



Nursing Practice Environments and Job Outcomes in Ambulatory Oncology Settings

Christopher R. Friese, PhD, RN, AOCN, FAAN
Laurel Himes-Ferris, MPH

OBJECTIVE: The aim of this study was to investigate job satisfaction and intent to stay for ambulatory oncology nurses.

BACKGROUND: An oncology provider shortage suggests that retention is a high priority, and factors associated with job outcomes are unknown in this setting.

METHOD: Data were derived from a cross-sectional survey completed by 402 oncology nurses employed in ambulatory settings. Logistic regression models estimated the likelihood of job satisfaction or intent to stay for at least 1 year.

RESULTS: Most nurses (80.9%) were satisfied and 87.4% indicated their intent to stay. Significant variables for job satisfaction were university/hospital ownership, staffing and resource adequacy, nurse manager ability and leadership, and workloads. Variables significant for intent to stay were staffing and resource adequacy, participation in practice affairs, and years of experience.

CONCLUSIONS: Favorable practice environments are key to effective nurse retention. Staffing, leadership, and resource allocation influence retention in ambulatory settings.

Author Affiliations: Assistant Professor (Dr Friese), Division of Nursing Business and Health Systems, University of Michigan School of Nursing, Ann Arbor; Epidemiologist (Ms Himes-Ferris), Oregon Health Authority, Portland.

This research was supported in part by a Pathway to Independence award from the National Institute of Nursing Research, National Institutes of Health (R00 NR01570), and through a University of Michigan Comprehensive Cancer Center Support Grant (5 P30 CA46592).

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Correspondence: Dr Friese, Division of Nursing Business and Health Systems, University of Michigan School of Nursing, 400 North Ingalls, 4162, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-5482 (cfriese@umich.edu).

DOI: 10.1097/NNA.0b013e318283dc3f

The Institute of Medicine (IOM) report *The Future of Nursing: Leading Change, Advancing Health*¹ provides an evidence-based imperative to transform existing healthcare delivery systems to improve patient outcomes. Key to this transformation is leadership from nurses to redesign healthcare delivery. The care delivery system for patients with cancer is a high-priority area for redesign, given the increasing numbers of cases, the complexity of the disease state, and the toxicity of prescribed treatments. Although most of chemotherapy care is delivered in ambulatory settings, little is known about the quality of care delivered.² The importance of favorable nursing practice environments (PEs) on outcomes for hospitalized patients has been well documented.³⁻⁷ Evidence focused on the PEs of ambulatory settings is almost nonexistent.

Nurses are the single largest group of providers in oncology settings.⁸ They serve as a safety net for toxicity prevention and management, crucial components to high-quality cancer care. Despite the desire to deliver optimal care, ambulatory settings face many barriers to implement evidence-based practices. Barriers include the professional environment for nursing practice, defined as the elements of the workplace that promote safe, effective nursing care and nursing workloads, which reflect the number of patients that nurses care for on a daily basis. A 2012 report identified significantly increased occupational exposure to chemotherapy when nurses practiced in unfavorable environments, had higher daily workloads, and reported lower guideline adherence.⁹ The IOM committee on the work environment for nurses and patient safety summarized in their volume following *Keeping Patients Safe* that “it is not just necessary, but also possible, to transform the work environment of today’s nurses.”^{6(p49)} The context in which providers deliver

care is as crucial to patient outcomes in ambulatory oncology settings (AOSs) yet has not received systematic study.

Conceptual Framework

The Practice Environments of Oncology Nurses Study was informed by the seminal conceptual work of Donabedian,¹⁰ who suggested that quality of health-care could be assessed in 3 components: structure, process, and outcome. A thematic analysis of focus group data obtained by a separate sample of nurses employed in AOSs posited a relationship between PEs and nursing job satisfaction.¹¹ Specifically, workloads, management support, the quality of medical assistant support, and physical resources were suggested to influence job satisfaction. Informed by this previous work, the current study sought to investigate empirically the relationship between nursing PEs and job outcomes for nurses employed in AOSs. The primary hypothesis was that more favorable PEs would be associated with significantly increased likelihood of nurse-reported job satisfaction and intention to stay.

