum. (2019). Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index. Retrieved from http://www.qualityforum.org/QPS/QPSTool.aspx?m=3450&e=1#qpsPageState= %7B%22TabType%22%3A1,%22TabContentType%22%3A2,%22ItemsToComp are%22%3A%5B%5D,%22StandardID%22%3A3450,%22EntityTypeID%22%3 A1%7D
- Nelson-Brantley, H. V., Park, S. H., & Bergquist-Beringer, S. (2018a). Characteristics of the Nursing Practice Environment Associated With Lower Unit-Level RN Turnover. J Nurs Adm, 48(1), 31-37. doi:10.1097/nna.00000000000567
- Nelson-Brantley, H. V., Park, S. H., & Bergquist-Beringer, S. (2018b). Characteristics of the Nursing Practice Environment Associated With Lower Unit-Level RN Turnover. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 48(1), 31-37. doi:10.1097/NNA.00000000000567
- Nelson, S. T., & Flynn, L. (2015). Relationship Between Missed Care and Urinary Tract Infection. *Geriatric Nursing*, 36(2), 126-130. doi:10.1016/j.gerinurse.2014.12.009
- Norman, G. (2010). Likert scales, levels of measurement and the "laws" of statistics. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 15(5), 625-632. doi:10.1007/s10459-010-9222-y
- Numminen, O., Ruoppa, E., Leino Kilpi, H., Isoaho, H., Hupli, M., & Meretoja, R. (2016). Practice environment and its association with professional competence and work-related factors: perception of newly graduated nurses. *Journal of Nursing Management, 24*(1), E1-E11. doi:10.1111/jonm.12280
- Nursing Solutions Inc. (2018). *National Health Care Retention & RN Staffing Report*. Retrieved from www.nursingsolutions.com
- Ogbolu, Y., Johantgen, M., Zhu, S., & Johnson, J. V. (2015). Nurse Reported Pateint Safety in Low-Resource Settings: A cross-sectional study of MNCH nurses in Nigeria. *Applied Nursing Research*, 28(4), 341-346. doi:10.1016/j.apnr.2015.02.006
- O'Hara, M. A., Burke, D., Ditomassi, M., & Palan Lopez, R. (2019). Assessment of Millennial Nurses' Job Satisfaction and Professional Practice Environment. *J Nurs Adm*, 49(9), 411-417. doi:10.1097/nna.00000000000777
- Park, J. H., Park, M. J., & Hwang, H. Y. (2019). Intention to leave among staff nurses in small- and medium-sized hospitals. *J Clin Nurs*, 28(9-10), 1856-1867. doi:10.1111/jocn.14802

Park, S. H., Hanchett, M., & Ma, C. (2018). Practice Environment Characteristics Associated With Missed Nursing Care. J Nurs Scholarsh, 50(6), 722-730. doi:10.1111/jnu.12434

Patrician, P. A. (2002). Multiple imputation for missing data[†][‡]. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 25(1), 76-84. doi:10.1002/nur.10015

- Patrician, P. A., Loan, L. A., McCarthy, M. S., Swiger, P., Breckenridge-Sproat, S., Brosch, L. R., & Jennings, B. M. (2017). Twenty years of staffing, practice environment, and outcomes research in military nursing. *Nursing Outlook, 65*, S120-S129. doi:10.1016/j.outlook.2017.06.015
- Patrician, P. A., Shang, J., & Lake, E. T. (2010). Organizational determinants of work outcomes and quality care ratings among Army Medical Department registered nurses. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 33(2), 99-110. doi:10.1002/nur.20370
- Pereira Lima Silva, R., Gonçalves Menegueti, M., Dias Castilho Siqueira, L., de Araújo, T. R., Auxiliadora-Martins, M., Mantovani Silva Andrade, L., & Laus, A. M. (2020). Omission of nursing care, professional practice environment and workload in intensive care units. *J Nurs Manag*. doi:10.1111/jonm.13005
- Povedano-Jimenez, M., Granados-Gamez, G., & Garcia-Caro, M. P. (2020). Work environment factors in coping with patient death among Spanish nurses: a crosssectional survey. *Rev Lat Am Enfermagem*, 28, e3234. doi:10.1590/1518-8345.3279.3234
- Raju, D., Su, X., & Patrician, P. A. (2014). Using Item Response Theory Models to Evaluate the Practice Environment Scale. *Journal of Nursing Measurement*, 22(2), 323-341. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1891/1061-3749.22.2.323
- Raquel Panunto, M., & de Brito Guirardello, E. (2013). Professional nursing practice: environment and emotional exhaustion among intensive care nurses. *Revista Latino-Americana de Enfermagem (RLAE), 21*(3), 765-772. doi:10.1590/S0104-11692013000300016
- Roche, M. A., Duffield, C., Friedman, S., Twigg, D., Dimitrelis, S., & Rowbotham, S. (2016). Changes to nurses' practice environment over time. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 24(5), 666-675. doi:10.1111/jonm.12371
- Rubin, D. B., & Rubin, D. B. (2009). Multiple imputation for nonresponse in surveys.
- Salas, E., Sims, D. E., & Burke, C. S. (2005). Is there a "Big Five" in Teamwork? *Small Group Research*, *36*(5), 555-599. doi:10.1177/1046496405277134
- Santos Alves, D. F., Silva, D., & Brito Guirardello, E. (2017). Nursing practice environment, job outcomes and safety climate: a structural equation modelling analysis. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 25(1), 46-55. doi:10.1111/jonm.12427
- Schubert, M., Glass, T. R., Clarke, S. P., Aiken, L. H., Schaffert-Witvliet, B., Sloane, D. M., & De Geest, S. (2008). Rationaling of Nursing Care and Its Relationship to Patient Outcomes: The Swiss extension of the International Hospital Outcomes Study. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care, 20*(4), 227-237. doi:10.1093/intqhc/mzn017
- Shang, R. J., Friese, H. C., Wu, H. E., & Aiken, H. L. (2013). Nursing Practice Environment and Outcomes for Oncology Nursing. *Cancer Nursing*, 36(3), 206-212. doi:10.1097/NCC.0b013e31825e4293

- Shieh, G., & Jan, S.-L. (2015). Optimal sample size allocation for Welch's test in oneway heteroscedastic ANOVA. *Behavior Research Methods*, 47(2), 374-383. doi:10.3758/s13428-014-0477-8
- Sillero-Sillero, A., & Zabalegui, A. (2020). Analysis of the work environment and intention of perioperative nurses to quit work. *Rev Lat Am Enfermagem, 28*, e3256. doi:10.1590/1518-8345.3239.3256
- Slater, P., Roos, M., Eskola, S., McCormack, B., Hahtela, N., Kurjenluoma, K., & Suominen, T. (2020). Challenging and redesigning a new model to explain intention to leave nursing. *Scand J Caring Sci.* doi:10.1111/scs.12884
- Smith, J. G., Morin, K. H., & Lake, E. T. (2018). Association of the nurse work environment with nurse incivility in hospitals. *J Nurs Manag*, 26(2), 219-226. doi:10.1111/jonm.12537
- Smith, S., Lapkin, S., Sim, J., & Halcomb, E. (2020). Nursing care left undone, practice environment and perceived quality of care in small rural hospitals. *J Nurs Manag.* doi:10.1111/jonm.12975
- Sorra, J. S., & Dyer, N. (2010). Multilevel psychometric properties of the AHRQ hospital survey on patient safety culture. *BMC Health Serv Res*, 10(1), 199. doi:10.1186/1472-6963-10-199
- Sorra, J. S., Dyer, N., Sorra, J. S., & Dyer, N. (2010). Multilevel psychometric properties of the AHRQ hospital survey on patient safety culture. *BMC Health Services Research*, 10, 199-199. doi:10.1186/1472-6963-10-199
- Study Group on Human Factors. (1994). *Third report: organising for safety* (0 7176 0865
 4). Retrieved from United Kingdom: http://inis.iaea.org/search/search.aspx?orig q=RN:29011023
- Sullivan, G. M., & Artino, A. R. (2013). Analyzing and Interpreting Data From Likert-Type Scales. *Journal of graduate medical education*, 5(4), 541-542. doi:10.4300/jgme-5-4-18
- Swezey, R. W., Salas, E., Alluisi, E. A., Andrews, D. H., Baker, E. L., Bell, H. H., . . . Zaccaro, S. J. (1992). *Teams: Their training and performance*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Swiger, P. A., Loan, L. A., Raju, D., Breckenridge-Sproat, S. T., Miltner, R. S., & Patrician, P. A. (2018). Relationships between Army nursing practice environments and patient outcomes. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 41(2), 131-144. doi:10.1002/nur.21855
- Swiger, P. A., Loan, L. A., Raju, D., Breckinridge-Sproat, S. T., Miltner, R. S., & Patrician, P. A. (2018). Relationships between Army nursing practice environments and patient outcomes. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 1-14.
- Swiger, P. A., Patrician, P. A., Miltner, R. S., Raju, D., Breckenridge-Sproat, S., & Loan, L. A. (2017). The Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index: An updated review and recommendations for use. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 74, 76-84. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2017.06.003
- Swiger, P. A., Raju, D., Breckenridge-Sproat, S., & Patrician, P. A. (2017). Adaptation of the Practice Environment Scale for military nurses: a psychometric analysis. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 73(9), 2219-2236. doi:10.1111/jan.13276

- Tabakakis, C. K., McAllister, M., Bradshaw, J., & To, Q. G. (2019). Psychological resilience in New Zealand registered nurses: The role of workplace characteristics. *J Nurs Manag*, 27(7), 1351-1358. doi:10.1111/jonm.12815
- Tervo-Heikkinen, T., Kiviniemi, V., Partanen, P., & Vehviläinen-Julkunen, K. (2009). Nurse staffing levels and nursing outcomes: a Bayesian analysis of Finnishregistered nurse survey data. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 17(8), 986-993. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2834.2009.01020.x
- The Joint Commission. (2018). Primary Care Medical Home. Retrieved from https://www.jointcommission.org/accreditation/pchi.aspx
- Thomas-Hawkins, C., & Flynn, L. (2015). Patient Safety Culture and Nurse Reported Adverse Events in Outpatient Hemodialysis Units. *Research and Theory for Nursing Practice, 29*(1), 53-65. doi:10.1891/1541-6577.29.1.53
- Thomas-Hawkins, C., Flynn, L., Lindgren, T., & Weaver, S. (2015). Nurse Manager Safety Practices in Outpatient Hemodialysis Units. *Nephrology Nursing Journal*, 42(2), 125-147. Retrieved from https://login.proxy.libraries.rutgers.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/log

in.aspx?direct=true&db=c8h&AN=103796964&site=ehost-live

- Topçu, İ., Türkmen, E., Badır, A., Göktepe, N., Miral, M., Albayrak, S., . . . Özcan, D. (2016). Relationship between nurses' practice environments and nursing outcomes in Turkey. *International Nursing Review*, 63(2), 242-249. doi:10.1111/inr.12247
- TriService Nursing Research Program. (2018). Research Priorities. Retrieved from https://www.usuhs.edu/tsnrp/research-priorities
- U.S. Army Medical Command. (2014a). ARMY PCMH Implementation Manual: Leaders guide to Army patient centered medical home transformation. Retrieved from
- U.S. Army Medical Command. (2014b). ARMY PCMH Operations Manual: Leaders guide to Army patient centered medical home. Retrieved from
- Ursachi, G., Horodnic, I.A., Zait, A. (2015). How Reliable Army Measurement Scales? External factors with indirect influence on reliability estimators. *Procedia Economics and Finance, 20*, 679-686.
- Van Bogaert, P., Timmermans, O., Weeks, S. M., van Heusden, D., Wouters, K., & Franck, E. (2014). Nursing unit teams matter: Impact of unit-level nurse practice environment, nurse work characteristics, and burnout on nurse reported job outcomes, and quality of care, and patient adverse events--A cross-sectional survey. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 51(8), 1123-1134. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2013.12.009
- Van den Heede, K., Florquin, M., Bruyneel, L., Aiken, L., Diya, L., Lesaffre, E., & Sermeus, W. (2013). Effective strategies for nurse retention in acute hospitals: A mixed method study. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 50(2), 185-194. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2011.12.001
- VanFosson, C. A., Jones, T. L., & Yoder, L. H. (2018). Monthly variation of unfinished nursing care at the US Army Burn Center. *Burns*, 44(8), 1910-1919. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burns.2018.03.008
- von Hippel, P. T. (2018). How Many Imputations Do You Need? A Two-stage Calculation Using a Quadratic Rule. *Sociological methods & research, 49*(3), 004912411774730-004912411774718. doi:10.1177/0049124117747303

- Weaver, S. H., & Lindgren, T. G. (2017). Getting Safely Through the Shift: A qualitative exploration of the administrative supervisor role. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 25(6), 430-437. doi:10.1111/jonm.12481
- Wharton, A. (1993). The Affective Consequences of Service Work. *Work and Occupations*, 20, 205-232.
- White, E., Woodford, E., Britton, J., Newberry, L. W., & Pabico, C. (2020). Nursing practice environment and care quality in nursing homes. *Nurs Manage*, 51(6), 9-12. doi:10.1097/01.NUMA.0000662656.07901.a8
- Wisconsin Hospital Association. (2018). Wisconsin Health Care Workforce Report. Retrieved from https://www.wha.org/WisconsinHospitalAssociation/media/WHA-Reports/2018_Workforce_Report.pdf
- Wu, X., Hayter, M., Lee, A. J., Yuan, Y., Li, S., Bi, Y., . . . Zhang, Y. (2020). Positive spiritual climate supports transformational leadership as means to reduce nursing burnout and intent to leave. *J Nurs Manag*, 28(4), 804-813. doi:10.1111/jonm.12994
- Yan, P., Yang, Y., Zhang, L., Li, F., Huang, A., Wang, Y., ... Yao, H. (2018). Correlation analysis between work-related musculoskeletal disorders and the nursing practice environment, quality of life, and social support in the nursing professionals. *Medicine (Baltimore)*, 97(9), e0026. doi:10.1097/md.000000000010026
- Yurumezoglu, H. A., & Kocaman, G. (2016). Predictors of nurses' intentions to leave the organisation and the profession in Turkey. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 24(2), 235-243. doi:10.1111/jonm.12305
- Zander, B., Blümel, M., & Busse, R. (2013). Nurse migration in Europe--Can expectations really be met? Combining qualitative and quantitative data from Germany and eight of its destination and source countries. *International Journal* of Nursing Studies, 50(2), 210-218. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2012.11.017
- Zangaro, G. A., & Jones, K. (2019). Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index: A Reliability Generalization Meta-Analysis. West J Nurs Res, 41(11), 1658-1684. doi:10.1177/0193945918823779

Appendix A.

Evidence Table

Author	Same la/Dum aga	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
Flynn,	Random	Cross-	The Nursing	23.3% intent to leave
Thomas-	selection of 422	sectional,	Organization and	related to workload
Hawkins, &	nephrology	correlational	Outcomes Model	11.1% report intent to
Clarke (2009)	nurses from 47	design		leave position within
	of the United		Staffing –	12 months but stay
	States		Nurse response to	with employer
			several items designed	8.2% report planning
	To investigate		to calculate patient to	to leave their employer
	the effect of		RN ratios	within 12 months
	workload,		XX7 11 1	
	practice		Workload –	Deletion of Adequacy
	environment, and		Individual Workload	subscale due to
	care processes on		Perception Scale, 5	significant association
	purses in U.S.		subscale	with starting measure.
	chronic		subscale	Practice Environment
	hemodialysis		Nursing Practice	on hurnout:
	centers and to		Fnvironment _	1) Unadjusted
	determine the		Practice Environment	$OR = 12 \ 37 \ (5 \ 90)$
	association		Scale of the Nursing	24.93) n< 001
	between burnout		Work Index (PES-	2) Adjusted
	and nurses'		NWI)	OR = 4.60, (1.96,
	intentions to		,	10.78), p<.01
	leave their jobs		Care Left Undone	/* 1
	5			Burned out nurses and
			Occupational burnout	intent to leave (within
			 Maslach Burnout 	12 months) compared
			Inventory (MBI)	to not burned out
			Emotional Exhaustion	nurses:
			(EE) subscale	1) Position
				OR= 3.0 (1.7, 5.0),
			Intent to leave –	p<.01
			Two single item	2) Employer
			measures (intent to	OR= 2.7 (1.59, 5.86),
			leave current position	p<.01
			and intent to leave	Findings suggest on
			current employer)	r maings support an
				auditional relational
				NOOM: process of
				care affects nurse
				Care left undone effect
				on burnout.
				1) Unadjusted
				OR = 8.75 (4.5.)
				17.01), p<.001
				2) Adjusted

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
()			(/	OR=2.68 (1.17, 6.14) p < 05
Tervo- Heikkinen, Kiviniemi, Partanen, & Vehvilainen- Julkunen (2009)	162 bedside registered nurses working on 46 inpatient care units at 5 university hospitals in Finland To assess the relationship between patient to registered nurse ratio and nursing outcomes: job satisfaction and stress, nursing care quality, control of own practice, intent to leave, adequacy of material sources and attitudes toward technical equipment	Cross- sectional, correlational design using Bayesian network modeling	Theory not specified; utilization of Bayesian Network model to discover relationships RN Working Conditions Barometry form: Opportunity to influence at work – 10 items Stress and intent to leave – 7 items Quality of work – 5 items Material resources – 5 items Attitudes toward technical equipment – 4 items Staffing situation – 1 item Job satisfaction – 1 item Demographics - Age - Gender, - Experience - Specialty area, - Education Patient to RN ratio: number of patients assigned on last worked shift Quality of nursing care – 3 items: 1) Quality of care in the unit is extremely good (good, satisfactory, poor) 2) I am satisfied with my present job 3) I have felt stress (none, slight,	 6.14), p<.05 Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Variables demonstrated 5 subscales (Cronbach alpha): RN assessed quality of care (0.630) Control over practice (0.717) Intent to leave (0.793) Adequacy of material resources (0.744) Attitudes toward technical equipment (0.619) Bayesian Model demonstrates a strong relationship between intent to leave and 1) care quality and 2) satisfaction; a moderate relationship between intent to leave and 3) control of own practice (autonomy)

Author	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)	Sample/1 urpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
			some extent,	
			extreme)	
Aiken &	Wave 1:	Cross-	Twinning partnership	Chi square results to
Poghosyan	859 nurses:	sectional,	driven by the	determine if changes
(2009)	Russia – 460	quantitative	American Nurses	within countries were
	Armenia – 399	description	Credentialing Center's	significant: before
			Application for	implementation, after
	Wave 2:		Magnet Designation	implementation
	Bussia 430		"Peseerch design was	1) Participation
	Armenia $= 364$		hased on methods and	- Russia a Policy Decisions
	7 millenna 504		measures used in the	50.0. 62.8
			International Hospital	(p<.001)
	To provide an		Outcomes Study of	b. Hospital
	outcome-		five Western countries	Governance
	evaluation of an		(Aiken, et al., 2002)"	49.2, 54.8
	intervention to		pp. 168	- Armenia
	strengthen		Name Due die e	a. Policy Decisions
	in Pussion and		Find Fractice	(n < 05)
	Armenian		Nursing Work Index-	h Hospital
	hospitals		Revised (NWI-R)	Governance
				67.1, 73.4
				2) Manager
			Burnout – MBI EE	- Russia
			subscale	a. Admin listens to RNs
			Confidence in	65.0, 68.9
			management's	b. Support for
			willingness to address	ideas
			problems in care –	47.3, 58.4
			single item measure	(p<.001)
			Quality of arra	c. RN continuity
			single item measure	43 3 50 2
			single nem medsure	$(n \le .05)$
			Readiness for	- Armenia
			discharge –	a. Admin listens to
			single item measure	RNs
				78.5, 85.5
				(p<.05)
				b. Support for
				73 5 77 9
				c. RN continuity
				of care
				77.3, 86.3
				(p<.01)
				3) Adequacy
				- Russia
	1	1	1	a. Enough KNS

