AACN Survey - 2022

## Demographics

One thousand, four hundred and eleven (1,411) RNs participated in this study from 5 countries (Cyprus: n=264, Spain: n=435, Croatia: n=290, Poland: n=105, and Romania: n=317). With respect to their gender, 15% identified as Male, 52% as Female, and 33.3% preferred not to answer or didn;t provide a response. Their mean age was 37.3 years (SD = 9.9).

**Table 1**: Demographic characteristics

| Characteristic | Overall, N = 1,4111 | Cyprus, N = 2641 | Spain, N = 4351 | Croatia, N = 2901 | Poland, N = 1051 | Romania, N = 3171 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Male | 206 (15%) | 67 (25%) | 40 (9.2%) | 62 (21%) | 7 (6.7%) | 30 (9.5%) |  |
| Female | 740 (52%) | 113 (43%) | 189 (43%) | 172 (59%) | 65 (62%) | 201 (63%) |  |
| Prefer not to answer | 89 (6.3%) | 14 (5.3%) | 2 (0.5%) | 19 (6.6%) | 3 (2.9%) | 51 (16%) |  |
| (Missing) | 376 (27%) | 70 (27%) | 204 (47%) | 37 (13%) | 30 (29%) | 35 (11%) |  |
| Age [Mean (SD)] | 37.3 (9.9) | 34.9 (8.1) | 38.8 (10.6) | 32.9 (9.8) | 42.4 (9.7) | 41.0 (8.0) | <0.001 |
| Unknown | 434 | 75 | 204 | 37 | 30 | 88 |  |
| Please indicate whether you have University education |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Yes | 748 (53%) | 194 (73%) | 231 (53%) | 120 (41%) | 68 (65%) | 135 (43%) |  |
| No | 256 (18%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 133 (46%) | 7 (6.7%) | 116 (37%) |  |
| (Missing) | 407 (29%) | 70 (27%) | 204 (47%) | 37 (13%) | 30 (29%) | 66 (21%) |  |
| What is the highest degree you have received? |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Diploma in Nursing | 296 (21%) | 2 (0.8%) | 62 (14%) | 76 (26%) | 7 (6.7%) | 149 (47%) |  |
| Bachelor Degree | 410 (29%) | 127 (48%) | 39 (9.0%) | 139 (48%) | 12 (11%) | 93 (29%) |  |
| Master’s degree in Nursing | 246 (17%) | 53 (20%) | 103 (24%) | 36 (12%) | 43 (41%) | 11 (3.5%) |  |
| Master’s degree in Non – Nursing | 49 (3.5%) | 6 (2.3%) | 17 (3.9%) | 0 (0%) | 10 (9.5%) | 16 (5.0%) |  |
| Doctoral Degree in Nursing in Non – Nursing | 18 (1.3%) | 1 (0.4%) | 10 (2.3%) | 2 (0.7%) | 3 (2.9%) | 2 (0.6%) |  |
| (Missing) | 392 (28%) | 75 (28%) | 204 (47%) | 37 (13%) | 30 (29%) | 46 (15%) |  |
| Did you attend a special training/education in critical/intensive care nursing? |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Yes | 470 (33%) | 96 (36%) | 189 (43%) | 22 (7.6%) | 63 (60%) | 100 (32%) |  |
| No | 543 (38%) | 97 (37%) | 42 (9.7%) | 231 (80%) | 12 (11%) | 161 (51%) |  |
| (Missing) | 398 (28%) | 71 (27%) | 204 (47%) | 37 (13%) | 30 (29%) | 56 (18%) |  |
| Years of total nursing experience | 14.2 (10.1) | 11.8 (8.3) | 15.8 (10.6) | 11.3 (9.9) | 19.9 (12.1) | 15.7 (9.1) | <0.001 |
| Unknown | 401 | 71 | 204 | 37 | 30 | 59 |  |