Methods

Setting, Participants, and Study Procedures

The protocol received human subject approval by our university's institutional review board. The study took place in 1 large state in the Southeastern United States and the survey was administered between April and June 2010. A total of 1 339 nurses were identified through the state's board of nursing database. These registered nurses (RNs) and licensed practice nurses (LPNs) were selected for inclusion because they reported on their licensure renewal that they practiced in oncology nursing outside hospital inpatient units. Participants were invited to complete either a paper or Web-based questionnaire; both questionnaires had identical content. Nonsignificant differences in participation rates by mode of survey completion have been reported previously.¹² After an introductory letter was mailed, participants received a \$2 incentive with their 1st survey packet, which included a study description, questionnaire and/or instructions to complete the questionnaire online, and a return envelope. Following a modified protocol recommended by Dillman and colleagues,¹³ reminders were sent at 10-day intervals. All mailings used 1st-class mail.

Measures

The data source for this study was a questionnaire administered to nurses in AOSs. The research team prepared a 12-page questionnaire for nurses employed in AOSs. The questionnaire included items that cap-

tured demographic and practice characteristics, perceived PEs, and an array of outcomes, which included job satisfaction and intention to stay in current position. For job satisfaction, nurses were asked to complete the question "How satisfied are you with your current position," with 1 of 5 answer choices: very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, satisfied, or very satisfied. The analyses presented below dichotomized the job satisfaction outcome to reflect that participants reported being satisfied or very satisfied with their current position. To measure job retention, nurses were asked, "Do you intent to stay in your current position?" Possible answer choices included a plan to leave within 6 months, a plan to leave within 1 year, or no plans to leave. The analyses below used a dichotomous outcome of whether the respondent did not plan to leave within 1 year.

The independent variables were included after considering our conceptual model and variables significantly associated with nurse job outcomes in previous studies.^{11,14} They included nurse demographics: race (white vs nonwhite), certification (holds oncology certification vs does not hold certification), education (holds at least a bachelors degree vs holds less than a bachelors degree), years of experience, and practice ownership (hospital or university owned vs private practice or other ownership arrangement).

Nursing workloads and perceived nursing PEs were 2 important variables for consideration. To measure nursing workloads, we asked nurses to report the number of patients they provided most of direct care for on their last shift. To measure PEs, we asked nurses to complete a revised set of items that derive from the Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index (PES-NWI).¹⁵ The PES-NWI includes 31 items across 5 subscales reflecting the degree to which nurses agree that characteristics that exemplify professional environments are present. The modifications made for this study have been reported previously.¹⁶ First, all items were scaled on a 5-point Likert scale with the inclusion of a neutral category, as opposed to the original 4-point scale (strongly disagree, disagree, agree, or strongly agree that the characteristic is present in their current job). In addition to item reduction, a 6th subscale—medical assistant support—was added. The final revised scale included 23 items across 6 subscales: staffing and resource adequacy (Cronbach's $\alpha = .89$), nursing foundations for quality of care (.80), nurse participation in practice affairs (.86), nurse manager leadership, ability, and support of nurses (.90), collegial nurse-physician relations (.86), and medical assistant support (.87). In addition to the subscale reliability reported above, validity was confirmed using a structural equation model with acceptable fit, as shown by a comparative fit index of 0.95 and a root-mean-square error of

approximation of 0.057.¹⁶ For modeling purposes, these revised subscales were dichotomized to reflect whether nurse respondents scored them above the midpoint of 3.0, which would indicate that the nurse agreed that the characteristic was present in the workplace. For each revised PES-NWI subscale, the referent category was a score below the theoretical midpoint on the subscale items.

Data Analysis

First, we examined bivariate relationships between nursing job satisfaction and study variables, including the revised PES-NWI subscales, nurses' reported workloads, and demographic characteristics. These analyses were repeated with nurses' intention to remain in their position at least 1 year as the 2nd dependent variable. Student *t* test and χ^2 test statistics were used for continuous and categorical variables, respectively.