Author		Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings 63.9, 53.5 (p<.05) b. Enough staff 51.0, 46.3 c. Support services 64.4, 66.3 d. Satisfactory salary 16.1, 20.2 - Armenia a. Enough RNs 92.6, 89.5 b. Enough staff 92.8, 92.8 c. Support services 93.2, 93.9 d. Satisfactory salary 53.4, 53.1 4) Nurse Phy Rel - Russia a. Phy value RNs 67.0, 73.6 (p<.05) b. Collaborations 78.8, 89.9 (p<.001) c. Teamwork 83.9, 89.2 (p<.05) - Armenia d. Phy value RNs 82.6, 80.3 e. Collaborations 88.0, 91.2 f. Teamwork 85.8, 89.5 Change in intent to leave not reported; nurse burnout significantly higher on comparison units when compared with magnet units. before
				magnet units, before 19.1, after 14.1.
				p<.001
Aiken,	10,184 nurses	Cross-	Discussion of the	PES-NWI Cronbach's
Clarke,	and 232, 342	sectional,	Quality Health	alphas:
Sloane, Lake,	surgical patients	correlational	Outcomes Model and	1) Foundation $\alpha =$
& Cheney	in 168	design	adapted conceptual	.74
(2009)			model	2) Manager $\alpha = .82$

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
(1000)	Pennsvlvania	1111119515		3) Nurse Phy Rel
	hospitals		RN Staffing –	$\alpha = .80$
	1		Mean number of	
	To analyze the		patients assigned to	Hospital percentages
	net effects of		staff nurses on their	by care environment:
	nurse practice		last shift)	- Poor 26%
	environments on			- Mixed 49%
	nurse outcomes		RN Education –	- Better 25%
	and patient		Percentage of BSN or	
	outcomes after		higher degree holders	Adjusted Odds Ratios
	accounting for			for effect of Care
	nurse staffing		Patient Care	Environment and
	and education		Environment (3	Staffing on Nurse
			subscales of the PES-	Outcomes (estimated
			NWI)	separately):
			- Nursing	1) Burnout
			Foundations for	- Care Env
			Quality Care	OR = 0.74 (0.68, 0.80) < 01
			(NFQC)	0.80), p<.01
			- Nurse Manager	- Starting OP = 1.21 (1.11)
			Leadership and	0R = 1.21(1.11, 1.31)
			Support for	2) Job dissatisfaction
			Nurses (NM)	- Care Env
			- Collegial Nurse	OR = 0.74 (0.67)
			Physician	0.80 n< 01
			Relations (CNPR	- Staffing
				OR = 1.15 (1.06)
			RN Job satisfaction –	1.24), p<.01
			Single item measure	3) Intent to leave (1
			6	yr)
			Burnout –	- Care Env
			MBI EE subscale	OR= 0.87 (0.78,
				0.96), p<.01
			Intent to leave (job	- Staffing
			within the next year) –	OR= 1.05 (0.96,
			Single item measure	1.14)
				4) Quality of RN
			KN perception of	care
			quality care –	- Care Env
			I hree item scale	OR = 0.60 (0.53, 0.60)
				0.68), p<.01
			Surgical Patient	- Starting OP = 1.22 (1.22)
			Outcomes –	OK = 1.33 (1.23, 2.01) = -01
			Patient death within	2.01, $p > .015) Confidence in$
			30 days of admission	Managers
			- Failure to	- Care Env
			rescue	OR = 0.62 (0.56)
			Patient	0.68 n< 01
			Characteristics:	- Staffing
			- Age	OR = 1.16 (1.05)
			- Sex	1.29), p<.001

Author	G 1 /D	Study Type/	The	eory/Concepts	<i>a</i> .	
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	(Er	npirical Indicators)	Sig	nificant Findings
			-	Transfer status	6)	Confidence in
			-	Emergent		patient mgt of
				admission		care
			-	48 surgery types	-	Care Env
			-	28 present or		OR= 0.74 (0.66-
				preexisting		0.84), p<.01
				conditions	-	Staffing
						OR=1.22 (1.09,
						1.36), p<.01
					7)	Would not
						recommend
						hospital
					-	Care Env
						OR= 0.55 (0.44,
						0.68), p<.01
					-	Staffing
						OR= 1.26 (1.04,
						1.52), p<.05
					(est	timated jointly):
					1)	Burnout
					-	Care Env
						OR= 0.76 (0.70,
						0.82), p<.01
					-	Staffing
						OR= 1.17 (1.09,
						1.25), p<.01
					2)	Job dissatisfaction
					-	Care Env
						OR= 0.75 (0.68,
						0.81), p<.01
					-	Staffing
						OR= 1.11 (1.04,
						1.18), p<.01
					3)	Intent to leave (1
						yr)
					-	Care Env
						OR= 0.87 (0.78,
						0.96), p<.01
					-	Staffing
						OR= 1.03 (0.95,
						1.12)
					4)	Quality of RN
						care
					-	Care Env
						OR = 0.62 (0.55,
						0.69), p<.01
					-	Staffing
						OR= 1.27 (1.16,
						1.40), p<.01
					5)	Confidence in
						Managers
			1		-	Care Env

Author	~ 1 /2	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
				$\begin{array}{r} & \text{OR} = 0.63 \; (0.57, \\ & 0.68), p < .01 \\ \text{-} & \text{Staffing} \\ & \text{OR} = 1.11 \; (1.01, \\ & 1.21), p < .05 \\ \text{6)} & \text{Confidence in} \\ & \text{patient mgt of} \\ & \text{care} \\ \text{-} & \text{Care Env} \\ & \text{OR} = 0.76 \; (0.68- \\ & 0.86), p < .01 \\ \text{-} & \text{Staffing} \\ & \text{OR} = 1.18 \; (1.06, \\ & 1.31), p < .01 \\ \text{7)} & \text{Would not} \\ & \text{recommend} \\ & \text{hospital} \\ \text{-} & \text{Care Env} \\ & \text{OR} = 0.56 \; (0.45, \\ & 0.70), p < .01 \\ \text{-} & \text{Staffing} \\ & \text{OR} = 1.19 \; (0.99, \\ & 1.43) \\ \end{array}$
				Adjusted Odds ratios indicating effect of care environment on patient outcomes: 1) Mortality OR= 0.91 (0.85, 0.97), p<.01 2) Failure to rescue OR= 0.91 (0.89, 0.98), p<.01 Estimated jointly with nurse education and staffing: 1) Mortality OR= 0.93 (0.87, 0.99) 2) Failure to rescue OR= 0.94 (0.88, 1.00), p<.001
Patrician, Shang, & Lake (2010)	955 registered nurses working on inpatient units in 23 U.S. based Army Medical Department Hospitals. Military 357, Civilian 598	Cross- sectional, correlational design	Nursing Organization and Outcomes Model referenced as the Aiken, et al. (1997) framework RN Demographics	27% of the sample report job dissatisfaction 30% report high emotional exhaustion - Military nurses report significantly more high emotional

Author	Sample/Durnose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)	Sample/Turpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
			Nursing Practice	exhaustion scores
	Describe		Environment –	than civilian
	AMEDD RN		PES-NWI	counterparts
	practice			34% of the sample
	environments;		RN Job dissatisfaction	report intend to leave
	Examine levels		– single item measure	within one year
	01 JOD dissotisfaction		Emotional Exhaustion	(controlling for
	anssatisfaction,		MPI FE subscale	minitary and minitary
	exhaustion and			within and out of the
	ioh termination		Intent to leave –	hospital)
	intentions among		single item measure:	16% report fair to poor
	AMEDD RNs:		if no military	quality of care
	Describe		obligation of self or	(agreement between
	AMEDD RN		spouse, would you	military and civilian
	assessed quality		leave your current job;	nurses)
	of care; Examine		categorized as	Strongest consistent
	the contributions		dichotomous)	predictor of RN work
	of nurse staffing			outcomes was an
	and the practice		Fair/Poor quality of	unfavorable practice
	environment for		care –	environment; nurses
	predicting RN		Single item measure	reporting an
	work outcomes			unfavorable practice
	and KIN-rated			environment compared
	quality of care			to a favorable practice
				- 14 times more
				- 14 times more likely to
				experience job
				dissatisfaction
				(13.75, p<.001)
				- 13 times more
				likely to
				experience
				emotional
				exhaustion (12.70,
				p<.001)
				- 3 times more
				likely to intend to
				leave within 1
				year $(5.05, -6.001)$
				p < .001)
				- likely to report
				fair to poor
				quality of care
				(10.66, p<.001)
				Largest effect
				controlling for all
				other variables was for
				emotional exhaustion
				 BSN prepared
				nurses (1.97,

Author	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)	Sample/1 urpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	
				 p<.001) were more likely than AD prepared nurses to experience to report high emotional exhaustion Caucasian nurses were more likely than other racial groups to report high emotional exhaustion (1.53, p<.05) and fair to poor quality of care (.94, p<.05)
Cheng & Liou (2011)	195 Asian nurses working at least six months in United States Hospitals. Personal referrals and snowball sampling To measure the predictability of cultural orientation on organizational commitment, perception of practice environment, and intention to leave among Asian nurses working in US hospitals	Cross- sectional, correlational, and comparative design	Theory not specified: Mention to Mowday (1979) Organizational Commitment and to Lake (2002) Practice Environment Organizational Commitment – OC Questionnaire developed by Mowday, 1979 Practice Environment (PES-NWI) Intention to Leave – Anticipated Turnover Scale, ATS by Hinshaw and Atwood, 1985 Cultural Orientation – Collectivist Orientation Scale	Intention to leave was negatively correlated with years practiced at the current position (- .24,p<.05), years lived in the United States (- .23, p<.05), age (24, p<.05), organizational commitment (52, p<.001), practice environment (34, p<.001), and cultural orientation (24, p<.05 Regression: Cultural orientation was positively associated with: - Organizational commitment $R^{2}= 5.8\%$, B= 0.59, t= 3.34, p<.001 - Practice Environment $R^{2}= 3.9\%$, B=1.34, t= 2.69, p<.01 And negatively associated with - Intent to leave

Author	Comm1-/D	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Cionificant Ein 1
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
				$R^2 = 6.1\%, B = -$
				.47, t= -3.35,
				p<.001
				Perception of the
				practice environment
				was correlated with:
				- Organizational
				commitment
				$R^2 = 3.5\%,$
				B=0.22, l=10.39, m < 0.01
				p<.001) Intent to leave
				- Intent to leave $\mathbf{P}^2 - 6.7\%$ $\mathbf{P} - $
				R = 0.770, B = -0.770, t = -3.85
				n < 001
				Organizational
				commitment was
				correlated with:
				- Intent to leave
				(controlling for
				cultural
				orientation and
				demographics)
				R ² = 19.3%, B= -
				0.36, t = -7.12,
				p<.001)
				Mediation:
				When organizational
				commitment and
				ware entered into the
				regression analysis
				nractice environment
				did not have
				significant regression
				weight ($B=0.01$. t=
				0.27, p=0.79)
				suggesting mediation
				effect of
				organizational
				commitment
				Organizational
				commitment mediated
				93.98% of the practice
				environment effect on
				intent to leave (Sobel
				= -5.57, p<.001); this
				increased to 96.54%
				when controlling for
				cultural orientation $(S_{1}) = 5.22$
				(SODEI = -3.32, m < 0.01)
1		1	1	p<.001)

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
Lin, Chiang, & Chen (2011)	535 Taiwanese nurses providing direct care to patients in Taiwanese hospitals To compare the difference between Taiwanese nurses' intent to leave or stay in employment in nursing as related to their perceptions of the practice environment	Cross- sectional, comparative design	Theory not specified; discussion of literature examining nursing work and practice environments Nurse Practice Environment – PES-NWI Chinese Version Intent to leave – Two single item measures 1. Nursing (single item: "do you frequently think of quitting nursing?" 2. Employment (single item: "do you currently consider finding a nursing job in another hospital?"	C-NPE association with intent to leave employment: mean (SD), t, p 3. Composite 2.6(0.4), t= 3.9, p<.001 4. Management 2.5(0.5), t- 2.7, p=.007 5. Prof Development 2.9(0.4), t= 4.2, p<.001 6. Quality 2.8(0.4), t= 2.5, p=.012 7. Adequacy 2.3(0.6), t= 4.4, p<.001 8. Participation 2.3(0.6), t= 1.5, p= 0.145 C-NPE association with intent to leave nursing: mean (SD), t, and p 9. Composite 2.7(0.3), t= 36.0, p<.001 10. Management 2.6(0.5), t- 4.2, p<.001 11. Prof Development 3.0(0.3), t= 3.3, p<.001 12. Quality 2.7(0.4), t= 5.6, p<.001 13. Adequacy 2.4(0.6), t= 5.9, p<.001 14. Participation 2.3(0.6), t= 4.0, p<.001 14. Participation 2.3(0.6), t= 4.0, p<.001
Lavoie- Tremblay, Paquet, Marchionni, & Drevniok (2011)	To investigate which domains of the nursing practice	descriptive design	used the Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index (PES-NWI) as a framework for examining the work	ANOVA revealed no significant differences between generational categories on the PES- NWI

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
	environment influence the intent to leave a job among generation Y nurses.	711101/515	environment and how it influences turnover in Generation Y nurses." Pp. 40 Sociodemographic variables: - <24 years (Gen Y) - 25-44 (Gen X) - Type of institution of current employment - Job title - Department - Employment status - Schedule Type - Work Environment – PES-NWI Intent to leave – Two single item measures 1. Employer (ANY intent; no timeframe) 2. Profession (ANY intent; no timeframe)	Point-biserial correlations betweenNURSINGPRACTICEENVIRONMENT andIntent to Quit1)Participationa.Position17, $p < .05$ b.Profession19, $p < .05$ 2)Foundationa.Position15, $p < .05$ b.Profession24, $p < .01$ 3)Managera.Position09b.Profession24, $p < .01$ 4)Adequacya.Position09b.Profession23, $p < .01$ 5)Nurse Phy Rel a.a.Position16, $p < .05$ b.Profession16, $p < .01$
Hinno, Partanen, & Vevilainen- Julkunen (2012)	Random sample of 869 hospital nurses from Finland and the Netherlands Nurses: Finland 535 Netherlands 334 To investigate the relationship between nurse work environment characteristics	Cross- sectional, correlational comparative survey	Theory not specified; discussion of nurse work environment and nurse practice environment literature from USA, Canada, Australia, and several European countries. Practice Environment – NWI-R translated and back-translated into Dutch	 Cronbach alpha for modified NWI-R Adequacy 0.85 Support of management 0.86 Assurance of care quality 0.77 Professional practice environment of RN comparison between countries Finland Adequacy 2.32(0.47)