| Years of nursing experience in critical/intensive care unit | 10.8 (9.2) | 7.6 (7.0) | 11.9 (9.5) | 9.3 (8.9) | 13.8 (11.3) | 12.7 (9.0) | <0.001 |
| Unknown | 413 | 84 | 204 | 37 | 30 | 58 |  |
| Current position |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Unit Manager | 76 (5.4%) | 27 (10%) | 11 (2.5%) | 27 (9.3%) | 6 (5.7%) | 5 (1.6%) |  |
| Bed Side Nurse | 903 (64%) | 159 (60%) | 205 (47%) | 214 (74%) | 60 (57%) | 265 (84%) |  |
| Unit Educator | 16 (1.1%) | 3 (1.1%) | 10 (2.3%) | 2 (0.7%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.3%) |  |
| Other (please specify) | 34 (2.4%) | 4 (1.5%) | 5 (1.1%) | 10 (3.4%) | 9 (8.6%) | 6 (1.9%) |  |
| (Missing) | 382 (27%) | 71 (27%) | 204 (47%) | 37 (13%) | 30 (29%) | 40 (13%) |  |
| Place of current work |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Clinical Practice | 837 (59%) | 70 (27%) | 216 (50%) | 211 (73%) | 64 (61%) | 276 (87%) |  |
| Education | 18 (1.3%) | 4 (1.5%) | 2 (0.5%) | 10 (3.4%) | 2 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) |  |
| Management | 23 (1.6%) | 7 (2.7%) | 9 (2.1%) | 3 (1.0%) | 4 (3.8%) | 0 (0%) |  |
| Other (Please specify) | 44 (3.1%) | 6 (2.3%) | 4 (0.9%) | 29 (10%) | 5 (4.8%) | 0 (0%) |  |
| (Missing) | 489 (35%) | 177 (67%) | 204 (47%) | 37 (13%) | 30 (29%) | 41 (13%) |  |
| Type of institution |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Public | 796 (56%) | 60 (23%) | 143 (33%) | 251 (87%) | 67 (64%) | 275 (87%) |  |
| Private | 57 (4.0%) | 26 (9.8%) | 25 (5.7%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (5.7%) | 0 (0%) |  |
| Other | 68 (4.8%) | 1 (0.4%) | 63 (14%) | 2 (0.7%) | 2 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) |  |
| (Missing) | 490 (35%) | 177 (67%) | 204 (47%) | 37 (13%) | 30 (29%) | 42 (13%) |  |
| Type of ICU |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| General(Mixed) | 655 (46%) | 149 (56%) | 164 (38%) | 61 (21%) | 55 (52%) | 226 (71%) |  |
| Medical-Surgical | 121 (8.6%) | 6 (2.3%) | 29 (6.7%) | 65 (22%) | 2 (1.9%) | 19 (6.0%) |  |
| Coronay | 31 (2.2%) | 5 (1.9%) | 9 (2.1%) | 13 (4.5%) | 4 (3.8%) | 0 (0%) |  |
| Cardiac Surgery | 46 (3.3%) | 3 (1.1%) | 5 (1.1%) | 14 (4.8%) | 2 (1.9%) | 22 (6.9%) |  |
| Neuro Surgery | 91 (6.4%) | 0 (0%) | 16 (3.7%) | 66 (23%) | 9 (8.6%) | 0 (0%) |  |
| Other | 77 (5.5%) | 28 (11%) | 8 (1.8%) | 34 (12%) | 3 (2.9%) | 4 (1.3%) |  |
| (Missing) | 390 (28%) | 73 (28%) | 204 (47%) | 37 (13%) | 30 (29%) | 46 (15%) |  |
| 1n (%); Mean (SD) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test; One-way ANOVA | | | | | | | |

## Section A —————————————————————

### Job satisfaction as an RN

Overall, 56% of the respondents are very satisfied with being a registered nurse. The highest on average satisfaction [on the scale 1 to 4] is observed in Spain [3.6 (SD=0.8)] and the lowest in Croatia [3.1 (SD=0.7)]