Next, 2 logistic regression models were estimated for both dependent variables of job satisfaction and intention to stay in current position. For each fully adjusted model, all study variables of interest were included (practice ownership, revised PES-NWI subscales above the theoretical midpoint, demographic characteristics, workload on last shift, and years of nursing experience). The parsimonious models for both job outcomes include only those variables significant at $P < .15$ after specifying a backward selection process. All 4 models reported specified a generalized estimating equation to adjust standard errors for the clustering of nurses within practices. Analyses were performed in SAS 9.1.3 (SAS Institute Inc, Cary, North Carolina).

Results

Of the 1339 potential participants, 402 nurses responded to the survey (30.0% response rate), with minimal demographic differences observed between respondents and nonrespondents.¹⁶ A total of 242 nurses had requisite data for analyses; they were employed by 106 practices. Of these nurses, 67% worked in hospital- or university-affiliated practices. Ninety-one percent were white, 74% reported oncology certification, and 46% reported holding a bachelor's degree or higher. Most (95%) respondents were RNs and the remainder were LPNs.

Job Satisfaction

A total of 190 (80.9%) respondents indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with their current position. Compared with nonsatisfied nurses ($n = 45$, 19.1%), satisfied oncology nurses reported higher scores on the revised PES-NWI subscales (Table 1).

Scores differed the most on the staffing and resource adequacy subscale (3.73 for satisfied nurses vs 2.58 for dissatisfied nurses; $P < .001$). All subscales differed significantly at $P < .01$, with the exception of the difference in the medical assistant support scale. On the global assessment of the PE, the overwhelming majority of satisfied nurses reported favorable PEs (87.8% vs 12.2%; $P < .001$). Most of the dissatisfied nurses reported unfavorable or mixed PEs (67.4% vs 32.6%; $P < .001$). Satisfied nurses reported significantly lower workloads on their last shift (8.29 vs 11.77 patients for dissatisfied nurses; $P < .01$). Job satisfaction did not differ by race, oncology certification, education, or years in practice.

Intention to Stay in Current Position for 12 Months or Longer

Most nurse respondents ($n = 208$, 87.4%) indicated that they intend to stay in their current position for 12 or more months, compared with 30 nurses (12.6%) who reported intent to leave in more than a year (Table 1). Compared with the results on job satisfaction, fewer subscales on the revised PES-NWI differed significantly by nurses' intention to stay (Table 1). Nurse participation in practice affairs; nurse manager leadership, ability, and support; and staffing and resource adequacy were significantly higher for nurses who intend to stay in their position. Once again, the staffing and resource adequacy subscale had the largest difference between groups (3.61 vs 2.70; $P < .001$). Perceived medical assistant support was higher in nurses who did not intend to stay for 1 year (3.80 versus 3.57), but the difference was not statistically significant. Although workloads were lower for nurses who intend to stay (8.76 vs 10.18), the difference was not significant. White nurses, oncology certified nurses, and nurses with more years of practice reported intention to stay more frequently than did their counterparts (all $P < .05$).

Multivariable Results on Job Outcomes

Results from 4 multivariable logistic regression models are displayed in Table 2. Two models are shown for each outcome: job satisfaction and intent to stay. The fully adjusted models use all study variables displayed in the table and parsimonious models use variables with reported odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs). Variables were removed from these models using stepwise backward selection with a cutpoint of $P > .15$. All 4 models were adjusted for nurse clustering in practices using generalized estimating equations. Across all 4 models displayed, the strongest and most significant variable for the 2 job outcomes was staffing and resource adequacy. When