(Year) Jample Luboc Analysis (Empirical Indicators) Significat Indicators) Significat Indicators) and nurse- reported outcomes in hospital settings in Finland and the Netherlands Nurse job-related feelings - Single item measure (positive/negative) 4. Support of mgnt 2.43(0.50) 1. Current Unit (NTV intent; no timeframe) 5. Quality 3.13(0.37) 2. Two single item measures 2.76(0.38) 2.76(0.43) 3. Outly intent; no timeframe) 8. Quality 2.76(0.40) 2. Orgonation (ANY intent; no timeframe) 8. Quality 2.76(0.47) 2. Adequacy 2.76(0.47) 8. Quality 2. Tokol.40) 8. Quality 2.76(0.47) 2. Adequacy 9. Job-related negative feelings 1. Adequacy 3. The Netherlands 0.8 - 3.174 1.10, 7.42, p<.05 10. Job-related positive feelings 1. Adequacy 8. Finland 0. R=1.668 (1.082, 2.554), p<.05 2. Support 11. Intention to leave the unit 1. Adequacy 8. Finland 0. R=1.668 (1.082, 2.554), p<.05 2. Support 2. Support 8. Finland 0.720, 0.521, p<.05 2. Support	Author	Sample/Durpase	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
and nurse- reported outcomes in hospital settings in Finland and the NetherlandsNurse job-related feelings - Single item measure (positive/negative)4.Support of mgnt 2.13(0.37)1Intent to Leave - Two single item measures (ANY intent; no timeframe)7.Support of mgnt 2.76(0.38)2.Organization (ANY intent; no timeframe)7.Support of mgnt 2.76(0.37)2.Organization (ANY intent; no timeframe)8.Quality 2.76(0.37)2.Organization (ANY intent; no timeframe)8.Quality 2.76(0.37)3.Support of mgnt 2.56(0.40)8.Quality 2.76(0.37)3.Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year)9.Job-related negative feelings1)Adequacy a.Finland OR=3.174OR=3.174 (1.301, 7.742), p<0.5	(Year)	Sample/Fulpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
reported outcomes in hospital settings in Finland and the Netherlands Intent to Leave – Two single item measures 1. Current Unit (ANY intent; no timeframe) Care Quality – Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality – Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality – Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year) Dab-related negative feelings 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=24.617 (1.301, 7.742), p<.05 10. Job-related positive feelings 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=4.108 (2.652, 6.361), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=4.108 (2.652, 6.361), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=4.108 (2.652, 6.361), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=-0.55 2) Support a. Finland DR=-0.55 2) Support 3) Support 3) Support 3) Support 3)		and nurse-		Nurse job-related	4. Support of mgnt
Single item measure improvement on the unit over last year) Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year) Solution 2. 5. Quality 3. 13(0.37) 2) The Netherlands Intent to Leave – Two single item measures 1. Current Unit (ANY intent; no timeframe) 2. Organization (ANY intent; no time or the unit over last year) Solution 2. 65 b. Netherlands OR=3.174 (1.301, 7.742), p<05 10. Job-related positive feelings 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=4.108 (2.652, 6.361), p<05 11. Intention to leave the unit 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=4.108 (2.652, 6.361), p<05 2) Support a. Finland OR=4.033 (0.230, 0.541), p<05 2) Support a. Finland OR=4.033 (0.230, 0.541), p<05 2) Support a. Finland OR=4.033 (0.230, 0.541), p<05 2) Support a. Finland OR=4.03 2) (0.230, 0.541), p<05 2) Support a. Finland OR=4.03 2) (0.230, 0.541), p<05 2) Support a. Finland OR=4.03 2) (0.230, 0.541), p<05 2) Support a. Finland OR=4.03 2) (0.230, 0.541), p<05 2) Support a. Finland OR=4.05 2) (0.230, 0.541), p<05 2) Support a. Finland 2) (0.230, 0.541), p<05 2) Support a. Finl		reported		feelings –	2.43(0.50)
 hospital settings in Finland and the Netherlands Intent to Leave – Two single item measures 1. Current Unit (ANY intent; no timeframe) 2. Organization (ANY intent; no timeframe) Care Quality – Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year) 2. Job-related negative feelings 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=2.4617 (6.196, 97.806), p<05 10. Job-related positive feelings 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=2.63(1, 7, 742), p<05 10. Job-related positive feelings 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=1.668 (1.082, 2.554), p<05 11. Intention to leave the unit 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=1.668 (1.082, 2.554), p<05 11. Intention to leave the unit 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=1.633 (0.230, 0.541), p<05 11. Intention to leave the unit 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<05 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<05 		outcomes in		Single item measure	5. Quality
in Finland and the Netherlands 1. Current Unit (ANY intent; no timeframe) 2. Organization (ANY intent; no timeframe) 2. Care Quality – Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality – Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year) 2. Organization (ANY intent; no timeframe) 2. Organization (I.301, 7.742), p<.05 3. Support a. Finland OR=4.618 (1.301, 7.742), p<.05 3. Support a. Finland OR=4.618 (1.082, 2.554), p<.05 3. Support a. Finland OR=1.668 (1.082, 2.554), p<.05 3. Support a. Finland OR=1.668 (1.082, 2.554), p<.05 3. Support a. Finland OR=0.5 3. Support bits celings 1. Adequacy a. Finland OR=0.5 3. Support bits celings 1. Adequacy bits celings 1. Adequacy a. Finland 0.0429(0.320, 0.541), p<0.5 3. Support bits celings 1. Adequacy bits celings 1. Adequacy 1. Adequacy bits celings 1. Adequacy		hospital settings		(positive/negative)	3.13(0.37)
the Netherlands Intent to Leave – Two single item measures I. Current Unit (ANY intent; no timeframe) 2. Organization (ANY intent; no timeframe) 2. Organization (ANY intent; no timeframe) 2. Gare Quality – Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year) 2. Intention to leave the unit over last year) 3. Netherlands OR=3.174 (1.301, 7.742), p<.05 10. Job-related negative feelings 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=3.174 (1.301, 7.742), p<.05 10. Job-related negative feelings 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=3.174 (1.301, 7.742), p<.05 10. Job-related negative feelings 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=3.164 (1.302, 2.554), p<.05 11. Intention to leave the unit 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=1.668 (1.082, 2.554), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support		in Finland and		T T	2) The Netherlands
$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \text{ Wo single item} \\ \text{measures} \\ 1. \text{ Current Unit} \\ (\text{ANY intent; no} \\ \text{timeframe}) \\ 2. \text{ Organization} \\ (\text{ANY intent; no} \\ \text{timeframe}) \\ 2. \text{ Care Quality} - \\ \text{Single item measure} \\ (\text{improvement on the} \\ \text{unit over last year}) \\ \begin{bmatrix} 1 \text{ Wo single item measure} \\ (\text{improvement on the} \\ \text{unit over last year}) \\ \end{bmatrix} \text{ Adequacy} \\ a. \text{ Finland} \\ \text{OR=3.174} \\ (1.301, 7.742), \\ p < 05 \\ 10. \text{ Job-related} \\ positive feelings \\ 1) \text{ Adequacy} \\ a. \text{ Finland} \\ \text{OR=4.108} \\ (2.652, 6.361), \\ p < .05 \\ 2) \text{ Support} \\ a. \text{ Finland} \\ \text{OR=4.108} \\ (2.652, 6.361), \\ p < .05 \\ 2) \text{ Support} \\ a. \text{ Finland} \\ \text{OR=3.174} \\ (1.301, 7.742), \\ p < .05 \\ 10. \text{ Job-related} \\ positive feelings \\ 1) \text{ Adequacy} \\ a. \text{ Finland} \\ \text{OR=4.108} \\ (2.652, 6.361), \\ p < .05 \\ 2) \text{ Support} \\ a. \text{ Finland} \\ \text{OR=-0.353} \\ (0.230, 0.541), \\ p < .05 \\ 2) \text{ Support} \\ a. \text{ Finland} \\ \text{OR=-0.353} \\ (0.230, 0.541), \\ p < .05 \\ 2) \text{ Support} \\ 3. \text{ Finland} \\ \text{OR=-0.353} \\ (0.230, 0.541), \\ p < .05 \\ 2) \text{ Support} \\ 3. \text{ Finland} \\ \text{OR=0.353} \\ (0.230, 0.541), \\ p < .05 \\ 2) \text{ Support} \\ 3. \text{ Finland} \\ \text{OR=0.353} \\ (0.230, 0.541), \\ p < .05 \\ 2) \text{ Support} \\ 3. \text{ Finland} \\ \text{OR=0.354} \\ (0.499, (0.326, 0.541), \\ p < .05 \\ (0.56, 0.56) \\ (0.56,$		the Netherlands		Intent to Leave –	6. Adequacy
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				I wo single item	2.76(0.38)
(ANY inten; no timeframe) $(ANY inten; no timeframe)$ $(ANY inten; no timeframe)$ $(ANY inten; no timeframe)$ $(ANY inten; no timeframe)$ $(Care Quality - Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year)$ $(Gare Quality - Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year)$ $(Gare Quality - Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year)$ $(Gare Quality - Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year)$ $(Gare Quality - Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year)$ $(Gare Quality - Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year)$ $(Gare Quality - Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year)$ $(Gare Quality - Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year)$ $(Gare Quality - Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year)$ $(Gare Quality - Single item measure (improvement on the unit 0 adequacy a Finland OR=4.108 (2.652, 6.361), p<.05$ $(Jare Quality - Single item measure (improvement on the unit 1) Adequacy a - Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05$ $(Jare Quality - Single item measure (Improvement on the unit 1) Adequacy - Single item measure (Improvement on the unit 1) Adequacy - Single item measure (Improvement on the unit 1) Adequacy - Single item measure (Improvement on the unit 1) Adequacy - Single item measure (Improvement on the unit 1) Adequacy - Single item measure (Improvement on the unit 1) Adequacy - Single item measure (Improvement on the unit 1) Adequacy - Single item measure (Improvement on the unit 1) Adequacy - Single item measure (Improvement on the unit 1) Adequacy - Single item measure (Improvement on the unit 1) Adequacy - Single item measure (Improvement on the unit 1) Adequacy - Single item measure (Improvement on the unit 1) Adequacy - Single item measure (Improvement on the unit 1) Adequacy - Single item measure (Improvement on the unit 1) Adequacy - Single item measure (Improvement on the unit 1) Adequacy - Single item measure (Improvement on the unit - Single item$				measures	7. Support of mgnt $2.5((0, 40))$
(AVT intent; notimeframe) 2. Organization (ANY intent; no timeframe) 2. Job-related negative feelings 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=4.108 (2.652, 6.361), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.323 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.323 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 3. Support a. Finland OR=0.323 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 3. Support a. Finland OR=0.323 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 3. Support a. Finland OR=0.323 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 3. Support a. Finland OR=0.325 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 3. Support				1. Current Unit	2.56(0.40)
$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 7 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1$				(ANY intent; no	8. Quality $2.7(0.27)$
$ \begin{array}{c cccc} 2. & Organization \\ (ANY intent; no timeframe) \\ Care Quality - Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year) \\ (introver last year) \\ (int$				2 Organization	2.70(0.57)
(ArV i fitch, no timeframe) Care Quality - Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality - Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality - Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year) P. Job-related DOB-related DOB				2. Organization (ANV intent: no	Degrassion:
Care Quality – Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality – Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality – Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality – Single item measure (introvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality – Single item measure (introvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality – Single item measure (introvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality – Single item measure (introvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality – Single item measure (introvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality – Single item measure (introvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality – Single item measure (introvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality – Single item measure (introvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality – Single item measure (introvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality – Single item measure (introvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality – Single item measure (introvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality – Single item measure (introvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality – Single item measure (introvement on the unit over last year) Support a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<05 Care Quality – Support a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<0.55 Care Quality – Support a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<0.55 Care Quality – Support a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<0.55 Care Quality – Support a. Finland OR=0.353 Care Quality – Support a. Finland OR=0.353 Care Quality – Support a. Finland OR=0.353 Care Quality – Support A. Finland OR=0.355 Care Quality – Support A. F				timeframe)	Q Job_related
Care Quality – Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality – Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality – Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality – Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality – Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year) Care Quality – Single item measure (ingraver technigs 1) Adequaey a. Finland OR=3.174 (1.301, 7.742), p<0.5 10. Job-related positive feelings 1) Adequaey a. Finland OR=1.668 (1.082, 2.554), p<0.5 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<0.5 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<0.5 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<0.5 2) Support a. Finland				timename)	9. JOU-ICIAICU
Single item measure (improvement on the unit over last year) $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 $				Care Quality -	1) Adequacy
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				Single item measure	a Finland
(inprovidential of the order between the init over last year) = (6.196, 97.806), p<0.5 b. Netherlands OR=3.174 (1.301, 7.742), p<0.5 10. Job-related positive feelings 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=4.108 (2.652, 6.361), p<0.5 2) Support a. Finland OR=1.668 (1.082, 2.554), p<0.5 11. Intention to leave the unit 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<0.5 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<0.5 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.55 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.55 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.55 2) Support b. Netherlands OR=0.51 Comparison to the sevent of the second of th				(improvement on the	OR = 24.617
$ \begin{array}{c} (0.15, 0.000), \\ p<0.5 \\ b. \\ Netherlands \\ OR=3.174 \\ (1.301, 7.742), \\ p<.05 \\ 10. \\ Job-related \\ positive feelings \\ 1) \\ Adequacy \\ a. \\ Finland \\ OR=4.108 \\ (2.652, 6.361), \\ p<0.5 \\ 2) \\ Support \\ a. \\ Finland \\ OR=1.668 \\ (1.082, 2.554), \\ p<0.5 \\ 11. \\ Intention to leave \\ the unit \\ 1) \\ Adequacy \\ a. \\ Finland \\ OR=0.353 \\ (0.230, 0.541), \\ p<0.5 \\ 2) \\ Support \\ a. \\ Finland \\ OR=0.353 \\ (0.230, 0.541), \\ p<0.5 \\ 2) \\ Support \\ a. \\ Finland \\ OR=0.53 \\ (0.230, 0.541), \\ p<0.5 \\ 2) \\ Support \\ a. \\ Finland \\ 0.499 (0.329, 0.576) \\ 0.576 \\ 0.$				unit over last year)	(6 196 97 806)
b. Netherlands OR=3.174 (1.301, 7.742), p<.05 10. Job-related positive feelings 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=4.108 (2.652, 6.361), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=1.668 (1.082, 2.554), p<.05 11. Intention to leave the unit 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.239, 0.541), p<.05					p<0.5
OR=3.174 (1.301, 7.742), p<.05					b. Netherlands
(1.301, 7.742), p<.05 10. Job-related positive feelings 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=4.108 (2.652, 6.361), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=1.668 (1.082, 2.554), p<.05 11. Intention to leave the unit 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.329, 0.57() = 205					OR=3.174
p<.05 10. Job-related positive feelings 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=4.108 (2.652, 6.361), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=1.668 (1.082, 2.554), p<.05 11. Intention to leave the unit 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.329, OS=0.329,					(1.301, 7.742),
10. Job-related positive feelings 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=4.108 (2.652, 6.361), p<.05					p<.05
positive feelings 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=4.108 (2.652, 6.361), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=1.668 (1.082, 2.554), p<.05 11. Intention to leave the unit 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland 0.499 (0.329, 0.570 - 205					10. Job-related
 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=4.108 (2.652, 6.361), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=1.668 (1.082, 2.554), p<.05 11. Intention to leave the unit 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland O.570 2) Support 					positive feelings
a. Finland OR=4.108 (2.652, 6.361), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=1.668 (1.082, 2.554), p<.05 11. Intention to leave the unit 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland					1) Adequacy
OR=4.108 (2.652, 6.361), p<.05					a. Finland
(2.652, 6.361), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=1.668 (1.082, 2.554), p<.05 11. Intention to leave the unit 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland 0.499 (0.329, 0.572() = 0.05					OR=4.108
p<.05 2) Support a. Finland OR=1.668 (1.082, 2.554), p<.05 11. Intention to leave the unit 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland 0.499 (0.329, 0.570 = .05					(2.652, 6.361),
2) Support a. Finland OR=1.668 (1.082, 2.554), p<.05 11. Intention to leave the unit 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland 0.499 (0.329, 0.576) = 05					p<.05
a. Finland OR=1.668 (1.082, 2.554), p<.05 11. Intention to leave the unit 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland 0.499 (0.329, 0.572() - 205					2) Support
OR=1.008 (1.082, 2.554), p<.05					a. Finland $OP = 1$ (69)
(1.082, 2.334), p<.05 11. Intention to leave the unit 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland 0.499 (0.329, 0.576) = 05					OK=1.008
 p<.05 11. Intention to leave the unit 1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland 0.499 (0.329, 0.576) = 605 					(1.082, 2.334),
$\begin{array}{c} \text{ in intention to leave } \\ \text{ the unit } \\ 1) \text{Adequacy} \\ \text{a. Finland} \\ \text{OR=0.353} \\ (0.230, 0.541), \\ \text{p<.05} \\ 2) \text{Support} \\ \text{a. Finland} \\ 0.499 (0.329, \\ 0.576) \\ 0.576) \\ 0.576 \\ $					11 Intention to leave
1) Adequacy a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland 0.499 (0.329, 0.572() - 205					the unit
a. Finland OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland 0.499 (0.329, 0.572() - 205					1) Adequacy
OR=0.353 (0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland 0.499 (0.329, 0.572) = 205					a Finland
(0.230, 0.541), p<.05 2) Support a. Finland 0.499 (0.329,					OR=0.353
p<.05 2) Support a. Finland 0.499 (0.329,					(0.230, 0.541),
2) Support a. Finland 0.499 (0.329,					p<.05
a. Finland 0.499 (0.329,					2) Support
0.499 (0.329,					a. Finland
					0.499 (0.329,
0.576), p<.05					0.576), p<.05
b. Netherlands					b. Netherlands
OR=0.523					OR=0.523
(0.315, 0.898),					(0.315, 0.898),
p<.US					$p \le .03$
12. Intention to leave					12. Interniton to leave

Author	G 1 /D	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
				1) Adequacy
				a. Finland
				OR=0.510
				(0.334, 0.778),
				p<.05
				b. Netherlands
				OR=0.268
				(0.138, 0.520),
				p<.05
				2) Support
				a. Finland
				OR=0.530
				(0.354, 0.794),
				p<.05
				13. Intention to leave
				the profession
				1) Adequacy
				a. Finland
				OR=0.426
				(0.279, 0.651),
				p<.05
				b. Netherlands $OP = 0.419$
				OR=0.418
				(0.217, 0.807),
				p < .03
				2) Support
				OR = 0.426
				(0.285, 0.635)
				n<.05
				b. Netherlands
				OR=0.464
				(0.278, 0.776),
				p<.05
				14. Quality of care in
				the unit is high
				1) Adequacy
				a. Finland
				OR=5.644
				(1.631, 19.527),
				p<.05
				b. Netherlands
				OR=4.885
				(2.475, 9.639),
				p < .03
				2) Quality
				a. Γ manu $\Omega R = 12.466$
				(4 748 32 730)
				n < 05
				15. Quality of care is
				improved in last
				vear

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
		Analysis		 Adequacy a. Finland OR=4.330 (2.741, 6.840), p<.05 b. Netherlands OR=4.749 (2.498, 9.029),
Liu, You, Chen, Hao, Zhu, Zhang, & Aiken (2012)	1,104 RNs in 89 medical, surgical, and intensive care units in 21 hospitals across Guangdong province in China; stratified convenience sample To examine the relationship between hospital work environments and job satisfaction, job- related burnout and intention to leave among nurses in Guangdong province, China	Cross- sectional, correlational design	Nursing Organization and Outcomes Model referenced as the Aiken, et al. (1997) framework Nurse characteristics Hospital characteristics Unit characteristics Work Environment – (PES-NWI) Job satisfaction – Single item measure Burnout – MBI EE subscale Intention to leave – Single item measure (within the next year)	Adjusted odds ratios for unit work environment on: 1) Burnout OR= 0.673, 95%CI, p=.006 2) Job dissatisfaction OR= 0.501, 95%CI, p<.001 3) Retention OR= 0.599, 95%CI, p=0.053 (adjusted for gender, age, marital status, having children under the age of eighteen, registered or not, employment status, working years, and education level)
Fuentelsaz- Gallego, Moreno- Casbas, & Gonzalez- Maria (2013)	Nurses working on medical surgical and critical care units in 33 randomly selected Spanish National Health	Psychometric Study	Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index for translation to Spanish Version of the Practice Environment Scale	Questionnaire translated to Spanish by two translators with a degree in translation and previous experience in written or oral translation in

Author (Vear)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
(rear)	Service (SNHS)	Analysis	Favorable (4 to 5	the field of healthcare
	Hospitals with		subscales > 2.5)	and nursing
	more than 150		Mixed (2 to 3 subscalar > 2.5)	Superial version healt
	beus		Unfavorable (0 to 1)	translation to
	To evaluate the		subscale > 2.5)	American English
	validity and		,	performed by two
	reliability of the		_	additional translators
	Spanish version		Burnout –	with the same
	Environment		WBI Spanish version	All four versions (one
	Scale of the		Job Satisfaction –	from each translator)
	Nursing Work		Single item measure	reviewed for
	Index,			inconsistencies and
	determining the		Intent to leave –	edited to remain as
	content validity,		Single item measure	close as possible to the
	reliability,			American English. No
	internal			discrepancies
	consistency, and			
	construct validity			Internal consistency:
				Composite = 0.90
				1) Participation 0.81
				2) Foundation 0.73
				3) Manager 0.81
				4) Adequacy 0.78 5) Nurse Phy Rel
				$\frac{0.77}{0.77}$
				Test-retest reliability:
				384 surveys paired;
				Coefficient = 0.87
				(0.85, 0.90)
				1) Participation 0.88
				(0.85, 0.90)
				2) Foundation 0.85 $(0.82, 0.88)$
				(0.82, 0.88) 3) Manager 0.87
				(0.86, 0.91)
				4) Adequacy 0.82
				(0.78, 0.85)
				$\begin{array}{c} \text{S} \\ \text{O} \\ \\ $
				0.00 (0.05, 0.90)
				Kappa Index for each
				item ranges from 0.24-
				0.51 (agreement of
				test-retest

Author	G 1/D	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	0' 'C' (E' 1'
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Content Validity: No discrepancies 16. 10 hospital RNs with broad clinical experience, fluent in English and Spanish, and experience in the SNHS within 5 years asked: 1) Ease of understanding 2) Adapted to Spanish cultural context 3) Capable of measuring the concepts in Spain it was designed to measure in the US 17. Provided three- column document with American English and Spanish version side-by-side and an additional column for comments 18. Same nurses performed a second review to assess the relevance of each item on a scale of 1-4 19. Content Validity Index: 5 items attain maximum level of agreement; all items range 0.5- 1.0; 4 items below 0.8 1. Chief nursing officer
				other top-level