**Table 2**: Independent of your present job how satisfied are you with being a registered nurse?

|  | Overall, N = 1,4111 | Cyprus, N = 2641 | Spain, N = 4351 | Croatia, N = 2901 | Poland, N = 1051 | Romania, N = 3171 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Independent of your present job how satisfied are you with being a registered nurse? |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Very satisfied | 787 (56%) | 153 (58%) | 309 (71%) | 88 (30%) | 41 (39%) | 196 (62%) |  |
| Somewhat satisfied | 481 (34%) | 94 (36%) | 77 (18%) | 163 (56%) | 57 (54%) | 90 (28%) |  |
| Somewhat dissatisfied | 92 (6.5%) | 14 (5.3%) | 34 (7.8%) | 26 (9.0%) | 6 (5.7%) | 12 (3.8%) |  |
| Very dissatisfied | 51 (3.6%) | 3 (1.1%) | 15 (3.4%) | 13 (4.5%) | 1 (1.0%) | 19 (6.0%) |  |
| Mean satisfaction (SD) | 3.4 (0.8) | 3.5 (0.7) | 3.6 (0.8) | 3.1 (0.7) | 3.3 (0.6) | 3.5 (0.8) | <0.001 |
| 1n (%); Mean (SD)  Mean rating (SD): Mean of scores ranging from 1 (Very dissatisfied) to 4 (Very satisfied) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test; One-way ANOVA | | | | | | | |

### Advice a qualified individual to pursue a career in Nursing

Overall, 75% of the respondents definitely would, or probably would advice a qualified individual to pursue a career in Nursing. Romania is most likely (on average, on the scale 1 to 4) to advice in this direction [3.2 (SD = 0.7)].

**Table 3**: How likely are you to advice a qualified individual to pursue a career in Nursing?

|  | Overall, N = 1,4111 | Cyprus, N = 2641 | Spain, N = 4351 | Croatia, N = 2901 | Poland, N = 1051 | Romania, N = 3171 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| How likely are you to advice a qualified individual to pursue a career in Nursing? |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Definitely would | 353 (25%) | 48 (18%) | 108 (25%) | 45 (16%) | 25 (24%) | 127 (40%) |  |
| Probably would | 701 (50%) | 133 (50%) | 223 (51%) | 148 (51%) | 47 (45%) | 150 (47%) |  |
| Probably would not | 286 (20%) | 64 (24%) | 81 (19%) | 82 (28%) | 28 (27%) | 31 (9.8%) |  |
| Definitely would not | 71 (5.0%) | 19 (7.2%) | 23 (5.3%) | 15 (5.2%) | 5 (4.8%) | 9 (2.8%) |  |
| Mean likelihood (SD) | 2.9 (0.8) | 2.8 (0.8) | 3.0 (0.8) | 2.8 (0.8) | 2.9 (0.8) | 3.2 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| 1n (%); Mean (SD)  Mean rating (SD): Mean of scores ranging from 1 (Definitely would not) to 4 (Definitely would) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test; One-way ANOVA | | | | | | | |

### Quality of care for patients in your unit

Overall, 81% of the respondents would you describe the quality of care for patients in their unit as Excellent or Good. Respondents from Romania have a higher score in the rating on average (on the scale 1 to 4) - [3.2 (SD = 0.8)] and Poland the lowest [2.9 (SD=0.7)]