Table 1. Bivariate Relationships for Oncology Nursing Job Outcomes

	Intent to Stay in Current Position for ≥1 Year			Satisfied or Very Satisfied With Current Position		
	Yes (n = 208)	No (n = 30)	P	Yes (n = 190)	No (n = 45)	P
Revised PES-NWI subscales, mean (SD) ^a						
Staffing and resource adequacy	3.61 (0.89)	2.70 (1.08)	<.001	3.73 (0.80)	2.58 (1.02)	<.001
Nursing foundations for quality	4.17 (0.58)	3.97 (0.59)	.10	4.21 (0.58)	3.89 (0.55)	<.01
Medical assistant support	3.57 (1.02)	3.80 (0.93)	.26	3.65 (1.00)	3.45 (1.09)	.27
Nurse participation in practice affairs	3.17 (0.76)	2.48 (0.87)	<.001	3.25 (0.73)	2.45 (0.79)	<.001
Nurse manager ability, leadership, and support	3.59 (0.87)	3.10 (1.10)	<.01	3.69 (0.83)	2.87 (0.99)	<.001
Collegial nurse-physician relations	4.02 (0.71)	3.81 (0.73)	.15	4.08 (0.68)	3.77 (0.72)	<.01
Number of patients cared for on last shift, mean (SD) ^a	8.76 (6.31)	10.18 (4.65)	.31	8.29 (5.75)	1.77 (7.29)	<.01
Years of nursing experience, mean (SD) ^a	22.2 (10.2)	15.8 (11.2)	<.01	21.6 (10.1)	21.0 (12.0)	.77
Perception of the nursing PE, n (%) ^b						
Unfavorable or mixed environment	44 (22.6)	17 (60.7)	<.001	23 (12.2)	29 (67.4)	<.001
Favorable environment	151 (77.4)	11 (39.2)		165 (87.8)	14 (32.6)	
Nonwhite race, n (%) ^b	15 (7.2)	6 (20.0)	.04	17 (8.9)	4 (8.9)	1.0 ^c
White race, n (%) ^b	192 (92.8)	24 (80.0)		172 (91.1)	41 (91.1)	
Does not hold oncology nurse certification, n (%) ^b	50 (24.0)	13 (43.3)		47 (24.7)	16 (35.6)	.14
Holds oncology nurse certification, n (%) ^b	158 (76.0)	17 (56.7)		143 (75.3)	29 (64.4)	
Holds less than a bachelors degree, n (%) ^b	111 (53.4)	18 (60.0)	.49	101 (53.2)	27 (60.0)	.41
Holds a bachelors degree or higher, n (%) ^b	97 (46.6)	12 (40.0)		89 (46.8)	18 (40.0)	

^aDifferences tested using 2-sample *t* tests.

^bDifferences tested using χ^2 test of independence.

^cDifferences compared using Fisher exact test because of small sample sizes.

nurses reported above the midpoint on the revised staffing and adequacy subscale from the PES-NWI, they were significantly more likely to report that they were satisfied or very satisfied with their current position. They were also significantly more likely to report that they intend to stay in the current position for at least 1 year. Related to staffing and resource adequacy, nurses who reported higher workloads were significantly less likely to report job satisfaction (OR, 0.92; 95% CI, 0.85-1.00). Nurses employed in practices owned by universities or hospitals were more likely to be satisfied in contrast to nurses employed in physician-owned or other private practice settings. Finally, nurses who reported above the midpoint on the revised nurse manager, leadership, and ability subscale were more likely to report job satisfaction.

In addition to staffing and resource adequacy, in the parsimonious model, 2 subscales were significantly associated with an increased likelihood to report intention to stay. Nurses who scored above the midpoint on the nurse participation in practice affairs were significantly more likely to report intention to stay (OR, 3.08; 95% CI, 1.01-9.42). Nurses who reported above the midpoint on the medical assistant support scale were less likely to report intention to stay (OR, 0.21; 95% CI, 0.06-0.72). Finally, in both the fully adjusted and parsimonious models, more years of nursing

experience were significantly associated with an increased likelihood in intent to stay.