Author	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)	Sample/1 urpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant i munigs
				executives (0.7)
				2. Written up-to-
				date care plans
				for all patients
				(0.7)
				3. Use of nursing
				diagnoses
				(0.6)
				Construct Validity:
				1) Better NDE-higher job
				satisfaction
				$X^2 = 727.84$, df=6.
				p<.001
				2) Better NPE=lower
				burnout
				$X^2 = 183.30, df = 4,$
				p<.001 2) Boor NDE-intent
				5) FOOI NFE-IIItelit
				No statistically
				significant differences
				were found between
				the composite score
				and intent to leave
				within the next year as
				dissatisfaction
Blake, Leach.	Convenience	Descriptive.	American Association	Intent to leave
Robbins,	sample of 415	cross-	of Critical Care	correlated with
Pike, &	critical care	sectional,	Nurses' 6 Standard of	leadership,
Needleman	pediatric RNs	correlational	a Healthy Work	management subscale
(2013)	working at least	design	Environment	of the PES-NWI (-
	6 months on 10		TT '/ 1 1 '/ 1/	0.117, p < .05) and
	pediatric		Hospital and unit data:	years of experience as an $PN(0.134 \text{ m} < 01)$
	units having		- Ivursnig leadershin	an KN (-0.134, p<.01)
	greater than 10		structure	Model 3 statistically
	beds and critical		- Medical	significant, p<.01
	care medicine		leadership	$(R^2=0.034)$
	fellowship		structure	20. Leadership
	programs		- Physician staffing	(manager subscale
	Examine the		and availability	of PES-NWI)
	effects of the		- Hospital type	timeliness
	healthy work		- Magnet status	22. Years of
	environment		- Beacon unit status	experience as an
	(communication,		- Union	RN
	collaboration,		representation	Inverse relationship
	and leadership)		 Patient days 	between PES-NWI
	on RN turnover			

Author	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)	from data	Analysis	- Nursing hours per	manager subscale and
	research study		(HPPD)	-0.196, SE=0.088, t=- 2.241, p=.026
			RN Demographics - Age	Model 4 statistically
			- Sex - Education	significant, p<.05 $(R^2=0.069)$
			- Experience in	23. Communication
			 Experience in pediatric intensive 	25. Leadership 26. Vears of
			care nursing	experience as an RN
			Healthy Work Environment –	27. Highest level of education
			PES-NWI	28. Age 29. Magnet
			Communication – 22 items from the ICU	designation 30. HPPD
			Nurse Physician Communication	31. Manager responsible for
			Questionnaire by Shortell et al., 1991	one unit Inverse relationship
			Intent to leave –	between PES-NWI Manager subscale and
			Single item measure, "do you intend to	intent to leave -0.287, SE=0.108, t=-
			leave your job in the next six months?"	2.649, p=.008)
				Results listed in the table do not match the
				results reported in the narrative:
				Table for Model 4: F= 0.069, R^2 = 0.022
				Therefore, only 2% of the variance in intent
				to leave was explained by this model.
				Table for Model 3: F=0.034, R ² = 0.003
				Therefore, only .3% of the variance in intent
				to leave was explained by this model.
				Also, models 1 and 2 which were rejected
				due to lack of significance explain
				12.2% and 11.6% of the variation in intent
				to leave, respectively;

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
		711101/513		PES-NWI manager subscale remains a significant predictor across the models
Choi, Cheung, & Pang (2013)	1,259 RNs working in 135 inpatient units in 10 public hospitals in Hong Kong To examine how the front-line registered nurses' perception of their work environment associates with and predicts nurse outcomes in terms of job satisfaction and turnover intention	Cross- sectional, correlational design with psychometric testing	Theory not specified; discussion included concerning the Magnet body of research and the development of several nursing work and practice environment measures Work Environment – Researcher-developed measure of 72 items across 5 subscales - Staffing and resources 13 - Management 11 - Co-worker relationship 12 - Ward Practice 22 - Professionalism 14 Job satisfaction – Single item measure (dichotomous single item: have or have not thought about resigning from work)	Spearman correlation between job satisfaction and intent to leave: -0.465, p<.001 45% of respondents report dissatisfaction 60% report intent to leave Work environment significantly correlated with: 1) Job satisfaction (Pearson) 0.516, p<.001 2) Intent to leave (Spearman) -0.399, p<.001 Logistic regression adjusted for age, gender, education, experience as RN, unit tenure, and hospital type: 1) Job satisfaction 32. Ward Practice OR=2.27 (1.78, 2.89), p<.001 33. Staffing and resources OR=1.71 (1.22, 2.39), p<.01 34. Management OR=2.44 (1.49, 4.00), p<.001 35. Professionalism OR=3.29 (2.36, 4.58), p<.001 2) Intent to leave 36. Ward Practice OR=0.58 (0.46, 0.72), p<.001 37. Management

Author	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)	Sample/1 urpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
				OR=0.37 (0.23, 0.60), p<.001
				38. Professionalism $OP = 0.26 (0.27)$
				0.49, p<.001
				0 <i>)</i> , p 1001
Raquel	129 nurses	Cross-	Nursing practice	NWI-R means and
Panunto & de	working on	sectional,	environment –	standard deviations:
Guirardello	in 17 public.	Equation	version	- Autonomy 2.2(0.62)
(2013)	private, and	Modeling		- Control 2.4(0.60)
	philanthropic	using Path	Burnout –	- Nurse Phy Rel
	hospitals across	Analysis	Brazılıan MBI	2.1(0.66)
	San Paulo, Brazil		Job satisfaction –	-2.2(0.52)
	2001 1 0010, 21020		Single item measure	((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((((
	To evaluate the			Analysis of
	characteristics of		Intent to leave – Single item measure	correlations between
	nursing practice		(in the next 12	outcomes resulted in
	environment and		months)	an RMSEA=0.9 above
	its relationship			the acceptable limit of
	with burnout,			0.8
	quality of care,			New model considered
	job satisfaction,			only Emotional
	and the intention			Exhaustion (EE)
	in the next 12			with NWI and
	months			outcomes yielded an
				RMSEA=0.0 and
				estimation of the
				paths were significant.
				r
				Autonomy to EE 0.21
				Control to EE 0.33
				Nulse Fily Kel 0.04
				EE to Quality care -
				0.44
				EE to Job satisfaction
				EE to Intent to leave -
				0.57
Van den Haada	3,186 bedside	Mixed	Theory not specified;	PES-NWI composite
Florquin.	randomly	Cross-	Credentialing Center	2.56 (0.14)
Bruyneel,	selected nursing	sectional,	Forces of Magnetism:	
Aiken, Diya,	units in 56	Sequential	are the basis for the in-	Generalized
Lesaffre,	Belgian acute	explanatory	depth qualitative	Estimating Models:

Author	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)	Sample/1 urpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	
Sermeus	T 1		G	Effect on intent to
(2013)	To examine the		Statting –	leave,
	impact of nursing		Nurse to patient ratio	OP = 0.08 (05.1.00)
	environments		Education	OR=0.98 (.95, 1.00),
	nurse staffing		Percent of nurses	40 Gender (not
	and nurse		holding a BSN	significant)
	education on		nording a Dorv	41. Experience (not
	nurse reported		Nursing work	significant)
	intention to leave		environment –	42. Bed Size
	the hospital		PES-NWI	OR=1.05 (1.02,
				1.07), p<.05
			Intent to Leave –	43. Teaching status
			Single item measure	(not significant)
			(if possible, would	44. High tech (not
			you leave your job	45 Begien
			within the next year)	45. Region. Walloon v
				Flanders
				OR=1.69(1.20.
				2.40), p<.05
				Brussels v
				Flanders
				OR=1.53 (1.22,
				1.94), p<.05
				46. NPE
				OR=0.69 (0.61,
				0.78), p<.0001
				4/. Starring $OP = 1.08 (1.01)$
				$0R = 1.08 (1.01, 1.16) n \le 05$
				48 Education (not
				significant)
				6)
				6 Flemish hospitals
				selected for in-depth
				interviews with Chief
				Nursing Officers
				presented with the
				lindings from the
				high performing and 2
				low performing).
				5 Themes extracted-
				1) Transformational
				Leadership
				Visible leaders,
				rounding often,
				listening to staff,
				highly involved,
				first-hand
				information,
	1			respectful

Author	C 1/D	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	G' 'C	· F' 1'
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Signific	cant Findings
Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Signific 2) Str En In nu af m str sta Lo pe Cl m co ra HI haa fill Lo pe ho Sa No Sa M m ter nu or Pr de Cl m th co Cl m th co co ra M Th co co Pr de Cl m th co co Pr de Cl m ter nu or Pr de Cl m ter nu or Pr de Cl m ter tr ter No Sa ter tr tr tr tr tr ter tr ter tr ter tr ter tr ter tr ter te	cant Findings uctural powerment volvement of urses in hospital fairs, flat anagement ructure, expect aff feedback ow erformance NOs and anagement erform emselves on ommittees ther than nurses igh performers ive a plan for lling vacancies ow erformance ospitals poorly anage staffing; mp agency urses v. nurses i fulltime status tofessional evelopment oportunity ffered o difference in lary, flexible ork schedules, uys off, sick uys, or lucation leave emplary ofessional actice fedical models ther than ursing models ilized across e sample
				Pra M ra nu ut th Hi sti	actice fedical models ther than ursing models ilized across e sample igh performers ill satisfied ith autonomy
				Lo au ov au 4) Inr Im	bw- doctor tonomy values ver nurse tonomy novations and provements
Author	~ 1 /2	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts		
------------------	----------------	-------------------------	---	---	
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings	
Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings High- value life long learning (nurse satisfaction 89%) Low- believe education removes staff from the ward increasing the burden on other nurses (nurse satisfaction 66%) High possess preceptorship Low expect nurses to hit the ground running 5) Empirical Outcomes: CNOs discuss quality care outcomes from larger study revealing higher scores for quality care in high performing hospitals regarding intent to leave Perception of quality of care: High 93% Low 65% Nurses would recommend hospital: 95% 67% High believe nurses are modest and this is a solid report Low admit patient safety is not the focus of	
				attention and their approach is	
				retroactive rather than proactive	
Zander,	27,451 nurses	Mixed	Theory not specified;	Review of secondary	
Blumel, &	from 328	Methods:	reference to work	qualitative data from	
Busse (2013)	hospitals:		environment literature	previous study in 17	

Author (Year) Sa	ample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
G	Germany	Cross-	examining the Nursing	European countries
U	Inited Kingdom	sectional,	Practice Environment	(nurse responses via
J)	UK)	Sequential	in European countries	online survey, two
N	letherlands	Exploratory		focus groups, and 20
(N	NL)		RN Characteristics:	standardized telephone
Sv	weden (SE)		- Age	interviews) to
N	lorway (NO)		- Gender	extrapolate motives
Sv	witzerland			for nurses to migrate
(0	CH)		Perceived staffing	to and from Germany:
Po	oland (PO)		shortage –	eight "push factors"
G	Breece (GR)		PES-NWI composite	identified.
So	outh Africa		TT' 1 .' 1	T 1.
(Z	ZA)		High emotional	Log regression results
т			exhaustion –	for push factor effect
	o lest whether		MBI EE subscale	on intent to leave: 1) $\mathbf{P}_{0} = \frac{1}{2}$
th	f qualitation		Desision	1) Poor work
01	i quantative and		Decision making	OP = 2.225
qu			power – Single item from the	OK = 5.255 (2.424, 4.201)
01	ni motives to		DES NWI	(2.434, 4.501),
111	ave the current		1 L'O-IN WI	2) FF
he	ospital		Recognition -	OR=2.445
re	espectively		Single item from the	(1.860, 3.215)
pr	rovides		PES-NWI	p<.001
su	ufficient			3) Low recognition
in	nformation 1) to		Collaboration between	OR=1.796
an	nalyze working		nurses and physicians	(1.299, 2.407),
cc	onditions in		- Single item from the	p<.001
G	Bermany		PES-NWI	4) Poor advanced
cc	ompared to five			training prospects
de	estination and		Work environment –	OR=1.686
th	nree source		Single item measure	(1.278, 2.225),
cc	ountries, 2) to			p<.001
Ve	erity or faisily		Satisfaction with	5) Lack of 11.1
th th	te assumption		renumeration –	between
un ac	anditions in		Single item measure	physicians and
de	estination		Advanced training	pirysicialis allu
	ountries are		opportunities –	OR=1.647
be	etter than in		Single item measure	(1.265, 2.145)
so	ource countries.			p<.001
an	nd 3) to identify		Intent to Leave –	6) Perceived staffing
so	ound strategies		Single item measure	shortage
fo	or workforce		(the hospital)	OR=1.553
pl	lanning.			(1.048, 2.302),
	-			p=.028
				Low renumeration and
				restricted decision-
				making power were
				not significant predictors of purse
				intent to leave.

Author	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)		Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	
Gabriel,	699 full-time	Cross-	Theory not specified.	Emotional Exhaustion:
Erickson,	RNs representing	sectional,	N	1) Participation
Moran, Diafandarff	/9 units across 9	multilevel	Nurse Practice	49. Individual (24, $n < 05$)
& Bromley	Midwestern	anarysis	DES NWI subscales	p<.03) 50 Unit (not
(2013)	hospital system		- NPHA	significant)
(2013)	nospital system		- NM	51 Homologous?
	To examine the		- SRA	No
	extent to which		- CNPR	2) Adequacy
	four of the PES-			52. Individual (70,
	NWI subscales		Emotional exhaustion	p<.001)
	have		– Wharton's seven	53. Unit (84,
	homologous or		item emotional	p<.001)
	emergent effects		exhaustion scale	54. Homologous?
	across different			Yes
	levels of analysis		Job Satisfaction –	3) Manager
			Five items adapted	55. Individual (not
			Staines 1070	significant)
			Stames, 1979	50. Ullit (libt
			Turnover intentions –	57 Homologous?
			Three single item	Yes
			measures	4) Nurse Phy Rel
			- Job within the	58. Individual (not
			next year	significant)
			- Employer within	59. Unit (not
			the next year	significant)
			- Profession within	60. Homologous?
			the next year	Yes
				Turnover Intentions:
				1) Participation
				61. Individual (30, $n < 0.01$)
				p < .001) 62 Unit (not
				02. Unit (not
				63 Homologous?
				No
				2) Adequacy
				64. Individual (10,
				p<.05)
				65. Unit (16,
				p<.05)
				66. Homologous?
				Yes
				3) Manager
				67. Individual (17, (17)
				p<.001)
				oð. Unit $(19, 05)$
				p > .03
				Ves
				4) Nurse Phy Rel

Author (Veer)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
				70. Individual (not significant) 71. Unit (16, p<.05) 72. Homologous? No Job Satisfaction: 1) Participation 73. Individual (.15, p<.001) 74. Unit (not significant) 75. Homologous? No 2) Adequacy 76. Individual (.27, p<.001) 77. Unit (.24, p<.001) 78. Homologous? Yes 3) Manager 79. Individual (.15, p<.001) 80. Unit (.18, p<.05) 81. Homologous? Yes 4) Nurse Phy Rel 82. Individual (.14, p<.001) 83. Unit (.16, p<.05) 84. Homologous? Yes
Shang, Friese, Wu, and Aiken (2013)	4.047 nurses working in 282 hospitals in 3 states To examine the differences in outcomes such as job dissatisfaction and burnout between oncology nurses and medical surgical nurses, and to identify factors that affect	Cross- sectional, correlational design examining secondary data	"Aiken and colleagues developed a conceptual framework that outlines the relationship between organizational forms, nursing operational mechanisms, and outcomes." Pp 207 RN Characteristics Organizational support for nursing – PES-NWI Burnout –	 PES-NWI subscale means and standard deviations: 1) Participation 85. Oncology 2.68(0.66) 86. Med-Surg 2.64(0.66) 2) Foundation 87. Oncology 3.07(0.55) 88. Med-Surge 3.02(0.54) 3) Manager 89. Oncology 2.61(0.82)

Author	C 1/D	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	0' 'C' (T' 1'
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
	oncology nurse		MBI EE subscale	90. Med-Surg
	outcomes			2.62(0.79)
			Job dissatisfaction –	4) Adequacy
			Single item measure	91. Oncology
				2.46(0.82)
			Intent to leave –	92. Med-Surg
			Single item measure	2.37(0.77)
			(ANY intent; no	5) Nurse Phy Rel
			timeframe)	93. Oncology
				2.88(0.69)
			Nurse assessed quality	94. Med-
			of care –	Surg2.83(0.67)
			Single item measure	
				Unfavorable
				28.5(34.8)
				Mixed 21.1(22.7)
				Favorable 50.4(42.5)
				.
				Logistic regression
				(controlling for patient
				to nurse ratios):
				1) Emotional
				Exhaustion
				95. Mixed
				a. One (not
				M/S (not
				b. M/S (liot
				06 Envorable
				a One 0.31
				(0.190.51)
				n < 0.01
				b $M/S 0.50$
				(0.32, 0.79).
				p < .001
				2) Job dissatisfaction
				97. Mixed
				a. Onc (not
				significant)
				b. M/S (not
				significant
				98. Favorable
				a. Onc 0.24
				(0.13, 0.43),
				p<.001
				b. M/S 0.40
				(0.23, 0.68),
				p<.01
				3) Intent to leave
				99. Mixed
				a. Onc (not
				significant)

Author	C 1 - /D	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Ciantificant Findinas
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
				b. M/S (not significant) 100.Favorable a. Onc (not significant) b. M/S (not significant) b. M/S (not significant) 4) Quality of care 101.Mixed a. Onc 0.51 (0.31, 0.85), p<.01 b. M/S 0.59 (0.37, 0.96), p<.05 102.Favorable a. Onc 0.29 (0.16, 0.51), p<.001 b. M/S 0.32 (0.18-0.57), p<.001
Ver Desert	1 109	Create	The series of the second secon	Simula Maltilanal
Van Bogaert, Timmermans,	1,108 nurses assigned to 96	cross- sectional.	theory not specified;	Models
Mace Weeks,	nursing units	correlational	the state of the science	Nurse practice
van Heusden,	across Belgium	design	concerning nurse	environment
Wouters, &	To investigate		practice environments	associated with all
(2014)	the impact of		Nurse Work	adjusted and
(=••••)	nurse practice		Environment –	unadjusted for all
	environment		NWI- R	confounders, except
	factors, nurse			for:
	work		RN Demographics	103.the associations
	and burnout on		Workload –	physician
	nurse reported		Intensity of labor scale	relations and
	job outcomes,		by Richter, 2000	management at
	quality of care,		Decision latitude –	the unit level and
	and patient		Seven item measure	patient and family
	the unit level		by Kichler, 2000	104 between nurse
			Social capital –	management at
			Six item scale by	the unit level,
			Ernstmann et al., 2009	nurse-physician
			Dumout	relations, and
			Burnout – MBI Human Services	personal
			Survey	with patient falls
				105.association
				between nurse
				management at