**Table 4**: How would you describe the quality of care for patients in your unit?

|  | Overall, N = 1,4111 | Cyprus, N = 2641 | Spain, N = 4351 | Croatia, N = 2901 | Poland, N = 1051 | Romania, N = 3171 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| How would you describe the quality of care for patients in your unit? |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 361 (26%) | 57 (22%) | 73 (17%) | 102 (35%) | 17 (16%) | 112 (35%) |  |
| Good | 794 (56%) | 148 (56%) | 293 (67%) | 130 (45%) | 65 (62%) | 158 (50%) |  |
| Fair | 211 (15%) | 49 (19%) | 55 (13%) | 56 (19%) | 17 (16%) | 34 (11%) |  |
| Poor | 45 (3.2%) | 10 (3.8%) | 14 (3.2%) | 2 (0.7%) | 6 (5.7%) | 13 (4.1%) |  |
| Mean rating (SD) | 3.0 (0.7) | 3.0 (0.7) | 3.0 (0.7) | 3.1 (0.7) | 2.9 (0.7) | 3.2 (0.8) | <0.001 |
| 1n (%); Mean (SD)  Mean rating (SD): Mean of scores ranging from 1 (Poor) to 4 (Excellent) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test; One-way ANOVA | | | | | | | |

### Are you aware of any Healthy Work Environment Standards in ICU?

Fifty-three percent (53%) stated they are aware of some Healthy Work Environment Standards in ICU. There were statistically significant differences (p<0.001) across the countries, with Spain having the lowest proportion of awareness and Poland the highest (Cyprus:68%, Spain:27%, Croatia:65%, Poland:69%, Romania:62%)

**Table 5**: Are you aware of any Healthy Work Environment Standards in ICU?

|  | Overall, N = 1,4111 | Cyprus, N = 2641 | Spain, N = 4351 | Croatia, N = 2901 | Poland, N = 1051 | Romania, N = 3171 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Are you aware of any Healthy Work Environment Standards in ICU? | 753 (53%) | 178 (67%) | 116 (27%) | 189 (65%) | 72 (69%) | 198 (62%) | <0.001 |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test | | | | | | | |

### Implementation of HWE standards

Twenty-five percent (25.2%) stated that their *UNIT* is well on its way or has fully implemented some Healthy Work Environment Standards. There were statistically significant differences (p<0.001) across the countries, with Romania having the highest proportion (55%) of “Well on their way” or Full implementation”, and Spain and Poland having the lowest [Cyprus:30.9%, Spain:8.5%, Croatia:16.1%, Poland:10.5%, and Romania:55%]. An overall 31% are not aware if any standards have been implemented.

Similarly, 24.2% stated that their *ORGANISATION* is well on its way or has fully implemented some Healthy Work Environment Standards. There were statistically significant differences (p<0.001) across the countries, with Romania having the highest proportion (53%) of “Well on their way” or Full implementation”, and Spain and Poland having the lowest [Cyprus:27.5%, Spain:6.4%, Croatia:17.4%, Poland:11.5%, and Romania:53%]. An overall 36% are not aware if any standards have been implemented.

**Table 6**: Implementation of HWE standards

|  | Overall, N = 1,4111 | Cyprus, N = 2641 | Spain, N = 4351 | Croatia, N = 2901 | Poland, N = 1051 | Romania, N = 3171 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Has your unit implemented any Healthy Work Environment Standards? |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Not at all | 480 (34%) | 74 (28%) | 198 (46%) | 104 (36%) | 57 (54%) | 47 (15%) |  |
| Just beginning | 142 (10%) | 43 (16%) | 16 (3.7%) | 49 (17%) | 14 (13%) | 20 (6.3%) |  |
| Well on the way | 247 (18%) | 68 (26%) | 26 (6.0%) | 38 (13%) | 5 (4.8%) | 110 (35%) |  |
| Fully implemented | 101 (7.2%) | 13 (4.9%) | 11 (2.5%) | 9 (3.1%) | 6 (5.7%) | 62 (20%) |  |
| Do not know | 441 (31%) | 66 (25%) | 184 (42%) | 90 (31%) | 23 (22%) | 78 (25%) |  |
| Has your Organization implemented any Healthy Work Environment Standards? |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Not at all | 431 (31%) | 59 (22%) | 189 (43%) | 80 (28%) | 59 (56%) | 44 (14%) |  |
| Just beginning | 138 (9.8%) | 53 (20%) | 15 (3.4%) | 44 (15%) | 9 (8.6%) | 17 (5.4%) |  |
| Well on the way | 233 (17%) | 61 (23%) | 17 (3.9%) | 44 (15%) | 5 (4.8%) | 106 (33%) |  |
| Fully implemented | 101 (7.2%) | 12 (4.5%) | 11 (2.5%) | 7 (2.4%) | 7 (6.7%) | 64 (20%) |  |
| Do not know | 508 (36%) | 79 (30%) | 203 (47%) | 115 (40%) | 25 (24%) | 86 (27%) |  |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test | | | | | | | |

