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Nursing Presence....

...is the intersubjective human connectedness shared between nurse and patient, manifested through compassionate concern, openness and commitment to another grounded in knowledge, direct and indirect physical availability and empathetic attention.

(Kostovich, in press)
Nursing Presence....

... exists in the cognitive, behavioral, affective, and spiritual domains all at once.

Nursing Presence....

... is the “being with” and “doing for” patients.
1. What are registered nurses’ perceptions of being present for their patients?

2. What is the relationship between nurses’ perceptions of nursing presence and professional commitment, job satisfaction, practice environment, and personality type?

3. Is there a difference in the RNs’ perception of nursing presence based on their certification, status, specialty area, shift, education, age, number of years an RN, and gender?
Participants

- 89 RNs from a Department of Veterans Affairs acute care hospital and extended care facility
- 87 surveys with complete data
- Response rate = 91.5%
Demographics

Gender:
- Male: N=11 (12.6%)
- Female: N=76 (87.4%)

Marital Status:
- Married: N=58 (66.7%)
- Single: N=18 (18%)
- Divorced: N=8 (9.2%)
- Widowed: N=1 (1.1%)
Demographics

Race:
- Black: N= 10 (11.5%)
- White: N=28 (32.2%)
- Asian/Pacific Islander: N= 45 (51.7%)
- American Indian/Alaskan Native: N=2 (2.3%)

Ethnicity:
- Hispanic: N=3 (3.4%)
- Non-Hispanic: N=75 (86.2%)
Demographics

**Education:**

- Diploma: N= 12 (13.8%)
- Associates Degree: N=18 (20.7%)
- Baccalaureate Degree: N=50 (57.5%)
- Masters Degree: N= 4 (4.6%)
- Non-Nsg UG Degree: N=1 (1.1%)
Demographics

- **Certification:**
  - YES: N= 44 (50.6%)
  - NO: N= 38 (43.7%)

- **Status:**
  - 36-40 hours/week: N=74 (85.1%)
  - >40 hours/week: N=12 (13.8%)
Demographics

Shift:

- Days- 8 hours: N=31 (35.6%)
- Evenings- 8 hours: N=10 (11.5%)
- Nights- 8 hours: N=15 (17.2%)
- Days- 12 hours: N=15 (17.2%)
- Nights- 12 hours: N=8 (9.2%)
- Other- N=7 (8%)
Research Question#1
What are RNs’ Perceptions of Nursing Presence?

- Instrument developed: Presence of Nursing Scale-RN Version (PONS-RN)
  - Content validity: Established by 2 content experts
  - Substantive validity: Established by 21 RNs
    - Matched 64 items to conceptual definitions of sub-constructs of nursing presence
    - Instrument reduced to 32 items
Construct Validity

• Factor Analysis
  • 32 items reduced to 18
  • 2 factors emerged:
    • “Doing for” the patient (12 items)
    • “Being with” the patient (6 items)
  • Consistent with Paterson & Zderad’s Humanistic Nursing Theory (1976)
PONS-RN: Sample Items
“Doing For” Subscale

Likert Scale 1-5 / Strongly Disagree → Strongly Agree

• “I taught my patients what they needed to know.”
• “I was able to prioritize the care of my patients.”
• “I knew what would work to make my patients better.”
## Factor 1: Doing For

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1 Item Loadings</th>
<th>Factor 2 Item Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knew when to intervene</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>0.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient as Individual</td>
<td>0.711</td>
<td>0.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care met my standards</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What works to make pt better</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>0.294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1 Item Loadings</th>
<th>Factor 2 Item Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listened</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacted support staff prn</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>0.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized care</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned care</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical comfort</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient teaching</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PONS-RN: Sample Items
“Being With” Subscale

Likert Scale 1-5 / Strongly Disagree ➔ Strongly Agree

• “I talked to my patients about non-health-related topics.”
• “I held my patient’s hand or patted their arm when I felt they needed a human touch.”
• “I am willing to open myself up to my patients.”
Factor 2: Being With

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 2 Item Loadings</th>
<th>Factor 1 Item Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally engaged</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk about non-health topics</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>-.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share feelings</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive to patient beliefs</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human touch</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open up to patients</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliability

• Total scale: Cronbach’s $\alpha=0.910$
• Factor 1 “Doing For” (12 items)
  • Cronbach’s $\alpha=0.916$
• Factor 2 “Being With” (6 items)
  • Cronbach’s $\alpha=0.877$
Research Question #1
What are RNs’ Perceptions of Nursing Presence?

• RNs perceive themselves as being highly present to their patients
  • “Doing For:” Mean score = 54.47 (possible 60)
  • “Being With:” Mean score = 24.33 (possible 30)
Research Question #2

What is the relationship between nurses’ perceptions of nursing presence and professional commitment, job satisfaction, practice environment, and personality type?
Instruments

• Professional Commitment Scale (adapted from Aranya, Pollock & Amernic, 1981)- 8 items
  • 5-point Likert scale (strongly disagree - strongly agree)
  • Reliability: Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.969$
  • “I am loyal to the nursing profession.”
  • “I am proud to tell people that I am an RN.”
Professional Commitment