Discussion

Motivated by a surge in demand for cancer services in ambulatory oncology and a predicted shortage in oncology nurses, this study examined 2 nurse job outcomes: satisfaction and intention to stay in current position for at least 1 year. A noteworthy number of nurses surveyed are not satisfied with their current position and are likely to leave their position. These findings highlight available opportunities to strengthen nursing PEs in AOS to improve satisfaction and retention. The most noteworthy finding is that nurse-reported staffing and resource adequacy are significantly associated with both job satisfaction and intention to stay, which is consistent with the study's conceptual model and proposed primary hypothesis. Interestingly, only 1 model identified a relationship between the number of patients cared for and job satisfaction. This suggests that nurses are comfortable with their patient assignments but feel that personnel and resources could be deployed more thoughtfully to support the unpredictable demands of daily practice. The finding of a strong and significant relationship between perceived nurse manager quality and job

Table 2. Multivariable Logistic Regression Models for Oncology Nursing Job Outcomes

	Intent to Stay in Current Position for ≥ 1 Year				Satisfied or Very Satisfied with Current Position			
	Fully adjusted ^a (n = 173)		Parsimonious ^b (n = 179)		Fully adjusted ^a (n = 171)		Parsimonious ^b (n = 182)	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
University or hospital owned	2.35	0.97-5.69	–	–	4.36	0.98-19.35	3.63	1.08-12.28 ^c
Staffing and resource adequacy ^d	7.86	2.38-25.95 ^c	8.05	2.50-25.95 ^c	16.05	5.63-45.8 ^c	12.94	5.09-32.92 ^c
Nursing foundations for quality ^d	2.55	0.31-20.66	–	–	2.53	0.27-23.36	–	–
Medical assistant support ^d	0.26	0.05-1.29	0.21	0.06-0.72 ^c	0.52	0.15-1.79	–	–
Nurse participation in practice affairs ^d	2.19	0.57-8.42	3.08	1.01-9.42 ^c	1.56	0.35-6.93	–	–
Nurse manager ability, leadership, and support ^d	1.46	0.28-7.63	–	–	2.64	0.66-10.64	3.17	1.02-9.85 ^c
Collegial nurse-physician relations ^d	0.60	0.09-4.01	–	–	3.05	0.71-13.00	3.37	0.97-11.71
White (compared with nonwhite)	2.40	0.47-12.34	1.85	0.31-11.11	0.57	0.13-2.58	0.69	0.15-3.25
Holds oncology nurse certification	2.09	0.70-6.23	1.83	0.66-5.13	1.70	0.62-4.71	1.85	0.74-4.63
Holds a bachelors degree or higher	0.33	0.10-1.10	0.52	0.19-1.42	0.34	0.12-0.94	0.48	0.19-1.19
Number of patients cared for on last shift	0.99	0.91-1.07	0.97	0.91-1.04	0.92	0.85-1.01	0.92	0.85-1.00 ^c
Years of nursing experience	1.06	1.0-1.13 ^c	1.10	1.02-1.18 ^c	0.98	0.92-1.04	0.96	0.91-1.02

^aFully adjusted models include all variables listed and are adjusted for clustering using generalized estimating equations.

^bParsimonious models include variables significant at $P < .15$ using stepwise backward selection. The models are adjusted for clustering using generalized estimating equations.

^c $P < .05$.

^dReferent group is nurses who reported below the midpoint of the subscale.

satisfaction is consistent with previous studies conducted in inpatient settings.¹⁶ Higher satisfaction in university- or hospital-owned practices suggests that these environments may promote professional practice and autonomy, as opposed to traditional, physician-owned private practice.

In addition to staffing and resource adequacy, stronger nurse participation in practice affairs is associated positively with intention to stay. When nurses are able to contribute to practice decision making, including policy development and equipment selection, they are likely to have a stronger connection to their work setting, thus promoting retention. The curious negative relationship between medical assistant support and intention to stay may reflect variations in skill mix in practices. It is possible that nurses who reported lower on this scale have fewer layers of clinical staff, thus enhancing autonomy and promoting retention. Skill mix in AOSs has not received systematic study, and these findings may stimulate additional research in this area. Finally, practices should be encouraged that their most experienced nurses are

more likely to stay, but retention of less experienced nurses should be an administrative priority.