## Section B ————————————————————-

One thousand, two hundred and three RNs (1203) completed Section B (the HWE scale).

### Dimensions

* **AACN Standards - In your Unit**

Overall, with respect to the AACN’s six essential standards, and in the RN’s Unit, the mean [on the scale of 1 to 4] Skilled Communication level is 2.2 (SD = 0.7) , True collaboration mean level is at 2.4 (SD=0.7), Effective Decision Making is at 2.3 (0.6), Appropriate staffing is at 2.4 (0.7), Meaningful recognition at 2.4 (0.7) and Authentic leadership is at 2.4 (0.7). There were statistically significant differences across the five countries in all six standards.

**Table 7**: Mean level (SD) of AACN Standars - In the Unit

| AACN Standard | Overall, N = 1,2031 | Cyprus, N = 2281 | Spain, N = 3071 | Croatia, N = 2771 | Poland, N = 871 | Romania, N = 3041 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Skilled Communication | 2.2 (0.7) | 2.2 (0.6) | 2.3 (0.6) | 2.4 (0.6) | 2.5 (0.6) | 1.9 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| True Collaboration | 2.4 (0.7) | 2.2 (0.6) | 2.7 (0.6) | 2.5 (0.6) | 2.8 (0.6) | 2.1 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| Effective Decision-Making | 2.3 (0.6) | 2.1 (0.5) | 2.4 (0.6) | 2.4 (0.6) | 2.5 (0.5) | 2.1 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| Appropriate Staffing | 2.4 (0.7) | 2.3 (0.7) | 2.6 (0.6) | 2.4 (0.7) | 2.9 (0.7) | 2.1 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| Meaningful Recognition | 2.4 (0.7) | 2.3 (0.6) | 2.5 (0.6) | 2.7 (0.7) | 2.6 (0.5) | 2.1 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| Authentic Leadership | 2.4 (0.7) | 2.3 (0.6) | 2.6 (0.7) | 2.5 (0.7) | 2.6 (0.6) | 2.0 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| 1Mean (SD) / Mean of scores ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree); a higher score indicates a higher level of of the AACN standard | | | | | | | |
| 2One-way ANOVA | | | | | | | |

* **AACN items - Unit**

Table below, shows the mean level of agreement [1: Strongly Disagree, 4:Strongly Agree] in the 16 AACN items with respect to the **Unit**.