• No significant correlation between Professional Commitment and:
  • PONS-RN “Doing For” subscale:  
    \[ r = .149 \ (p = .172) \]
  • PONS-RN “Being With” subscale:  
    \[ r = .077 \ (p = .483) \]
• McCloskey-Mueller Job Satisfaction Survey (MMJS) (1990) - 31 items
  • 5-point Likert scale (very dissatisfied- very satisfied)
  • 3 items changed
  • Total scale reliability: Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.936$
  • 8 sub-scales
## Instruments: MMJS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale 1: <strong>Extrinsic Rewards</strong>; 3 items; Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.783$</th>
<th>Subscale 5: <strong>Interaction opportunities</strong>; 4 items; Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.734$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 2: <strong>Scheduling</strong>; 6 items; Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.841$</td>
<td>Subscale 6: <strong>Professional opportunities</strong>; 4 items; Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.803$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 3: <strong>Family-work balance</strong>; 3 items; Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.570$</td>
<td>Subscale 7: <strong>Praise and recognition</strong>; 4 items; Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.843$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 4: <strong>Co-workers</strong>; 2 items; Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.706$</td>
<td>Subscale 8: <strong>Control and responsibility</strong>; 5 items; Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.874$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Job Satisfaction

• Significant correlations between 7 Job Satisfaction subscales and PONS-RN “Doing for” subscale:
  • *Praise and recognition (r=0.376; p=0.000)
  • *Control and responsibility (r=0.369; p=0.001)
  • *Professional opportunities (r=0.320; p=0.003)
  • *Interaction opportunities (r=0.267; p=0.013)
  • *Family-Work balance (r=0.244; p=0.030)
  • *Scheduling (r=0.232; p=0.034)
  • *Co-workers (r=0.231; p=0.033)
  • Extrinsic rewards (r=-0.047; p=0.668)
Job Satisfaction

• Significant correlations between 2 Job Satisfaction subscales and PONS-RN “Being With” subscale:
  • *Interaction opportunities (r=0.220; p=0.043)
  • *Professional opportunities (r=0.220; p=0.045)
  • Family-Work balance (r=0.144; p=0.209)
  • Control and responsibility (r=0.030; p=0.791)
  • Praise and recognition (r=0.097; p=0.376)
  • Extrinsic rewards (r=0.011; p=0.916)
  • Co-workers (r=0.190; p=0.080)
  • Scheduling (r=-0.039; p=0.724)
• Practice Environment/Staffing & Resource Adequacy Subscale (Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index, Lake, 2002)
4 items
  • 5-point Likert scale (strongly disagree - strongly agree)
  • Reliability: Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.898$
  • “My unit has enough staff to get the work done.”
  • “There are adequate support services to allow me to spend time with my patients.”
• Small but significant positive correlation between Practice Environment and PONS-RN “Doing For” subscale

\( r=0.243; \ p=0.024 \)
Practice Environment

- No significant correlation between Practice Environment and:
  - “Being With” subscale:
    \[ r = -0.029 \quad (p = 0.788) \]
• Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® - 93 items
  • Based on psychologist Carl Jung’s work
  • Dichotomous items
  • **Measures personality on 4 opposing dimensions:**
    • Introvert-Extravert
    • Sensing-Intuition
    • Thinking-Feeling
    • Judging-Perceiving
• “Extravert” nurses scored significantly higher on the PONS-RN “Being With” Subscale than “Introvert” nurses ($t=-3.550; p=0.001$)
Research Question #3

Is there a difference in the RNs’ perception of nursing presence based on their certification, status, specialty area, shift, education, age, number of years an RN, and gender?
Certification

- No significant difference in scoring on the PONS-RN subscales between certified and non-certified RNs:
  - **PONS-RN “Doing For”**
    - \( t=0.512; \ p=0.610 \)
  - **PONS-RN “Being With”**
    - \( t=1.631; \ p=0.107 \)
Status

• No significant difference in scoring on the PONS-RN subscales between nurses working full-time and > full-time:
  • PONS-RN “Doing For” (t=0.054; p=0.958)
  • PONS-RN “Being With” (t=0.816; p=0.425)
Gender

- No significant difference in scoring on the PONS-RN subscales between male and female nurses:
  - **PONS-RN “Doing For”**
    (t=0.294; p=0.774)
  - **PONS-RN “Being With”**
    (t=0.793; p=0.801)
• No significant difference in scoring on the PONS-RN subscales between nurses working day shift and other shifts:
  • **PONS-RN “Doing For”** (t=0.93; p=0.926)
  • **PONS-RN “Being With”** (t=1.031; p=0.306)
Area of Practice: Acute vs. LTC

- No significant difference in scoring on the PONS-RN subscales between nurses working acute care and LTC:
  - **PONS-RN “Doing For”**
    \( t=1.273; p=0.206 \)
  - **PONS-RN “Being With”**
    \( t=0.904; p=0.369 \)
Age

• No significant relationship in scores on the PONS-RN subscales and nurses’ age:
  • PONS-RN “Doing For” (r=0.132; p=0.248)
  • PONS-RN “Being With” (r=0.043; p=0.708)
Number of Years RN

- No significant relationship in scores on the PONS-RN subscales and number of years an RN:
  - **PONS-RN “Doing For”**
    - \( r=0.188; \ p=0.095 \)
  - **PONS-RN “Being With”**
    - \( r=0.019; \ p=0.870 \)
Education

• No significant difference on the PONS-RN subscales among nurses with varied educational background:
  • **PONS-RN “Doing For”**  
    \[ F(4,79)=0.740; \ p=0.567 \]
  • **PONS-RN “Being With”**  
    \[ F(4,79)=0.330; \ p=0.857 \]
Limitations

- Small sample size
- One data collection site
• Examine PONS-RN rating scale (data skewed toward positive end)
• Further evaluate the PONS-RN in other settings
• Collect data with larger sample size (multi-site) to strengthen psychometric properties of the PONS-RN
Thank you!

Questions?

kostovich@sxu.edu