Author	G 1 /D	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	G' 'C' (E' 1'
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
		-	Nurse job satisfaction	the unit level, and
			– Single item measure	nosocomial
			(with current job)	infections
				106.association
			Intent to leave –	between personal
			Single item measure	accomplishment
			(the profession within	and medication
			a vear)	errors
			5	Multilevel
			Adverse patient	Multivariate Analyses
			events:	1) Satisfaction with
			- Patient and family	current job
			complaints	a. Nurse man. Unit
			- Patient and family	level
			verbal abuse	Adjusted:
			- Patient falls	OR=4.79 (2.16.
			- Nosocomial	10.65), p<.001
			infections	Unadjusted:
			- Medication errors	OR=7.95 (3.72,
				17.00), p<.001
				b. EE
				Adjusted:
				OR=0.52 (0.43,
				0.66), p<.001
				Unadjusted:
				OR=0.54 (0.44,
				0.66), p<.001
				2) No intent to leave
				profession
				a. Nurse man. Unit
				level
				Adjusted:
				OR=2.26 (1.03,
				4.96), p<.05
				Unadjusted:
				OR=2.41(1.15,
				5.08), p<.05
				b. EE
				Adjusted:
				OR=0.63 (0.51, 0.70)
				0.79), p<.001
				OB = 0.67 (0.55)
				OK = 0.0 / (0.33, 0.82) = 0.01
				0.02, $p > .001$
				accomplishment
				A diusted.
				OR = 1.57 (1.16)
				2 14 n< 01
				Linadiusted.
				OR = 1.46 (1.11)
				1.93). n<.01

Author	Samela/Darras	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings 3) Quality of care on unit a. Nurse man. Unit level Adjusted: OR=15.18 (5.39, 42.71), p<.001 Unadjusted: OR=15.11 (5.61, 40.72), p<.001 b. Social capital Adjusted: OR=8.86 (4.49, 17.50), p<.001 Unadjusted: OR=8.13 (4.26, 15.54), p<.001 4) Quality of care last shift a. Nurse man. Unit level Adjusted: OR=8.67 (3.18, 23.67), p<.001 Unadjusted: OR=8.83 (3.26, 23.93), p<.001 b. Social capital Adjusted: OR=3.79 (2.04,
				Adjusted: OR=3.79 (2.04, 7.05), p<.001 Unadjusted: OR=3.91 (2.12, 7.21), p<.001 c. Personal accomplishment Adjusted: OR=1.45 (1.07, 1.97), p<.05 Unadjusted: OR=1.48 (1.10, 2.01), p<.05 5) Quality of care hospital (1yr) a. Nurse man. Unit level Adjusted: OR=8.99 (4.08, 19.81), p<.001 Unitial (197)
				Unadjusted: OR=10.22 (4.58, 22.82), p<.001

Author	G 1/D	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	0' 'C' (T' 1'
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
				b. Hosp. msn and
				org. support
				Adjusted:
				OR=4.62 (2.25,
				9.47), p<.001
				Unadjusted:
				OR=4.30 (2.11,
				8.78), p<.01
				c. Workload
				Adjusted:
				OR=0.50 (0.33,
				0.75), p<.001
				Unadjusted:
				OR=0.51 (0.34,
				0.77), p<.05
				6) Patient/Family
				complaints
				a. Hosp. man. and
				org. support
				Adjusted:
				OR=0.45 (0.26,
				0.77), p<.01
				Unadjusted:
				OR=0.43 (0.25,
				0.73), p<.01
				b. Depersonalizati
				on
				Adjusted:
				OR= 2.24 (1.81, 2.77) = 2.001
				2.77, p<.001
				OD=2.21 (1.89
				OR=2.51 (1.88, 2.85) m < 0.01
				2.63), p < .001
				yerbal abuse
				a. LL Adjusted
				OR=1.40
				(1.19.165)
				p<.001
				Unadiusted:
				OR=1.38 (1.17.
				1.61), p<.001
				b. Depersonalizati
				on
				Adjusted:
				OR=1.43 (1.16,
				1.77), p<.01
				Unadjusted:
				OR=1.48 (1.20,
				1.81), p<.001
				8) Patient Falls

Author (Veer)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
Lee, Kang,	Random sample	Cross-	Appears atheoretical:	a. Depersonalizati on Adjusted: OR=1.40 (1.15, 1.71), p<.01 Unadjusted: OR=1.40 (1.16, 1.69), p<.001 9) Nosocomial Infections a. Nurse phy relations Adjusted: OR=0.62 (0.44, 0.68), p<.01 Unadjusted: OR=0.65 (0.47, 0.92), p<.05 b. Depersonalizati on Adjusted: OR=1.53 (1.28, 1.83), p<.001 Unadjusted: OR=1.56 (1.31, 1.86), p<.001 Unadjusted: OR=0.69 (0.49, 0.98), p<.05 Unadjusted: OR=0.69 (0.49, 0.97), p<.05 b. Depersonalizati on Adjusted: OR=0.69 (0.49, 0.97), p<.05 b. Depersonalizati on Adjusted: OR=0.69 (0.49, 0.97), p<.05 b. Depersonalizati on Adjusted: OR=1.58 (0.49, 0.98), p<.001 Unadjusted: OR=1.58 (1.33, 1.88), p<.001 KGU-NWI
Yoon, & Kim (2014)	of 3,096 nurses working on 185 general inpatient wards in 60 hospitals across South Korea	sectional, correlational design	thorough discussion of the development and use of the NWI and NWI-revised Hospital variables – - Type - Ownership	 Participation in the decision- making process Nurse staffing adequacy Education to improve quality of care

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
(1 cur)	To examine	7 mary 515	- Bed to nurse	4) Organizational
	whether the		ratio	support and
	nursing practice		- Korean	management of
	environment at		General	the hospital
	the hospital level		Inpatient Unit	5) Doctor-nurse
	affects the job		data on the	relationship
	satisfaction and			6) Nursing process
	turnover		Work Environment –	
	intentions of		KGU-NWI	Multilevel logistic
	hospital nurses			Regression significant
	-		Demographics	predictors, odds ratio,
			- Gender	coefficient, p:
			- Age	Fixed Effect-
			- Education	1) Participation
			- Position	Not significant
			- Years of	2) Nursing Process
			experience	a. Job
			- Department	satisfaction
				107.Hospital
			Job satisfaction -	OR=4.21,
			Single item measure	1.44, p=.004
				108.Nurses
			Turnover intention –	OR=2.30,
			Single item measure	0.83, p<.001
			(are you planning to	b. Intent to leave
			leave your current job	109.Nurses
			within the next year?)	OR=1.24,
				0.21, p=.03
				3) Staffing
				a. Job
				satisfaction
				110.Hospital
				OR=4.09,
				1.41, p<.001
				111.Nurse
				OR=1.57,
				0.45, p<.001
				b. Turnover
				intention
				Not significant
				4) Education
				Not significant
				5) Org. Support
				a. Job
				Saustacuon 112 Nurse
				OP=1/17
				0.30 = 0.02
				0.39, $p=.003h Turnover$
				intention
				113 Nurse
				OR=1 77
				0.57, p<.001

		1		
Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
				 6) MD-RN a. Job satisfaction 114.Hospital OR=4.15, 1.42, p=.03 115.Nurse OR=2.04, 0.71, p<.001 b. Turnover intention 116.Nurse OR=1.42, 0.35, p=.002
				Random Effect 1) Job satisfaction a. Model 1 0.18 (8741.05), p<.05 b. Model 2 0.22 (7787.45), p<.05 c. Model 3 0.03 (7305.94), p<.001 2) Intent to leave a. Model 1 0.34 (8531.58), p<.05 b. Model 2 0.29 (7615.57), p<.05 c. Model 3 0.33 (7225.66), p<.05
				Null hypotheses rejected; however, result of model 3 compared to 2 suggest nursing practice environment is not a significant predictor of the variation in job satisfaction compared to intent to leave
Kutney-Lee, Stimpfel, Sloane, Cimiotto.	136 Pennsylvania hospitals (11 emerging	Retrospective two-stage panel design examining	American Nurses Credentialing Center Forces of Magnetism	Changes in PES-NWI in Magnet and non- Magnet hospitals from 1999-2006:

Author	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)		Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	
Quinn, &	Magnet and 125	secondary	Nurse Work	1) Participation
Aiken (2015)	non-Magnet)	data (random	Environment –	a. Magnet
	т	sampling)	PES-NWI	+0.52
	10 compare		Names and d	b. Non-magnet
	changes over		Nurse-reported	± 0.09
	nationt outcomes		Quality of Care –	c. Absolute
	patient outcomes,		- Overall (single	0.43×001
	quality and		Confidence in	(1.43, p < .001)
	nurse outcomes		- connuclice in natient's ability to	a Magnet
	in a sample of		manage care post-	+0.19
	hospitals that		discharge (single	b. Non-magnet
	attained Magnet		item)	-0.01
	status between		- Confidence that	c. Absolute
	1999 and 2007		management	difference
	with hospitals		would act to	0.20, p<.001
	that remained		resolve reported	3) Manager
	non-Magnet		patient care	a. Magnet
			problems (single	+0.24
			item)	b. Non-Magnet -0.01
			Job dissatisfaction –	c. Absolute
			Single item measure	difference
				0.25, p=.01
			Burnout –	4) Adequacy
			MBI EE subscale	a. Magnet +0.34
			Intentions to leave -	b. Non-magnet
			Single item measure	+0.18
			(employer in the next	c. Absolute
			year)	difference
			TT 1. 1	0.16, p=.06
			Hospital	5) Nurse Phy Rel
			characteristics –	a. Magnet
			- Teaching status	+0.21 h Non Magnat
			- Technology status	± 0.06
				c Absolute
			RN Characteristics –	difference
			- Education	0.15 p=.01
			- Staffing	,p
			.0	Adjusted Mean
			Patient Characteristics	Outcome Rate
			- Surgery type	A. 1999
			- 20-85 years old	1) Magnet
			-	Intent to leave
			Patient Outcomes	24.75
			- 30-day surgical	2) Non-Magnet
			mortality	Intent to leave
			- Failure to rescue	21.65, p=.05
				B. 2006
	1			I) Magnet

Author	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)	zampre, r urpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Intent to leave
				8.86
				2) Non-Magnet
				13.40, p<.01
				13.40, p<.01 Regression Coefficient for Change in Intent to leave associated with Magnet designation (Magnet vs. non- Magnet) Intent to leave a. Adjusted -6.79(1.41), p<.001 b. Unadjusted -6.06(1.50), p<.001 Adjusted model includes nurse age, sex, full-time status, and unit type. Weighted (likely to account for a violation of baterpacadeticity)
Flinkman &	15 registered	Qualitative	In-depth individual	Poor practice
Salantera	nurses under the	description	interviews; semi-	environment:
(2015)	age of thirty		structured with open-	- Ethical problems
	Finland;		ended questions	- Poor quality of
	purposive		Conventional content	care related to busy
	sampling of		analysis (Hsieh &	wards and staffing
	an organization		Snannon, 2003)	- Moral stress and
	within the past		Codes inductively	not wanting to be
	year		derived from the data (Flo & Kyngas, 2007)	part of an
	To describe why		(1510 & Kyligas, 2007).	providing poor
	young registered		Eight steps of	quality of care
	nurses had		analysis:	- Physically and mentally
	organization and		2) Reading	demanding work
	why they intend		3) Analytic	- Work pressures;
	to leave the		summaries	described as
	P1010351011		(ATLAS.ti	work,
			software)	uncontrollable,
			5) Coding review	strenuous, and unreasonable

Author	Sampla/Durnasa	Study Type/	The	eory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	(En	npirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
			6)	Clustering	 Reports of verbal
				categories	abuse from
			7)	Clustering themes	physicians and
			8)	Selection of	patients
				quotes	- Physical abuse
			_		reported from
			Tru	stworthiness:	patients
			-	Credibility	- One nurse stated
				(thematic	that she resigned
				interviews	because she was
				performed by a	exhausted; moved
				researcher	to casual worker
				familiar with the	schedule for
				context of the	quality of life
				nurses practice	- I wo nurses nad
				Den en de hility	due to humout and
			-	(detailing data	fatione
				(uctaining uata	Work caused
				providing direct	- work caused
				citations.	family life causing
				translation to	problems at home
				English	 Nursing described
				performed with	as repetitive and a
				translator to	dead-end job
				ensure	- Work did not
				accuracy/context)	promote use of
			-	Conformity	their skills or
				(consistency of	knowledge,
				the analyses	provide career
				through author	advancement, or
				meetings:	professional
				discussion and	development
				consensus)	- Powerless to
			-	Transferability	change their
				(description of the	unsatisfactory
				context,	work environments
				demographics of	- Nursing shortage
				participants, data	provided an
				and process of	opportunity to
				analysis, all	choose your
				openly provided)	workplace
					Leele ef Course at
					Lack of Support,
					mentoring
					- Inadequate
					orientation
					feelings of
					uncertainty a
					sense of
					abandonment.
					fear they would

Author	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)	Sample/Turpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
				 make a fatal mistake Expected to take on a great deal of responsibility leading to insecurity and anxiety, fear of making errors Not supported: "thrown into the deep end" "If you fail, no one will stand by you." Yearn for support from colleagues and managers Inadequate practical skills and knowledge upon graduation to perform in the workplace Behavior and attitudes of managers closest to the RNs greatly impacted their job satisfaction and intention to leave Nurse directors and managers distant Bureaucratic environment, rushed; leadership did not understand practical nursing work
				Nursing as a 'second best' or serendipitous career choice - Compromise career: second best, serendipity, drifted, unintentional describe becoming a nurse

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
(1041)		7 may 515		 Choice when not accepted to university Financial reasons or because it was "easy to get in" Some preferred nursing due to a strong desire to care and nurture Two worked previously as nurse aids or licensed practical nurses Having other nurses in their families also impacted their decision
Topcu, Turkman, Badir, Goktepe, Miral, Albayrak, Kebapci, Serbest, & Ozcan (2016)	2,592 nurses in 20 Ministry of Health and 29 private hospitals in Istanbul, Turkey To understand nursing practice environment characteristics in Istanbul-area hospitals in Turkey and the relationship between these characteristics and nursing outcomes in Turkey	Cross- sectional, correlational design	Appears atheoretical: mention of healthy work environments as those of Magnet designated facilities by the American Nurses' Credentialing Center Practice Environment – PES-NWI Turkish version Burnout – MBI -Turkish Demographic questionnaire collected sociodemographic characteristics, workplace characteristics Intention to leave – Single item measure (job within one year)	NPE mean and standard deviation; classification:1. Participation 2.50 (0.47)2. Foundation 2.49 (0.58)3. Manager 2.77(0.50)4. Adequacy 2.06 (0.64)5. Nurse Phy Rel 2.67 (0.60)Favorable 36% (22 private and 3 government hospitals)Mixed 42.8% (7 private and 10 government hospitals)Unfavorable 21.2% (7 government hospitals)Stepwise backward logistic regression: EE a. PES-NWI Adjusted

Author	G 1/D	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	0' 'C' (T' ''
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
			/	3.81(3.21,
				4.51), p<.001
				Unadjusted
				3.74 (3.16,
				4.43), p<.001
				Depersonalization
				a. PES-NWI
				Adjusted
				2.3 (1.93,
				2.74), p<.001
				Unadjusted
				2.26 (1.90,
				2.70), p<.001
				b. Work years
				Adjusted
				1.41 (1.19,
				1.67), p<.001
				Unadjusted
				1.36 (1.15,
				1.60), p<.001
				Personal
				Accomplishment
				a. PES-NWI
				Adjusted
				2.14 (1.82,
				2.52), p<.001
				Unadjusted
				2.15 (1.83,
				2.52), p<.001
				b. Gender
				Adjusted
				1.49 (1.18,
				1.88), p<.01
				\cup nadjusted
				1.30(1.08, 1.71) = 01
				1./1), p<.01
				c. Experience
				≥10y1 ∆ diusted
				1 32 (1 12
				1.52 (1.12, 1.55) n < 01
				Unadjusted
				1 36 (1 17
				1.60 n<001
				Intention to Leave
				a. High EE
				Adjusted
				1.91 (1.59.
				2.29). p<.001
				Unadjusted
				2.00(1.69-
				2.36), p<.001

Author		Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
				b. High
				depersonaliz
				ation
				Adjusted
				1.43 (1.20,
				1.71), p<.001
				Unadjusted
				1.57 (1.34,
				1.86), p<.001
				c. Permanent
				position
				Adjusted
				0.52 (0.43,
				0.63), p<.001
				Unadjusted
				0.51(0.43,
				0.61), p<.001
				d. PES-NWI
				Adjusted
				1.26 (1.04,
				1.51), p<.05
				Unadjusted
				1.44 (1.22,
				1.70), p<.05
				e. Special work
				unit
				Adjusted
				1.19 (1.00,
				1.41), p<.05
				Unadjusted
				1.18 (1.00,
				1.40), p<.05
Goh & Lopez	Stratified random	Cross-	Conceptual model	Acculturation score
(2016b)	sampling of 814	sectional.	built on findings from	$\alpha = 0.84, 32.94(6.88)$:
× ,	international	correlational	international	Malaysian
	nurses registered	design	qualitative	$\alpha = 0.88,$
	with the	C	acculturation research	35.81(7.72)
	Singapore		in nursing	Filipino $\alpha = 0.78$,
	Nursing Board		-	34.26(5.42)
			Demographics	Chinese $\alpha = 0.81$,
	To examine the			27.47(5.23)
	acculturation		ASASFN (12 item	India Nationals
	level of		acculturation measure)	α=0.84,
	international			32.05(7.04)
	nurse working in		Practice environment	Myanmar
	a multi-cultural		– PES-NWI-Revised	Nationals α =0.80,
	society		(to include technology	32.43(6.42)
			subscale)	Other $\alpha = 0.92$,
			World Health	<i>33.09(9.44)</i>
			Organization (WHO)	
	1	1	Organization (WHO)	

Author	Sample/Durpase	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)	Sample/Fulpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	 (Empirical Indicators) Quality of Life BREF (26 item questionnaire assessing 4 domains) Physical Psychological Social relationship Environment 	Significant Findings Correlations between work environment and acculturation: Negative correlation between acculturation and participation in hospital affairs r =111, $n = 793$, p < .01 Negative correlation between acculturation and nursing information technology r =097, $n = 814$, p < .01 Remaining subscales of PES-NWLR
				demonstrate a negative correlation with acculturation, however, results were not significant
				Lower level of acculturation associated with lower reported perception of the nurse work environment among international nurses
Roche, Duffield, friedman, Twigg, Dimitelis, & Rowbotham (2016)	Six acute care hospitals across three Australian states To examine changes in the nursing practice environment, retention-related factors, unit stability, and patient care tasks delayed or left undone over two	Descriptive secondary data analysis	Patient Care Delivery Model (PCDM) "Inputs" Unit characteristics Nurse characteristics "Throughputs" Staffing Skill mix Workload Practice Environment "Outputs" Nurse outcomes	PES-NWI mean and standard deviation (a.) wave 1 and (b.) wave 2: 1) Participation a. 2.7(0.52) b. 2.6(0.58) 2) Foundation a. 3.1(0.44) b. 3.0(0.50) 3) Manager a. 3.0(0.61) b. 2.9(0.65) 4) Adequacy a. 2.4(0.70) b. 2.4(0.68)