**Table 8**: HWE in your Unit: Mean (SD) level of agreement

|  | Overall, N = 1,2031 | Cyprus, N = 2281 | Spain, N = 3071 | Croatia, N = 2771 | Poland, N = 871 | Romania, N = 3041 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RNs are as proficient in communication skills as they are in clinical skills. - In your work unit | 3.9 (0.7) | 3.9 (0.7) | 4.0 (0.7) | 3.8 (0.7) | 3.8 (0.8) | 4.2 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| All team members are provided with support for and access to education programs that develop communication and collaboration skills - In your work unit | 3.6 (0.8) | 3.7 (0.7) | 3.4 (0.8) | 3.5 (0.7) | 3.2 (0.8) | 4.0 (0.8) | <0.001 |
| RNs are relentless in pursuing and fostering true collaboration - In your work unit | 3.9 (0.7) | 3.9 (0.7) | 3.7 (0.8) | 3.7 (0.7) | 3.8 (0.7) | 4.2 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| A structured process is provided to resolve disputes among/between members of the healthcare team. - In your work unit | 3.4 (0.8) | 3.6 (0.7) | 3.0 (0.7) | 3.3 (0.8) | 2.9 (0.8) | 3.8 (0.8) | <0.001 |
| A structured process is provided to resolve disputes among/between the healthcare team and patients and their families. - In your work unit | 3.5 (0.8) | 3.8 (0.7) | 3.2 (0.8) | 3.5 (0.8) | 2.9 (0.7) | 3.8 (0.8) | <0.001 |
| RNs are valued and committed partners in making policy, directing and evaluating clinical care, and leading organizational operations. - In your work unit | 3.7 (0.8) | 4.0 (0.7) | 3.4 (0.8) | 3.5 (0.8) | 3.5 (0.7) | 3.9 (0.8) | <0.001 |
| Structured processes are in place to ensure that the perspective of patients and their families are incorporated into decisions affecting patient care - In your work unit | 3.6 (0.8) | 3.8 (0.7) | 3.5 (0.8) | 3.5 (0.8) | 3.3 (0.7) | 3.9 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| RNs are engaged in the selection, adaptation, and evaluation of technologies that increase the effectiveness of nursing care delivery. - In your work unit | 3.8 (0.8) | 3.9 (0.7) | 3.8 (0.8) | 3.7 (0.7) | 3.5 (0.8) | 3.9 (0.8) | <0.001 |
| RNs have opportunities to influence decisions that affect the quality of patient care. - In your work unit | 3.9 (0.7) | 4.0 (0.7) | 3.8 (0.8) | 3.9 (0.7) | 3.7 (0.7) | 3.8 (0.8) | 0.054 |
| RN staffing ensures the effective match between patient needs and nurse competencies - In your work unit | 3.8 (0.8) | 3.9 (0.9) | 3.7 (0.8) | 3.8 (0.9) | 3.1 (0.9) | 4.0 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| There are formal processes to evaluate the effect of staffing decisions on patient and system outcomes. - In your work unit | 3.4 (0.8) | 3.5 (0.8) | 3.0 (0.7) | 3.4 (0.8) | 3.1 (0.8) | 3.8 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| RNs are recognized for the value each brings to the work of the organization. - In your work unit | 3.4 (0.9) | 3.6 (0.8) | 3.1 (0.8) | 3.2 (0.8) | 3.2 (0.7) | 3.7 (0.9) | <0.001 |
| RNs recognize others for the value they bring to the work of the organization. - In your work unit | 3.8 (0.7) | 3.9 (0.6) | 3.8 (0.7) | 3.4 (0.7) | 3.6 (0.6) | 4.1 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| Nurse leaders (formal and informal) fully embrace the concept of a healthy work environment. - In your work unit | 3.6 (0.8) | 3.7 (0.7) | 3.4 (0.8) | 3.5 (0.8) | 3.4 (0.8) | 4.0 (0.8) | <0.001 |
| Nurse leaders (formal and informal) engage others in achieving a healthy work environment. - In your work unit | 3.6 (0.8) | 3.7 (0.7) | 3.4 (0.8) | 3.5 (0.8) | 3.4 (0.8) | 4.0 (0.8) | <0.001 |
| Nurse leaders (formal and informal) receive support for and have access to educational programs to ensure that they develop and enhance their knowledge and abilities. - In your work unit | 3.7 (0.8) | 3.8 (0.7) | 3.5 (0.8) | 3.6 (0.8) | 3.2 (0.7) | 4.0 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| 1Mean (SD) / Mean of scores ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree); a higher score indicates a higher level of of the AACN standard | | | | | | | |
| 2One-way ANOVA | | | | | | | |

* **AACN Standards - In the Organisation**

Overall, in the 5 countries, with respect to the AACN’s six essential standards, and in the RN’s Organisation, the mean Skilled Communication level is 2.3 (SD = 0.7) on the scale of 1 to 4, True collaboration mean level is at 2.5 (SD=0.7), Effective Decision Making is at 2.4 (0.6), Appropriate staffing is at 2.5 (0.7), Meaningful recognition at 2.5 (0.7) and Authentic leadership is at 2.5 (0.7). There were statistically significant differences across the five countries in all six standards.