Study Limitations

The present study has several limitations worthy of additional discussion. First, although the response rate from surveyed nurses is 30.0%, previously published results suggest minimal, nonsignificant differences in demographic characteristics between respondents and nonrespondents.¹⁷ However, the possibility of differing perceptions on studied variables in nonresponders cannot be excluded. Second, this report is informed solely by surveyed nurse informants without the verification of actual turnover in the practices. Historically, intention to leave is strongly associated with actual job termination.¹⁴ Finally, the number of respondents did not permit a multilevel modeling approach. Instead, models were adjusted for clustering using generalized estimating equations. These limitations are presented alongside 1 of the largest published studies to date that focus on PEs in the high-risk, high-volume AOS, where nurses deliver most of the care.

Implications for Practice, Policy, and Leadership

The study results directly address 2 prominent policy statements by the IOM report on nursing and the National Cancer Policy Board workshop on the oncology workforce.^{2,8} To optimize care for patients receiving chemotherapy, retention of existing oncology nurses is a top priority. To promote job satisfaction and retention, staffing and resources must be adequate to meet daily patient care responsibilities. Because of the unpredictable nature of ambulatory patient care and the absence of national benchmarks, additional research is needed to elucidate how to develop and staff AOSs to optimize patient outcomes.

Currently, managers can assess workloads from staff and implement changes to improve the efficiency of personnel deployment to meet patient care needs. To increase nurse participation in practice affairs, managers and physicians can establish advisory councils to review policies, procedures, and equipment selection. Practice administrators should recognize the importance of strong nursing leadership on frontline staff satisfaction and provide the necessary training and support to managers who supervise clinical areas. Considered together, these strategies that derive from empirical findings are likely to retain oncology nurses and minimize the impact of turnover on the pressing shortage of oncology providers.

References

1. Institute of Medicine. *The Future of Nursing: Leading Change, Advancing Health*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2010.
2. Hewitt M, Simone JV, eds. *Ensuring Quality Cancer Care*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 1999.
3. Aiken LH, Smith HL, Lake ET. Lower Medicare mortality among a set of hospitals known for good nursing care. *Med Care*. 1994;32:771-787.
4. Friese CR, Lake ET, Aiken LH, Silber JH, Sochalski J. Hospital nurse practice environments and outcomes for surgical oncology patients. *Health Serv Res*. 2008;43:1145-1163.
5. Lake ET. The nursing practice environment: measurement and evidence. *Med Care Res Rev*. 2007;64(Suppl 2):104S-122S.
6. Page A, ed. *Keeping Patients Safe: Transforming the Work Environment of Nurses*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press; 2004.
7. Titler MG. Translation science and context. *Res Theory Nurs Pract*. 2010;24:35-55.
8. Institute of Medicine. *Ensuring Quality Cancer Care Through the Oncology Workforce: Sustaining Care in the 21st Century*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2009.
9. Friese CR, Himes-Ferris L, Frasier MN, McCullagh MC, Griggs JJ. Structures and processes of care in ambulatory oncology settings and nurse-reported exposure to chemotherapy [published online ahead of print 2011]. *BMJ Qual Saf*. 2012; 21:753-759.
10. Donabedian A. Evaluating the quality of medical care. *Milbank Q*. 1966;44:166-206.
11. Kamimura A, Schneider K, Lee CS, Crawford SD, Friese CR. Practice environments of nurses in ambulatory oncology settings: a thematic analysis. *Cancer Nurs*. 2012;35:E1-E7.
12. Friese CR, Lee CS, O'Brien S, Crawford SD. Multi-mode and method experiment in a study of nurses. May 2010. <http://surveypractice.org/2010/10/27/multi-mode-nurses-survey>. Accessed July 30, 2012.
13. Dillman DA, Smyth JD, Christian LM. *Internet, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method*. 3rd ed. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley; 2009.
14. Lake ET. Advances in understanding and predicting nurse turnover. *Res Social Health Care*. 1998;15:147-171.
15. Lake ET. Development of the Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index. *Res Nurs Health*. 2002;25:176-188.
16. Friese CR. Nurse practice environments and outcomes: implications for oncology nursing. *Oncol Nurs Forum*. 2005;32: 765-772.
17. Friese CR. Practice environments of nurses employed in ambulatory oncology settings: measure refinement. *Oncol Nurs Forum*. 2012;39:166-172.