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
Author (Year) Numminen, Ruoppa, Leino-Kilpo, Isoaho, Hupli, & Meretoja (Numminen et al., 2016)	Sample/Purpose 318 newly graduated Finnish registered nurses To explore newly graduated nurses' perception of their practice environment and its' association with their self- assessed competence, turnover intentions, and job satisfaction	Study Type/ Analysis Cross- sectional, descriptive correlation design	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators) Theory not specified; discussion of nurse practice environment and related concepts Practice Environment – PES-NWI Nurse Competence – 73 item Nurse Competence Scale by Meretoja et al., 2004 Professional competence Job Satisfaction – Four single item measures: - Satisfaction with orientation - Satisfaction with current job - Satisfaction with quality of care - Satisfaction with nursing profession Intent to leave – Two single item measures - Current job (single item measure) - Nursing profession (single item)	Significant Findings Turnover intentions: 117. Changing current job a. Very/fairly often 33.3% b. Never/fairly seldom 65.1 118. Changing profession a. Very/fairly often 14.2% b. Never/fairly seldom 84.3% Job satisfaction Orientation 65.4% Current job 83% Quality of care 80.5% Nursing profession 86.5% PES-NWI Cronbach alphas: 1) Participation $\alpha=0.846$ 2) Foundation $\alpha=0.769$ 3) Manager $\alpha=0.853$ 4) Adequacy $\alpha=0.846$ 5) Nurse Phy Rel $\alpha=0.848$ Association between NPE and level of competence: 1) Participation a. High 2.7 b. Low 2.5 c. Manova, 0.012, F=6.73, p<.05
			quality of care - Satisfaction with nursing profession	 Participation α=0.846 Foundation α=0.769
			Intent to leave – Two single item measures - Current job	 Manager α=0.853 Adequacy α=0.846 Nurse Phy Rel α=0.848
			(single item measure) - Nursing profession (single item)	Association between NPE and level of competence: 1) Participation a. High 2.7 b. Low 2.5 c. Manova, 0.012, F=6.73, p<.05 2) Composite a. High 2.8 b. Low 2.6 c. Manova, 0.0005, F=7.95, p<.05
				Main effects of analysis of variance model, adjusted:

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
				New graduate nurses who assessed their competence as high, never or seldom intended to leave their job or the profession, were satisfied with the quality of care in their unit and who were satisfied with their orientation had a more positive perception of their practice environment.
Goh & Lopez (2016b)	Stratified random sample of 495 migrant nurses working in a tertiary public hospital in Singapore To explore the job satisfaction level of migrant nurses working in a multicultural society and, more specifically, the relationship between their job satisfaction levels, work environment, their intentions to leave and the predictors of their intentions to leave	Cross- sectional, correlational design	Integration of the Push-pull theory of migration and Herzberg's (1987) two-factor theory Job Satisfaction – Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (JSQ) Work Environment – PES-NWI-Revised Demographic sheet: 119.Age - Gender - Citizenship - Religion - Marital status - Highest nursing qualification - Work experience in other countries - Nursing experience - Nursing practice environment - Nursing ranks - Intentions to leave (ANY intention, so timeframe) - Living arrangements	Mean difference for migrant nurses between intention to leave and the dimensions of the JSQ:Pay and benefits Mean diff = - 0.255 (-0.381, - 0.129), p<.05 Support Mean diff = - 0.154 (-0.274, - 0.033), p<.05 Autonomy and professional Mean diff = - 0.190 (-0.325, - 0.054), p<.05 Scheduling Mean diff = - $0.250(-0.397, -$ $0.102), p<.05Relationship andinteractionMean diff = -0.212 (-0.329, -0.094), p<.05)$

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
		Allalysis		 work experience out of Singapore, years of experience, PES foundation, and JSQ_Dimen3) 1) Nursing practice environment (unit type) OR=0.876 (0.791, 0.970), p=.011 2) PES Manager OR=1.152 (1.008, 1.316), p=.037
Friese, Siefert, Thomas- Frost, Walker, & Ponte (2016)	319 registered nurses and nurse practitioners working in ambulatory oncology settings across the Dana Farber Cancer Institute To examine nurse-reported outcomes throughout the institution; to examine how the practice environment of registered	Cross- sectional, descriptive design	Theory not specified; discussion of research concerning nursing practice environments, the America Nurses Credentialing Center Magnet recognition program, and the National Database of Nursing Quality Indicators. Quality of care – Single item measure Intention to leave – Single item measure Job satisfaction – Single item measure Safety Organizing - Safety Organizing Scale subscale "behaviors theorized to support a safety culture and actions to improve patient safety", 9 items) Practice environment – PES-NWI revised for ambulatory oncology settings	Intent to stay in current position 120.No plan to leave 77.4% 121.Within 6 months 2.2% 122.Within 1 year 6% 123.Not reported 14.4% Unfortunately, regression analysis utilized intention to stay operationalized as nurses reporting no plan to leave their current position. Intent to stay was significantly predicted by: 1) Manager OR=0.52 (0.28, 1.00), p=.05 2) Participation OR=6.38 (2.04, 19.93), p<.001 3) Nurse Phy Rel OR=1.83 (1.25, 2.67), p<.001

Author	C 1/D	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	0' '0' 4 E' 1'
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
Arabas	700 murges in 16	Cross	 Years of experience Education preparation Certifications Gender Direct care or not Role (RN or NP) Workload (number of patients to whom nurses provided care on their last shift) 	DES mores and
Arslan Yurumezoglu	/99 nurses in 16 hospitals across	cross- sectional.	thorough discussion of	standard deviations:
& Kocaman	the seven regions	descriptive	the literature	1) Participation
(2016)	of Turkey	design	surrounding nurses'	2.49(0.64)
	To examine the		recent literature	2) Foundation 2.70 (0.59)
	predictors of		~	3) Manager
	nurses'		General job	2.50(0.70)
	leave the		Single item measure	($1.98(0.75)$
	organization and		(overall how satisfied	5) Nurse Phy Rel
	intention to leave		are you with your	2.70 (0.71)
	the profession in		job?)	
	Тигкеу		Intention to leave –	a Yes 64.4%
			Two single item	b. No 35.6%
			measures	ITL Profession
			(organization and the	a. Yes 51.1%
			profession)	b. No 48.9%
			Burnout –	Logistic regression
			MBI Turkish	model controlling for
			Weyle Fusie and	years worked at
			PES-NWI Turkish	dissatisfied emotional
				exhaustion, and
				depersonalization:
				1) Intent to leave
				organization
				$\beta = -0.446$
				(0.172),
				p=.010
				b. Nurse Phy Rel
				p=-0.483 (0 198)
				p=.015

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
Nantsupawat, Kunaviktikul, Nantsupawat, Wichaikhum, Thienthong, & Poghosyan (2017)	Stratified and purposive sample of 1,351 nurses working in 43 inpatient units in five university hospitals across Thailand To investigate how work environment affects job dissatisfaction, burnout, and intention to leave among nurses in Thailand	Cross- sectional, correlational study	Quality Health Outcomes Model Nurse Practice Environment – PES-NWI RN job dissatisfaction RN turnover RN burnout – MBI EE subscale	Work environments classified as: Best: 16 units (37.21%) Mixed: 20 units (46.51%) Poor: 7 units (16.28%) Nursing foundations for Quality of Care subscale had the highest mean score (3.23, SD=0.13) and Staffing and Resource Adequacy had the lowest mean (2.56, SD=0.31) Adjusted models: A. odds of nurses reporting job dissatisfaction, intention to leave, and emotional exhaustion were lower for nurses working in best work environments B. 39-55% lower rate of emotional exhaustion in best work environment
Santos Alves, De Silva, & De Brito Guirardello (2017)	267 professional nurses working in two pediatric hospitals in Brazil To assess correlations between the characteristics of the nursing practice environment, job	Cross- sectional, Partial Least Square Structural Equation Modeling	Figure presents the theoretical model utilized for this study; unnamed. Nurse practice environment – NWI-R Brazilian Burnout – MBI EE subscale Safety Climate –	 Structural model: path coefficients 1) Nurse practice environment (autonomy) a. Path coefficient 0.91 b. Student's t 85.143 2) Nurse practice environment (control over practice)

Author	Sample/Durpase	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
	outcomes, and		Safety Attitudes	a. Path coefficient
	safety climate		Questionnaire- short	0.89
			form	b. Student's t
			Job satisfaction	40.400 2) Nurse presties
			Five single item	5) INUISE practice
			measures	(nurse physician
			mousures	relations)
			Intention to leave –	a. Path coefficient
			Single item measure	0.79
			(Do you intend to	b. Student's t
			leave your current job	27.548
			in the next 12	4) Nurse practice
			months?)	environment (EE)
			Damaanuliaa	a. Path coefficient
			Demographics:	0.55 b Student's t
			- Gender	11.624
			- Education	5) Nurse practice
			- Length of	environment
			professional	(safety climate)
			experience	a. Path coefficient
			 Time working on 	0.43
			current unit/at	b. Student's t
			current institution	7.940
			- weekly working	6) Nurse practice
			nours	satisfaction)
				a. Path coefficient
				0.38
				b. Student's t
				6.222
				7) Nurses practice
				environment
				(intention to
				a Path coefficient
				b. Student's t
				3.397
				All analyses resulted
				in a significant
				relationship (p<.001)
Gasparino &	209 nurses	Cross-	Validity tested via	Brazilian PFS
De Brito	working in Brazil	sectional.	Confirmatory Factor	Cronbach's alphas:
Guirardello	with at least 3-	Psychometric	Analysis using	1) Participation
(2017)	month	study	Structural Equation	α=0.87
	experience		Modeling examining	2) Foundation
	providing direct		correlations between	α=0.83
	patient care		the Brazilian PES-	3) Manager α =0.87

Author	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)	1 1	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	
	T. 1.11		IN WI and the	4) Adequacy $\alpha = 0.83$
	To validate the		following:	5) Nurse Phy Rel
	Brazilian version		D. ($\alpha=0.76$
	of the Practice		Burnout –	~ .
	Environment		MBI	Spearman's
	Scale			correlation with the
			Job satisfaction	Brazilian PES-NWI:
				1) Intent to leave
			Safety climate –	Participation
			Safety attitudes	33, p<.001
			questionnaire subscale	Foundation
				32, p<.001
			Intent to leave –	Manager
			Single item measure	30, p<.001
			(current job within the	Adequacy
			next year)	21, p<.007
				Nurse Phy Rel
				18, p<.007
				2) Job satisfaction
				Participation
				0.49, p<.001
				Foundation
				0.43, p<.001
				Manager
				-0.51, p<.001
				Adequacy
				0.47, p<.001
				Nurse Phy Rel
				0.44, p<.001
				3) Burnout
				a. Emotional
				Exhaustion
				Participation
				-0.40, p<.001
				Foundation
				-0.37, p<.001
				Manager
				-0.41, p<.001
				Adequacy
				-0.48, p<.001
				Nurse Phy Rel
				-0.36, p<.001
				b. Depersonalizat
				10n
				Participation
				-0.29, p<.001
				Foundation
				-0.26, p<.001
				Manager
				-0.32, p<.001
				Adequacy
				-0.30, p<.001
				Nurse Phy Rel

Author	Sample/Durpase	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)	Sample/Fulpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
				-0.32, p<.001
				c. Personal
				accomplishment
				(reduced)
				Participation
				0.40, p<.001
				Foundation
				0.38, p<.001
				$0.38 \text{ m} \leq 0.01$
				0.58, p<.001
				Adequacy $0.32 \text{ p} \le 0.01$
				Nurse Phy Rel
				0.39 p < 0.01
				4) Safety climate
				Participation
				0.59, p < .001
				Foundation
				0.60, p<.001
				Manager
				0.40, p<.001
				Adequacy
				0.44, p<.001
				Nurse Phy Rel
				0.44, p<.001
				5) Perception of
				quality
				Participation
				0.29, p<.001
				Foundation $0.51 \text{ m} \le 0.01$
				0.51, p<.001
				$0.40 \text{ p} \le 0.01$
				A dequacy
				0.51 p < 0.01
				Nurse Phy Rel
				0.35, p<.001
Hiler,	Convenience	Cross-	"Guided by a	Intent to leave:
Hickman,	sample of 328	sectional,	transactional model of	Yes 73%
Peimer, &	critical care	descriptive	stress and coping" pp.	No 27%
Wilson	nurses across the	correlational	60	
(2018)	United States	design		Unfortunately, intent
	with at least one		Moral Distress –	to leave was not
	year of		Moral Distress Scale –	included in the
	experience in		Kev1sed	stepwise regression
	adult intensive			analyses:
	care.		Practice Environment	Step 2 can explain 20% of the survivor
	To explore the		- res-inwi	50% of the variance in
	relationshing		Demographics	- Participation
	among the		- Age	-0.038 not
	severity of moral		- Sex	significant

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
	distress, the practice environment, and patient safety		 Race Years in practice Years in critical care Years on current unit Type of unit Education Geographic location AACN Beacon unit or not Magnet status Level of job satisfaction – Single item measure Intent to leave current position – Single item measure (have you contemplated leaving your job in the past 6 months?) 	 Foundation -0.121, not significant Manager -0.001, not significant Adequacy -0.185, p=.003 Nurse Phy Rel -0.181, p=.001 Beacon -0.031, not significant Age -0.139, p=.001 Job satisfaction -0.215, p<.001
Yan, Yang, Zhang, Li, Huang, Wang, Dai, & Yao (2018)	Cluster sampling of 1,973 nurses in 12 hospitals in the south middle, east, and north regions of the Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous region; 79.52% reporting work- related musculoskeletal disorders (WMSDs) To analyze the correlated influential factors between work related musculoskeletal disorders and nursing practice environment and quality of life	Cross- sectional, correlational design	Theory not specified Practice Environment – PES-NWI Chinese version Nordic Musculoskeletal Questionnaire MOS 36-item Short Form Health Survey Social Support Rating Scale (self-designed) Demographics - Age - Gender - Working duration - Education - Working institution and department - Shift - BMI	 Statistically significant risk factors for WMSDs: Age greater than 26 years working in the Department of Surgery, Critical Care, Outpatient department, Anesthesia Working duration greater than 40 hours per week Statistically significant protective factors for WMSDs: Physiological function Body pain Total health condition PES adequate staff and

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
	and social support			resources subscale 5. Social support
Nelson- Brantley, Park, & Bergquist- Beringer, (2018a)	1002 adult care units in 162 NDNQI participating hospitals To examine characteristics of the nursing practice environment associated with lower RN turnover	Secondary analysis of data; cross- sectional correlational design	Theory not specified Nursing Practice Environment, Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index RN turnover – Nurses leaving their job for any reason Hospital characteristics - Magnet status - Hospital size - Ownership - Teaching status - Unit characteristics - Case mix index - Unit type	10% of the variance in RN turnover explained by hospital and unit characteristics (Hospital ownership, case mis index, unit mean RN age, tenure, and education) Annual RN turnover decreased 14.8% for every unit increase on PES-NWI composite Government-owned hospitals had a significantly lower rate of RN turnover (β = -0.09 [-0.15, -0.02], p< .01) RN turnover increased 13.9% with every unit increase in case mix index 4 of the 5 PES-NWI subscales accounted for 4% of the variance in RN turnover controlling for hospital and unit characteristics: Every unit increase in Staffing and Resource adequacy decreased turnover 14.8%; every unit increase in Nurse Manager subscale RN turnover increase 8.3%
Smith, Morin, & Lake, (2018)	233 nurses working in a southwestern United States health system To determine whether nurse	cross- sectional, correlational design	Donabedian's structure-process- outcome model Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index (structure)	Positive nurse work environment perceptions were inversely correlated with incivility; Both subscales were inversely related with incivility; nurse
	coworker		(suuciure)	manager ability,

Author	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)	inoivility is	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	landarship and
	incivinty is		Scale (process)	support for purses
	the nurse work		Seale (process)	remained significant in
	environment		Demographics:	a joint model
	defined as		- Age	a joint model
	organizational		- Gender	
	characteristics		- Unit specialty	
	that promote		- Education level	
	nurse autonomy		- Employment	
			status	
			- Years of	
			experience	
Cho & Han,	432 nurses	Cross-	Person Environment	Respondents working
(2018)	working on 57	sectional,	Occupation	in units with higher
· · ·	units in five	correlational	Performance Model	NM reported greater
	hospitals in	design		health responsibility
	South Korea		Demographics	and physical activity
			- Age	Nurses reporting
	To determine the		- Gender	higher SRA report
	relationships		 Marital status 	better stress
	among the unit-		- Education	management
	level nursing		- Experience	
	work		- Work schedule	Nurses reporting
	environment and		- Work unit	higher CNPR reported
	individual-level		- Position	higher likelihood to
	health-promoting			practice healthy eating
	behaviors of		Nursing performance	
	hospital nurses in		quality –	Higher SRA more
	South Korea and		Six Dimension Scale	high on purging
	nursing		Derformance Korean	nigher nursing
	nerformance		r enformance Korean	performance
	quality		Nursing Work	Greater inner
	quanty		Fnvironment –	resources for pursuing
			PES-NWI Korean	goals and active sense
				of accountability for
			Health Promoting	personal health
			Behaviors –	associated with better
			Health Promoting	nursing task
			Lifestyle Profile II	performance
			Korean	<u> </u>
				Controlling for
				demographics,
				relationships between
				health promoting
				behaviors and
				perceived nursing
				performance were
				strengthened; the
				relationships between
				SRA were weakened

Author	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)		Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	
Park,	51,030 KINS	Descriptive,	Discussion of Magnet	Lare activities missed
Hanchett, & M_{2} (2018)	working on	correlational	and Nursing Practice	differed by poor,
Ma (2018)	1,585 units in	study	Environment	moderate, and good
	3/1 hospitals in	analyzing	literature; theory not	practice environments
	the US	secondary	specified	significantly (p< .001)
	To avamina	data	Practice Environment	Average:
	which		DEC NWI	oo.970 of fluises
	characteristics of		- 1 ES-IN W1	care activity in poor
	the practice		Missed Nursing Care	environments: 76% in
	environment		– 16 essential care	good environments
	were associated		activities for acute	and 85.2% in
	with missed care		care	moderate
	in US acute care			environments (χ^2
	hospital units		Hospital and unit	(2,1,583) = 190.04, p
	-		characteristics	<.001)
			- Size	,
			 Teaching status 	81.5% [1.156, 0.220]
			- Location	lower missed care for
			 Magnet status 	every unit increase in
			- Case mix index	SRA
			- Unit type	
				21.9% [0.622, 0.981]
				lower missed care for
				every unit increase in
				CINFK
				2.1 times [1.465,
				2.957] higher missed
				care for every unit
				increase in NPHA
				63 3% [0 335 0 425]
				lower missed care in
				good environments
				compared to poor
				· ·
				Moderate
				environments 36.7%
				[0.568, 0.705] less
				missed care compared
Knunn	175 MICU numara	Cross	The Systems	Experience and NICU
Patterson	working in 5	sectional	Findingering Initiative	experience
Ford	NICUS in the	correlational	for Patient Safety	demonstrated
Zurmehlv. &	Midwestern US	design	Model	correlations with nurse
Patrick.				age and were removed
(2018)	To examine the		Nurse characteristics	from further analysis
/	relationships		- Age	j
	among nurse		- Experience	Contributors to nurse
	fatigue,		- Experience in	fatigue:
	individual nurse		NICU	