**Table 9**: Mean level (SD) of AACN Standars - In the Organisation

| AACN Standard | Overall, N = 1,2031 | Cyprus, N = 2281 | Spain, N = 3071 | Croatia, N = 2771 | Poland, N = 871 | Romania, N = 3041 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Skilled Communication | 2.3 (0.7) | 2.3 (0.7) | 2.4 (0.6) | 2.5 (0.6) | 2.7 (0.6) | 2.0 (0.6) | <0.001 |
| True Collaboration | 2.5 (0.7) | 2.4 (0.6) | 2.8 (0.6) | 2.5 (0.6) | 2.9 (0.5) | 2.1 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| Effective Decision-Making | 2.4 (0.6) | 2.2 (0.5) | 2.5 (0.6) | 2.4 (0.6) | 2.7 (0.5) | 2.2 (0.6) | <0.001 |
| Appropriate Staffing | 2.5 (0.7) | 2.4 (0.7) | 2.8 (0.6) | 2.4 (0.7) | 3.1 (0.6) | 2.2 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| Meaningful Recognition | 2.5 (0.7) | 2.4 (0.6) | 2.6 (0.6) | 2.7 (0.7) | 2.8 (0.4) | 2.2 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| Authentic Leadership | 2.5 (0.7) | 2.4 (0.6) | 2.7 (0.7) | 2.5 (0.7) | 2.7 (0.6) | 2.1 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| 1Mean (SD) / Mean of scores ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree); a higher score indicates a higher level of of the AACN standard | | | | | | | |
| 2One-way ANOVA | | | | | | | |

* **AACN items - Organisation**

Table below, shows the mean level of agreement [1: Strongly Disagree, 4:Strongly Agree] in the 16 AACN items with respect to the **Organisation**.