Author	C 1 - /D	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Ciantificant Findinas
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
	factors, and the		- Education	Number of hours
	practice		- Shift length	worked each shift the
	environment in		- Hours of sleep	last two weeks (t =
	the inpatient		- Caffeine	2.30, p < .05)
	setting		consumption	Number of hours of
			- Additional	sleep in each 24-hour
			employment	period before shift (t = 2.10
			- Current or recent	-2.10, p < .05)
			Dhysical	current physical or montal contributor (t –
			- Thysical	3.61 n < 0.01
			fatione	Recent distressing
			- Mental	nation event $(t = 2.13)$
			contributions to	p < .05
			fatigue	P 100)
			- Recent distressing	NM associated with
			patient events	fatigue (t = -2.02, p <
			-	.05)
			Nurse Fatigue –	
			Checklist Individual	SRA and CNPR were
			Strength	not significantly
			Questionnaire	associated with fatigue
			Due stie e Eussie en euse	I
			Practice Environment	individual factors
			- Flactice	of the variance in
			the Nursing Work	nurse fatique (F
			Index	(11.62) = 3.71, p <
				.001)
				Addition or primary
				independent variables
				increased explanation
				in nurse fatigue by
				8.2% (F (3,159) =
				6.06, p < .01, for a
				total of 28.5 % of the
Lumillo-	239 nurses	Cross-	Theory not specified	Attitude toward ND
Gutierrez.	working in the	sectional.	Theory not specified	clustered by negative
Romero-	Catalan primarv	descriptive	Demographics	neutral, and positive
Sanchez,	health care	design	- Age	, . r
D'Agostino,	system in		- Gender	Respondents
Paramio-	Catalonia region		- Experience	belonging to each
Cuevas,	of Spain		- Field	cluster differed by
Fabrellas,			- Postgraduate	aggregate ($\Lambda = 0.104$;
Moreno-	To identify		training	F = 551.008; p <. 001)
Corral, &	clusters of nurses			and on each PND item
Paloma-	in relation to the		Frequency of nursing	(p<.05)
Castro,	utilization and		diagnoses use –	Clusters of ND
(2019)	autilides towards		Single tiem measure	vere low modium
1	nursnig			were low, meanum,

Author (Vear)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
	diagnoses and to compare their profiles considering demographics, professional characteristics, and nurse practice environments		Position on nursing diagnoses – Single item measure Practice Environment – PES-NWI Spanish	and high. Higher utilization attained higher PND scores and higher attitudes toward ND with significant differences between clusters (p < .001) Nurses with greater experience (χ^2 (2)= 6.69, p = .035) or in management (χ^2 (2) = 6.92, p = .031) demonstrated greater utilization Higher PES scores associated with higher utilization (χ^2 (2) = 6.76, p = .034) and positive attitudes (χ^2 (2) = 13.41, p < .001) Similar findings for NPHA and NFQC, and for NM only with attitudes No differences between clusters for SRA or CNPR
Change, Lee, Change, & Wang, (2019)	696 nurses working in three teaching hospitals in Taiwan To determine the influence of work excitement, workplace violence, and the violence prevention climate on professional commitment and turnover intention	Cross- sectional, correlational design	Discussion of Professional commitment; Theory not specified Demographics Workplace Violence Experience – Workplace Violence Experience Checklist Professional Commitment – The Professional Commitment Scale Work Excitement – Work Excitement –	Professional commitment had negative effect on turnover intention: Work ethic (β =336, p < .001) Willingness to stay (β =448, p < .001) Professional value (β = 134, p < .001) Job challenge and variety have a mediating effect on the relationship between professional commitment and turnover intention; both variables significantly reduce turnover intention

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
			Violence Prevention Climate – Violence Prevention Climate Scale Turnover intention – Employee's Turnover Intentions and Job Destination Choices Scale	As nurses witness others suffering from workplace violence, the effect of professional commitment on turnover intention diminishes; others' experiences moderate the relationship between professional commitment and turnover intention Personal experience of workplace violence moderates the relationship between professional commitment and turnover intention
Khan, Jackson, Stayt, & Walthall, (2019)	341 psychiatric nurses working on 43 clinical units in 2 psychiatric hospitals in Beijing, China To explore factors that may influence nurses' intentions to leave adult critical care areas	Cross- sectional, descriptive design	Discussion of nurse work environment literature; theory not specified Demographic characteristics Work Environment – Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index Chinese Work Engagement – Utrecht Work Engagement Scale, 9 item Chinese Nurse Quality of Care – single item measure Turnover Intention – Turnover Intention Scale Chinese	Structural Equation Modeling: Practice environment demonstrated direct effects on: Quality of care ($\beta =$ 0.498, p < .05) Turnover ($\beta =$ -0.394, p < .05) Work engagement partially mediated the effects of the practice environment on: Quality of care ($\beta =$ 0.096, p < .0.05 Turnover ($\beta =$ -0.296, p < 0.05) This model explained 36% of the variance in quality of care and 56% of the variance in turnover intention
Park, Park, & Hwang (2019)	951 staff nurses working in small and medium sized hospitals in South Korea	Cross- sectional, correlational design	Foundational theory not specified; ERG theory informed benefits and intention to leave hospital	The strongest predictor of intention to leave hospital was lower pay satisfaction $(\beta = .0.37, p < .001)$
Author	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
---------------------	--	----------------------	---	---
(Year)	- miprovi arpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	
	To explore the factors associated with the intention to leave among nurses in small- and medium- sized hospitals and to determine the predictors bout work environment and rewards		 Work Environment variables Form of employment Department Department Mean working hours per week for the last month Mean number of night shifts per month for the last month Mean consecutive days of night shift for the last month Mean consecutive days of night shift for the last month Number of patients per nurse in the last department Reward variables Pay satisfaction scale adapted Benefits satisfaction (Korean language benefits scale) 	Pay satisfaction had a statistically significant interaction with hospital size ($\beta = 0.16$, p = .04) Nurses perceive a greater imbalance between pay and effort in smaller hospitals (< 250 beds) compared to medium hospitals (\geq 250 beds)
			leave the hospital –	
-	10.070	~	Six item scale	D 1 0110
Lasater, Sloane.	12, 870 registered nurses	Cross- sectional.	Not specified, however, data used	Poor end of life care was associated with
McHugh, and	working in 491	correlational	from the RN4CAST	poor practice
Aiken,	US hospitals in	design	study which utilized	environments; nurses
(2019)	California,		the NOOM	in hospitals with poor
	Florida, New		AHRO PSCS overall	reported poorer end of
	Pennsylvania		patient safety grade	life care
	5			No significant
	To describe the		Likert scale of specific	differences in quality
	quality of end of		quality measures	between hospitals by
	hospitals from		Practice Environment	technology status or
	the perspective		Scale of the Nursing	size
	of hospital nurses		Work Index	For profit hospitals
	and to evaluate			had significantly
	the relationship		Demographics	higher percentage of
	between the		- Age	nurses reporting
	environment and		- Years of	and lower quality
	end of life care		experience	compared with not for

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
			 Education Specialty certification Working in an ICU Frequency providing end of life care Hospital characteristics: Size Teaching status Technology status Profit status 	profit and government nonfederal hospitals, but this association did not remain significant in multivariate models
Hallowell, Rogowski, & Lake, (2019)	6060 Registered nurses working in 104 NICUS and providing care for 15,233 infants To examine the relationship between the NICU work environment and parental presence in the NICU using a national data set	Cross- sectional, correlational design	 Profit status Theory not specified Practice Environment PES-NWI Parental presence: Two single item measures (parent presence on last shift, parent time present as less or more than half the shift_ 	Correlations present between nurse participation in hospital affairs and nurse manager ability, leadership, and support for nurses and higher parental presence; composite also correlated with higher parental presence Parental presence also significantly correlated with level A (low- level) NICUs Only the composite and higher parental presence remained statistically significant in a multiple linear model even when accounting for NICU level
Li, Li, & Wan (2019)	410 nurses from 32 community health centers in Beijing, China To test the relationship between work practice environment and turnover	Cross- sectional, correlational study	Job -Demand Resources Model and the Conservation of Resources Theory Work practice environment – Chinese version of the Practice Environment Scale	The structural equation model demonstrated goodness of fit and explained 29% of the variance in turnover intention and 18% in work engagement A significant negative relationship was

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
(Tour)	intention, considering the mediation of work engagement and	Thirtysis	Work Pressure – Job stressor scale of Turnover intention – Four item scale	identified between turnover intention and work engagement (β = 20 [341,065], p = .021
	the moderation of work pressure among community health nurses		Work engagement – Chinese version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale Demographics - Age - Gender - Marital status - Education - Work seniority	Work practice environment directly $(\beta =43 [639, -$.305], p = .021) and indirectly $(\beta =08 [-$.148,006], p = .012) effects turnover and directly effects work engagement ($\beta = .42$ [.482, .605], p = .013) Work engagement partially mediated the work practice environment relationship with turnover
O'Hara, Burke, Ditomassi, & Palan Lopez, (2019)	375 Millennial nurses working in a large Magnet hospital in the northeastern US	Descriptive, correlational design	The Practice Environment Conceptual Framework developed by Erikson et al.	86% of Millennial nurses were somewhat satisfied, satisfied, or very satisfied
	To assess the relationship between		Demographics - Age - Gender	dissatisfied working in their current unit
	demographic factors and work environment, and work satisfaction		 Race Work status Degree Experience 	Age explained 2.6% of the variance in job satisfaction
	to increase understanding of millennial nurses		- Years at current setting	Supportive leadership explained 63% of the variance in job
			Work Environment; PPWE Inventory	satistaction
Tabakakis, McAllister, Bradshaw, & To (2019)	480 RNs in New Zealand To investigate the impact of workplace	Cross- sectional correlational design	The Health Services Workplace Environment Environmental Resilience Model	Resilience was not significantly associated with age, gender, ethnicity, relationship status, highest nursing
	registered nurses		- Age - Gender	qualification, employment type, place of employment, or year employed

Author	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)	Sample/Turpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
			- Ethnicity	D 11
			- Relationship	Resilience was
			status Employment	significantly correlated
			- Employment	with intent to leave $(n < 0.01)$
			Highest nursing	(p< .001)
			- Inglicit hursing	Resilience correlated
			- Years employed	with.
			- Place of	PES ($r = 0.30, p < $
			employment	.001)
			1 2	NPHA ($r = 0.23, p < $
			Psychological	.001)
			resilience –	NFQC (r = 0.28, 0 <
			Connor-Davidson	.001)
			Resilience Scale	NM (r = 0.24, p <
				.001)
			Practice Environment	SRA $(r = 0.2/, p < 0.1)$
			-PES-INWI	(001)
			Perceived exposure to	CNTK(1 = 0.50, p < 0.01)
			negative acts –	NAO-R ($r = -0.28$, $p < -0.28$
			Negative Acts	.001)
			Questionnaire-Revised	Person-related
				bullying (r = -0.25, p $<$
			Intention to leave –	.001)
			Single item measure	Work-related bullying
			(in the last twelve	(r = -0.31, p < .001)
			months)	D 11
				significantly correlated
				with Physically
				intimidating bullying
				For every unit increase
				in PES:
				2.48-point increase in
				resilience (p < .001)
				T • •
				For every unit increase
				in NAQ-K:
				0.07-point decrease in resilience ($n < 0.01$)
				(p < .001)
				Associations remained
				significant controlling
				for age, gender,
				relationship status,
				years employed as a
				nurse, highest nursing
				qualification, and
				intent to leave PES 2.76 ($p < 0.01$)

	1	~	T (a)	T
Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
				NAQ-R -0.08 (p = .003)
				This combination of variables with control variables accounted for 14.5% of the variance in resilience
Dols, Chargualaf, & Martinez, (2019)	95 nurses working in a 250+ bed teritary hospital in south Texas To identify evolving cultural and generational factors influencing nurse retention	A cross- sectional, single site descriptive study	 Theory not specified Demographics Age Sex Ethnicity Support status Year actively worked as an RN Years at this hospital Education Employment setting Employment status Number of hours worked per week and per day Career Survey for Nurses Nursing Leadership Preferences Survey Practice Environment – NWI-R 	Nurses who reported not being able to meet their patient's needs were more dissatisfied; Average percentage of nurses reporting inability to meet their patient's needs were [mean (sd)]: Baby Boomers 16.34% (25.99%) Generation X 19.93% (24.81%) Millennials 21.10% (23.98%) Millennial Hispanics more positive perception of practice environment compared to non-Hispanic Millennials and Hispanic Generation X Generation X non- Hispanic nurses more positive perception of practice environment compared to non- Hispanic Millennials Director Traits Rankings: Millennial Hispanic Attitude - 1. Calm 2. Cooperative 3. Supportive 4. Hard Work Ethic Intrinsic - 1. Dedicated

Author	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)		Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Motivated (tied) 2. Honest 3. Strong willed 4. Dependable
				 Millennial non- Hispanic Attitude - 1. Supportive 2. Respectful of subordinates 3. Positive attitude 4. Approachable Intrinsic - 1. Dependable 2. Nonjudgmental 3. Understanding 4. Dedicated Motivated (tied)
				 Generation X Hispanic Attitude - 1. Approachable 2. Hard work ethic 3. Respectful of subordinates 4. Fair Intrinsic - 1. Honest 2. Understanding 3. Motivated 4. dedicated
				 Generation X non- Hispanic Attitude - 1. Supportive 2. Approachable 3. Respectful of subordinates 4. Reasonable Intrinsic - 1. Integrity 2. Dependable 3. Trustworthy 4. Wise
Adolfo, (2019)	374 nurses working in two government and two private hospitals in the Philippines	Cross- sectional, correlational design	Discussion of practice environment literature; theory not specified Demographics - Age	Only nurse sex and practice area were significant predictors of nurse quality safety

Author (Vear)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
	To examine the contribution of nurses' perceptions of their practice environment on their perceptions of their practice environment's quality and safety	Analysis	 Sex Marital status Education Experience Current hospital Monthly salary Hours per week Hospital type Practice environment PES-NWI Nursing Quality Safety – Nursing Quality Safety Self Inventory	Sex predicted knowledge ($\beta = 0.761$, $p = .04$) and attitude ($\beta = .824$, $p = .02$) Practice area predicted knowledge ($\beta.758$, $p = .03$) and attitude ($\beta = .353$, $p = .05$) Practice environment was not a significant predictor of nurse quality safety
Zangaro & Jones (2019)	80,563 registered nurses across 51 studies Using meta- analysis to examine the reliability generalization of the PES-NWI.	Meta- Analysis	PES-NWI	Reliability of PES- NWI composite: $\alpha = .922$ [.904, .936] Reliability of subscales: NPHA $\alpha = .825$ NFQC $\alpha = .774$ NM $\alpha = .832$ SRA $\alpha = .806$ CNPR $\alpha = .829$ Variability of effect sizes: Q = 5,331.514, df = 37, p < .05, I^2 = 99.31% Reliability of the PES- NWI differed by setting with "other" settings demonstrating stronger reliability; high quality studies demonstrated lower reliability compared with lower and moderate quality studies
Wu, Hayter, Lee, Yuan, Li, Bi, Zhang, Cao, Gong, & Zhang (2020)	391 nurses working in two hospitals located in the Jiangsu Province of China To explore the relationship	Cross- sectional, correlational design	Transformational Leadership Theory Demographics - Age clinical site - Total years' experience	Spiritual climate was negatively correlated with emotional exhaustion ($r =455$, p < .01) and turnover intention ($r =323$, $p < .01$)

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
	between spiritual climate and transformational leadership, and examine their impact on nurses perceived emotional exhaustion and intentions to quit		The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Chinese The Spiritual Climate Scale Chinese Maslach's Emotional Exhaustion Scale Chinese Turnover Intention Scale Chinese	Mediation analysis using Sobel test: Transformational leadership associated with Spiritual climate (a = 0.198, p < .01) and emotional exhaustion $(c =115, p < .01)$ Spiritual climate negatively associated with emotional exhaustion $(b = -$ 0.499, p < .01); Sobel test was significant $(p < .01)$ Significant indirect effect of spiritual climate on the relationship between transformational leadership and
Lee In Pr	267	Crease	Drive and Muellen	emotional exhaustion
Lee, Ju, & Lim, (2020)	267 nurses working in four general hospitals in South Korea To investigate the intent to leave or stay among Korean hospital nurses and to identify what factors influence their intent to leave or stay	Cross- sectional, correlational design	Price and Mueller Turnover Model Nursing Work Environment – Practice Environment of the Nursing Work Index Korean Job Satisfaction – Job Satisfaction Scale of Clinical Nurses Korean Burnout – Maslach burnout inventory Korean Organizational commitment – 15 item scale, Korean Intent to leave and Intent to stay – 16 item scale, Korean	Intent to leave by: Age (F = 4.08, p = .007 Intent to leave (ITL) differed according to: Education (F = 5.99, p = .003) Religion (F = 2.66, p = .049) Department (F = 5.82, p = .001) Clinical career (F = 3.92 , p = .009 Hospital size (F = 3.88 , p = .010) Post hoc test demonstrated intent to leave was higher among: Nurses aged 26-40 compared to 41+, Nurses without a religion or with a religion other than Catholicism compared to Catholics, Nurses working in internal modicine

Author	G 1/D	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	G' 'C' (E' 1'
(Year)	Sample/Purpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
				compared to those working in the ICU, ER, or OR; Nurses with a total clinical career of 6-15 years than those 15+, Nurses working in 399 beds or fewer than those working in a hospital with 800+ Intent to leave correlated with: Work environment (r =48, p< .001 Job satisfaction (r = - .41, p < .001 Organizational commitment (r =54, p < .001) Burnout (r = .33, p <
				.001) Intent to stay differed according to the same as ITL plus Marital status (t = - 2.17, p = .031) Monthly salary (F = 3.94, p = .009) Intent to stay was higher among: Nurses age 41+, Married nurses compared to single, Nurses with a master's degree compared to bachelors or lower, Christian nurses compared to Buddhist, Nurses working in units other than Internal Medicine, Nurses with <1 year or greater than 15 years' experience compared to those with 1-14 years' experience, Nurses working in 800+ bed hospitals, Nurses with monthly income of 4 million KRW or more compared to income of

Author (Vear)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
		7 thaty 515		3.99 million KRW or
				less
				Intent to leave affected by (F = 63.60, p < .001, R ² of .39): Organizational commitment (β =32, p < .001) Work Environment (β =22, p = .001) Burnout (β = .20, p < .001 Master's degree or higher (β =13, p = .010) Working in a special unit (β =12, p < .045)
				Factors affecting Intent to Stay (F = $63.60, p < .001, R^2$ of .42): Organizational commitment (β = .59, p < .001) Clinical career (β = .11, p = .020) Hospital size \geq 800 beds (β = .11, p = .018)
Cheng, Cui, Chen, Ye, Liu, Zhang, Zeng, & Hu, (2020)	300 pediatric nurses from 3 Class A tertiary hospitals in Jilin Province To develop and test a hypothesized model that uses path analysis to explore the relationships among general self-efficacy, perceived organizational	Descriptive, cross- sectional study using path analysis	Theory not specified General Self-Efficacy Scale Perceived Organizational Support Scale Practice Environment – PES-NWI Chinese Nurses' Perceived Professional Benefits Scale	All variables were significantly correlated with one another All paths with POS, GSE, NPE, and NPPB were significant in the path model POS had significant direct effects on NPE ($\beta = 0.677$, p<.000) and NPPB ($\beta = 0.640$, p<.000) NPE had significant direct effects on NPPB
	support, nurses' perceived professional			(β = 0.257, p<.000)

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
	benefits, and nursing practice environment			GSE had significant direct effect on NPE ($\beta = 0.430$, p< .000) POS ($\beta = 0.174$, p< .000) and GSE ($\beta =$ 0.111, p< .000) had significant effects on NPPD through NPE
Pereira Lima Silva, Goncalves Menegueti, Dias Castilho Siqueria, de Araujo, Auxiliadora- Martins, Montovani Silva Andrade, & Laus, (2020)	29 nurses working on 3 ICUs in Brazil To characterize the omission of nursing care according to the nurses' perception of the professional practice environment and the nursing workload of intensive care units (ICU) in Brazil	Cross- sectional descriptive design	Kalish's Missed Nursing Care conceptual framework Practice Environment – PES-NWI Brazilian Missed care – MISSCARE – Brasil (hours) Workload – Nursing Activities Score instrument (hours)	ICU 1: 89.85 NAS compared to 21.5 missed care; mixed work environment PES mean(sd) NPHA 2.3(0.3) NFQC 2.4(0.4) NM 2.6(0.8) SRA 2.3(0.4) CNPR 2.8(0.4) ICU 2: 67.13 NAS compared to 16.1 missed care; favorable work environment PES mean(sd) NPHA 3.1(0.3) NFQC 3.0(0.4) SRA 2.6(0.4) CNPR 2.9(0.1) ICU 3: 64.17 NAS compared to 15.5 missed care; mixed work environment PES mean(sd) NPHA 2.5(0.9) NFQC 2.8(0.6) NM 2.7(0.8) SRA 2.5(0.5) CNPR 3.0(0.4)
Slater, Roos, Eskola, McCormack, Hahtela, Kurjenluoma, & Suominen, (Slater et al., 2020)	605 Finnish nurses working across 5 clinical settings To examine the impact of predictive work environment factors on nurses' intention	Cross- sectional, correlational design	JOINT Model of Turnover Nursing Content Index - Stressors in work - Job satisfaction - Organizational characteristic - Intention to leave	Statistically significant predictors of intention to leave: Work life balance $\beta =$ 0.131, p = .009) Lack of support staff ($\beta =168$, p = .007) Satisfaction with pay ($\beta = .131$, p = .009)

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
	to leave their position and to explore contributing factors	7111119515		Satisfaction with training (β = .131, p = .009) Personal satisfaction (β = .131, p = .009) Nursing management (β = .131, p = .009) Organizational commitment (β = .131, p = .009)
				 Path analysis of five factors: 1. Work Stress and preparation 2. Interpersonal relationships 3. The work climate 4. Satisfaction with the profession and resources 5. Organizational management
				Only factor 4 was associated with ITL (- 1.048); individual items "professional satisfaction" (238) and "organizational commitment" (171) were independently associated with ITL
Smith, Lapkin, Sim, Halcomb, (2020)	383 nurses working in rural hospitals in Australia To examine nursing care left undone and its relationship with the nursing practice environment and perceived quality	Cross- sectional descriptive design	Theory not specified Nurse characteristics Nursing practice environment – NWI-R: Australian Care left undone – 13 activities considered necessary Quality of care –	Moderate correlation between care left undone and quality of care ($r = -0.37$, $p < .01$) Moderate correlations between care left undone and NWI subscales – mean ($r = -0.36$, $p < .01$) Moderate correlations
	of nursing care in small Australian rural hospitals		Single item measure previously utilized in international research	between: CNPR and quality of care ($r = 0.43$, $p < .01$) NPHA and quality of care ($r = 0.48$, $p < .01$)

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
		T mary 515		NM and quality of care $(r = 0.44, p < .01)$
				Strong correlation between quality of care and SRA ($r =$ 0.52, $p < .01$) Quality of care and NFQC ($r = 0.61$, $p <$.01) Quality of care and composite NWI ($r =$ 0.60, $p < .01$)
				Nurses reporting care left undone reported lower practice environment (p < .001)
				Nurses reporting care left undone report lower quality of care (t (381) = 7.71, p < .001, r = 0.38)
Sillero- Sillero & Zabalegui (2020)	130 nurses working in Surgical department of a Spanish public university hospital	Cross- sectional, descriptive correlational design	Discussion of Magnet facility research basis; theory not specified Work Environment – Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index Spanish	Scores on the NFQC and CNPR were higher in the perioperative environment compared to studies in other work areas across Spain
	To investigate how the perioperative work environment affects work dissatisfaction, professional		Burnout – Maslach burnout inventory Spanish Quality of Care – Single item measure	Nurses dissatisfied with work were 2.3 times more likely to abandon work Nurses with high emotional exhaustion
	exhaustion, and the perception of the quality of care about the		Intention to abandon work – single item (yes/no)	also had 1.11 times greater risk to abandon work
	intention of abandoning the work of perioperative nurses		Job satisfaction – 9 item scale	Higher SRA associated with lower intention to abandon work

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
Povedano- Jimenez, Granados- Gamez, & Garcia-Caro, (2020)	534 nurses in the Spanish Colleges of Nursing To explore self- perception competence among Spanish nurses dealing with patient death and its relationship with work environment, evidence-based practice, and occupational stress	Cross- sectional, correlational design	(Empirical Indicators)Theory not specifiedDemographic and work-related data- Age- Sex- education- Years of practiceWork setting- Unit- Specialty- Type of health centerCoping with Death Scale SpanishPractice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index SpanishPerception of Evidenced-Based Practice QuestionnaireNursing Stress Scale Spanish	Compared to older nurses, younger nurses reported inadequate coping (p < .001) Respondents reporting lower SRA also reported inadequate coping (1.7 ± 0.6) Respondents reporting adequate coping scored higher on EBP and reported less stress (81.1 ± 15.1). PES demonstrated positive association with EBP (β = 0.12, p < .05) and negatively associated with occupational stress (β =10, p < .015) A positive attitude towards EBP was the most significant predictor of coping with death (β = 0.29, p < .001) Lower coping associated with less than 10 years' experience (β = -0.10, p< .001)
Liao, Yeh, Lin, & Wang, (Liao, Yeh, Lin, & Wang, 2020)	2,605 nurses working on 125 units in seven hospitals in China To explore a hierarchical model of occupational burnout that is associated with job-induced stress, nurse self- concept, and	Cross- sectional, correlational design	Maslach's Burnout Model Demographics - Age - Gender - Years of experience - Marital status - Education - Monthly salary Occupational Burnout - Maslach Burnout Inventory Human Services Survey	Hospital level was removed from HLM model due high collinearity among variables; cross-level model also did not converge due to multicollinearity Nurse self-concept was negatively associated with emotional exhaustion Nurse self-concept was negatively

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
	practice environment		Job Induced Stress – Nurse Stress Checklist	associated with depersonalization
			Nurse Self-Concept – Nurses' Self Concept Instrument Chinese Nursing Work Environment – Nursing Work Index – Revised: Chinese	Aspects of occupational burnout showed greater variation among nursing units rather than among individual nurses
Koy, Yunibhand, Angsuroch, & Turale, (2020)	375 nurses from 12 government hospitals in Cambodia To examine the causal relationships between RN perceptions of care quality and the factors affecting their work in Cambodian hospitals	Cross- sectional, descriptive design using Structural Equation Modeling	Revised: Chinese "Nurse Work Environment, Nurse Staffing, and Outcome Model" Number of patients assigned on last shift Index of Work Satisfaction Copenhagen Burnout Inventory PES-NWI, only 30 items The Cambodian Nursing Care Quality Scale (author developed)	Nurse work satisfaction has a direct negative effect on Nurse Care Quality and Number of patients assigned (b = 26) and a direct positive effect on NB (b = .22) Practice Environment did not directly affect nurse care quality, nurse burnout, or nurse work satisfaction Number of patients assigned did not affect nurse care quality or burnout Nurse work satisfaction, practice environment, number of patients assigned, and burnout explained 12% of the variance in nurse care quality
				Number of patients assigned and practice environment explained 8% of the variance in nurse work satisfaction
				Number of patients assigned, practice environment, and

Author (Year)	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/ Analysis	Theory/Concepts (Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
				work satisfaction explained 6% of the variance in burnout
Halcomb & Bird, (2020)	786 nurses working in Australian General Practices To investigate the job satisfaction and turnover intentions of nurses working in Australian general practice	Cross- sectional, descriptive design	Theory not specified Job satisfaction – 29 item survey Turnover Intention – modified version of the Nurse Retention Index	72.8% of general practice nurses reported no intention to leave; 7.9% report intention to leave; 19.3% were undecided Higher satisfaction scores were associated with lower intention to leave Only the total satisfaction score was a statistically significant predictor of intention to leave (p < .001)
				Nurses reporting dissatisfaction were 6.1 [3.7, 10.2] times more likely to demonstrate intention to leave Nurse reporting indecision were 4.8 [2.7, 8.4] times more
				likely to report
Ambani, Kutney-Lee, & Lake (2020)	320 nurses working in one public and one military hospital in Saudi Arabia To assess the nursing practice environments and nurse job- related outcomes in two types of hospitals in Saudi Arabia	Cross- sectional, path analysis	The Modified Model for Nurse Turnover (author conceptual model) Demographics - Age - Gender - Nationality - Marital status - Number of children aged < 18 years - Education - Experience	Practice environment scores were significantly lower for public hospital Nurses cared for 1.62 more patients in the public hospital compared to the military hospital Path analysis: Job dissatisfaction to intent to leave (0.48) Burnout to intent to
			Nursing practice environment –	leave (0.43)

Author	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)	Sample/Turpose	Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	Significant Findings
			Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index Burnout – Maslach Burnout Inventory Emotional Exhaustion subscale Job dissatisfaction – Single item measure Intention to leave – Single item measure Patient to nurse ratio – single item measure	Age 31-35 to intent to leave (0.55) Children < 18 to intent to leave (14) Saudi to intent to leave (41) Children to job dissatisfaction (.34) Practice environment to job dissatisfaction (- 1.15) Patient to nurse ratio to burnout (.03) Saudi to burnout (.41) Practice environment to burnout (36)
Bagnasco, Dasso, Rossi, Timmins, Watson, Aleo, Catania, Zanini, & Sasso, (2020)	2,243 Italian pediatric nurses working on 169 units To explore Italian pediatric nurses' reported burnout and its relationship to their perceptions of safety and adverse events	Cross- section, correlational design	Discussion of burnout and safety culture; theory not specified Demographics 1. Age 2. Gender 3. Experience 4. Education Burnout – Maslach Burnout Inventory Overall grade of patient safety – single item from the AHRQ Patient Safety Culture Survey Adverse Events – Nurse-reported occurrence of 1. Medication administration errors 2. Pressure ulcers 3. Falls with injuries 4. Urinary tract infections 5. Bloodstream infections 6. Pneumonia	Higher level of emotional exhaustion (EE) increased the risk of negative patient safety grade in: Surgical (OR = 1.056 [1.024, 1.090], p < .001) Medical (OR = 1.029 [$1.012, 1.047$], p < .001) Critical care (OR = 1.042 [$1.014, 1.071$], p < .01) Personal accomplishment reduces risk of poor safety grade in : Surgical (OR = 0.952 [$0.906, 1.036$]), p = .01)

Author	Sample/Purpose	Study Type/	Theory/Concepts	Significant Findings
(Year)		Analysis	(Empirical Indicators)	
Huang,	43 units from	Cross-	Theory not specified	Nursing work
Wang, Dong,	two psychiatric	sectional,		environment had
Li & Wan,	hospitals in	descriptive	Nursing work	direct effects on:
(2020)	Beijing	design	environment –	Quality of care ($\beta =$
		_	PES-NWI Chinese	.498, p < .05)
	To focus on			Turnover intention (β
	psychiatric		Work engagement -	=394, p < .05)
	nurses and		Utrecht Work	
	examine the		Engagement Scale,	Work engagement
	relationship		nine item Chinese	partially mediated the
	among nursing		version	work environment
	work			effect on:
	environment,		Quality of care –	Quality of care ($\beta =$
	nurse perceived		Single item measure	.096, p < .05)
	quality of care,			Turnover intention (β
	turnover		Turnover intention –	=296, p < .05)
	intention, and		Turnover Intention	
	work		Scale	Model explained 36%
	engagement			of the variance in
	using structural			quality of care and
	equation			56% of the variance in
	modeling			turnover intention

Appendix B.

Instruments

Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index

This scale has been modified for use among Army nursing samples and was provided to the primary investigator by the Executive Officer for the Army Nurse Corps, Army Nurse Corps Chief's office, for use in this proposed study. Response options for each question include strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree.

Nurse participation in hospital affairs.

- 1. Career development/clinical ladder opportunity.
- 2. Opportunity for staff nurses to participate in policy decisions.
- A chief nursing officer/DCN/DNS who is highly visible and accessible to staff.
- A chief nursing officer/DCN/DNS equal in power and authority to other top-level hospital executives.
- 5. Opportunities for advancement.
- 6. Administration that listens and responds to employee concerns.
- Staff nurses are involved in the internal governance of the hospital (e.g., practice and policy committees).
- Staff nurses have the opportunity to serve on hospital and nursing committees.
- Nursing administrators consult with staff on daily problems and procedures

Nursing foundations for quality care.

- 1. Active staff development or continuing education programs for nurses.
- 2. High standards of nursing care are expected by the administration.
- 3. A clear philosophy of nursing that pervades the patient care environment.
- 4. Working with nurses who are clinically competent.
- 5. An active performance improvement program.
- 6. A preceptor program for newly hired RNs.
- 7. Nursing care is based on a nursing, rather than a medical, model.
- 8. Written, up-to-date nursing care plans for all patients.
- 9. Patient care assignments that foster continuity of care, i.e., the same nurse cares for the patient from one day to the next.
- 10. Use of nursing diagnoses

Nurse manager ability, leadership, and support for nurses.

- 1. A supervisory staff that is supportive of the nurses.
- 2. Supervisors use mistakes as learning opportunities, not criticism.
- 3. (a) A nurse manager/clinical nurse officer in charge/department head who is a good manager and leader.
 - (b) A noncommissioned officer in charge/leading petty officer who is a good manager and leader.

Team leadership model: responses to both questioned averaged.

- 1. Praise and recognition for a job well done.
- 2. A nurse manager who backs up the nursing staff in decision-making, even if the conflict is with a physician.

Staffing and resource adequacy.

- 1. Adequate support services allow me to spend time with my patient
- Enough time and opportunity to discuss patient care problems with other nurses.
- 3. Enough registered nurses to provide quality patient care.
- 4. Enough staff to get the work done

Collegial nurse-physician relations.

- 1. Physicians and nurses have good working relationships.
- 2. A lot of teamwork between nurses and physicians.
- 3. Collaboration (joint practice) between nurse personnel and physicians.

TEAMSTEPPS Teamwork Perceptions Questionnaire

From the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality TeamSTEPPS Teamwork Perceptions Questionnaire Manual (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2010). Answer options for each question include strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, or strongly disagree.

Team Structure.

- 1. The skills of staff overlap sufficiently so that work can be shared when necessary
- 2. Staff are held accountable for their actions.
- Staff within my unit share information that enables timely decision making by the direct patient care team
- 4. My unit makes efficient use of resources (e.g., staff, supplies, equipment, information).

- 5. Staff understand their roles and responsibilities.
- 6. My unit has clearly articulated goals.
- 7. My unit operates at a high level of efficiency.

Leadership.

- 8. My supervisor/manager considers staff input when making decisions about patient care.
- 9. My supervisor/manager provides opportunities to discuss the unit's performance after an event.
- 10. My supervisor/manager takes time to meet with staff to develop a plan for patient care.
- 11. My supervisor/manager ensures that adequate resources (e.g. staff, supplies, equipment, information) are available.
- 12. My supervisor/manager resolves conflict successfully.
- 13. My supervisor/manager models appropriate team behavior.
- 14. My supervisor/manager ensures that staff are aware of any situations or changes that may affect patient care.

Situation Monitoring.

- 15. Staff effectively anticipate each other's needs.
- 16. Staff monitor each other's performance.
- 17. Staff exchange relevant information as it becomes available.
- 18. Staff continuously scan the environment for important information.
- 19. Staff share information regarding potential complications (e.g. patient changes, bed availability)

- 20. Staff meet to reevaluate patient care goals when aspects of the situation have changed.
- 21. Staff correct each other's mistakes to ensure that procedures are followed properly.

Mutual Support.

- 22. Staff assist fellow staff during high workload.
- 23. Staff request assistance from fellow staff when they feel overwhelmed.
- 24. Staff caution each other about potentially dangerous situations.
- 25. Feedback between staff is delivered in a way that promotes positive interactions and future change.
- 26. Staff advocate for patients even when their opinion conflicts with that of a senior member of the unit.
- 27. When staff have a concern about patient safety, they challenge others until they are sure the concern has been heard.
- 28. Staff resolve their conflicts, even when the conflicts have become personal.

Communication.

- 29. Information regarding patient care is explained to patients and their families in lay terms.
- 30. Staff relay relevant information in a timely manner.

- 31. When communicating with patients, staff allow enough time for questions.
- 32. Staff use common terminology when communicating with each other.
- 33. Staff verbally verify information that they receive from one another.
- 34. Staff follow a standardized method of sharing information when handing off patients.
- 35. Staff seek information from all available sources.

Appendix C.

Mediation Analyses

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis three stated US Army primary care clinic team performance will mediate the relationship between the nursing practice environment and (a) staff perception of overall patient safety, (b) staff nurses' job satisfaction, and (c) staff nurses' intent to leave. However, bivariate analyses found no relationship between team performance and staff nurse intent to leave. Therefore, hypothesis 3c was not evaluated. The results of hypothesis testing for hypotheses 3a and 3b are presented in this appendix.

Hypothesis 3a-b. A PROCESS matrix was utilized to estimate the mediating potential of the dimensions of team performance in the relationship between the nursing practice environment and the dimensions of clinic staff perception of overall patient safety and staff nurse job satisfaction controlling for covariates (Hayes, 2018). A simple mediation model using 10,000 bootstrap samples and a 95% confidence interval estimated the mediating potential of situation monitoring in the relationship between the composite PES-NWI and (a) manager expectations and actions promoting safety, (b) organizational learning, and (c) communication openness. The indirect effects (*ab*) for each of these models were not significant. Therefore, situation monitoring did not mediate the relationship between the nursing practice environment and (a) manager expectations and actions promoting safety, (b) organizational learning, and (c) communication openness. The indirect effects (*ab*) for each of these models were not significant. Therefore, situation monitoring did not mediate the relationship between the nursing practice environment and (a) manager expectations and actions promoting safety, (b) organizational learning, and (c) communication openness. The total effect (*c*) and mediation (*c'*) models are presented in Figures 3, 4, and 5.

Figure 3.

Total Effect and Mediation Model for Manager Expectations and Actions Promoting

Patient Safety



Figure 4.

Total Effect and Mediation Model for Organizational Learning – Continuous

Improvement



Figure 5.

Total Effect and Mediation Model for Communication Openness



A simple mediation model using 10,000 bootstrap samples and a 95% confidence interval estimated the mediating potential of team structure in the relationship between the composite PES-NWI and (a) frequency of events reported controlling for RN hours per 1000 patient encounters and (b) staff nurse job satisfaction controlling for RN assigned FTEs. Simple mediation models were estimated and the indirect effects (*ab*) for both models were not statistically significant. Therefore, team structure did not mediate the relationship between the nursing practice environment and (a) frequency of events reported and (b) staff nurse job satisfaction. The total effect (*c*) and mediation (*c*') models are presented in Figures 6 and 7.

Figure 6.

Total Effect and Mediation Model for Frequency of Events Reported





Total Effect and Mediation Model for Staff Nurse Job Satisfaction