**Table 10**: HWE in your Organisation: Mean (SD) level of agreement

|  | Overall, N = 1,2031 | Cyprus, N = 2281 | Spain, N = 3071 | Croatia, N = 2771 | Poland, N = 871 | Romania, N = 3041 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RNs are as proficient in communication skills as they are in clinical skills. - In your organization | 3.8 (0.7) | 3.7 (0.8) | 3.9 (0.7) | 3.6 (0.7) | 3.5 (0.8) | 4.0 (0.6) | <0.001 |
| All team members are provided with support for and access to education programs that develop communication and collaboration skills - In your organization | 3.5 (0.8) | 3.7 (0.8) | 3.4 (0.8) | 3.4 (0.7) | 3.1 (0.8) | 3.9 (0.8) | <0.001 |
| RNs are relentless in pursuing and fostering true collaboration - In your organization | 3.7 (0.7) | 3.8 (0.7) | 3.6 (0.7) | 3.6 (0.7) | 3.6 (0.7) | 4.1 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| A structured process is provided to resolve disputes among/between members of the healthcare team. - In your organization | 3.3 (0.8) | 3.5 (0.7) | 3.0 (0.7) | 3.3 (0.8) | 2.9 (0.7) | 3.8 (0.8) | <0.001 |
| A structured process is provided to resolve disputes among/between the healthcare team and patients and their families. - In your organization | 3.5 (0.8) | 3.6 (0.7) | 3.1 (0.7) | 3.5 (0.8) | 2.9 (0.7) | 3.8 (0.8) | <0.001 |
| RNs are valued and committed partners in making policy, directing and evaluating clinical care, and leading organizational operations. - In your organization | 3.6 (0.8) | 3.9 (0.7) | 3.3 (0.8) | 3.5 (0.8) | 3.3 (0.7) | 3.8 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| Structured processes are in place to ensure that the perspective of patients and their families are incorporated into decisions affecting patient care - In your organization | 3.6 (0.8) | 3.7 (0.7) | 3.4 (0.7) | 3.4 (0.8) | 3.2 (0.7) | 3.9 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| RNs are engaged in the selection, adaptation, and evaluation of technologies that increase the effectiveness of nursing care delivery. - In your organization | 3.7 (0.8) | 3.8 (0.8) | 3.7 (0.7) | 3.6 (0.7) | 3.3 (0.7) | 3.8 (0.8) | <0.001 |
| RNs have opportunities to influence decisions that affect the quality of patient care. - In your organization | 3.7 (0.7) | 3.8 (0.7) | 3.7 (0.7) | 3.8 (0.7) | 3.4 (0.7) | 3.8 (0.8) | <0.001 |
| RN staffing ensures the effective match between patient needs and nurse competencies - In your organization | 3.7 (0.8) | 3.8 (0.8) | 3.5 (0.8) | 3.8 (0.9) | 2.8 (0.7) | 3.9 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| There are formal processes to evaluate the effect of staffing decisions on patient and system outcomes. - In your organization | 3.3 (0.8) | 3.4 (0.8) | 2.9 (0.7) | 3.4 (0.8) | 3.0 (0.7) | 3.7 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| RNs are recognized for the value each brings to the work of the organization. - In your organization | 3.3 (0.8) | 3.4 (0.8) | 3.0 (0.7) | 3.2 (0.8) | 2.9 (0.6) | 3.6 (0.9) | <0.001 |
| RNs recognize others for the value they bring to the work of the organization. - In your organization | 3.7 (0.7) | 3.8 (0.6) | 3.7 (0.7) | 3.4 (0.7) | 3.5 (0.6) | 4.0 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| Nurse leaders (formal and informal) fully embrace the concept of a healthy work environment. - In your organization | 3.5 (0.8) | 3.5 (0.7) | 3.2 (0.8) | 3.4 (0.8) | 3.3 (0.7) | 3.8 (0.8) | <0.001 |
| Nurse leaders (formal and informal) engage others in achieving a healthy work environment. - In your organization | 3.5 (0.8) | 3.5 (0.7) | 3.2 (0.8) | 3.5 (0.8) | 3.3 (0.7) | 3.9 (0.8) | <0.001 |
| Nurse leaders (formal and informal) receive support for and have access to educational programs to ensure that they develop and enhance their knowledge and abilities. - In your organization | 3.6 (0.8) | 3.6 (0.7) | 3.4 (0.8) | 3.6 (0.8) | 3.2 (0.7) | 4.0 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| 1Mean (SD) / Mean of scores ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree); a higher score indicates a higher level of of the AACN standard | | | | | | | |
| 2One-way ANOVA | | | | | | | |

## Section C —————————————————————

One thousand, fifty-three RNs (1053) completed Section B (the HWE scale).

### Communication

* Distribution of responses

The table shows the distribution of responses across the four communication items [Nurses, Physicians, Nursing managers, and Hospital administration].

**Table 11**: How would you rate the quality of communication in your unit among the following?

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Communication between Nurses |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 231 (22%) | 48 (24%) | 69 (30%) | 25 (9.7%) | 5 (6.7%) | 84 (29%) |  |
| Good | 503 (48%) | 110 (56%) | 120 (52%) | 89 (35%) | 44 (59%) | 140 (48%) |  |
| Fair | 268 (25%) | 34 (17%) | 37 (16%) | 118 (46%) | 25 (33%) | 54 (18%) |  |
| Poor | 51 (4.8%) | 4 (2.0%) | 6 (2.6%) | 25 (9.7%) | 1 (1.3%) | 15 (5.1%) |  |
| Communication between nurses and Physicians |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 102 (9.7%) | 21 (11%) | 15 (6.5%) | 19 (7.4%) | 2 (2.7%) | 45 (15%) |  |
| Good | 440 (42%) | 101 (52%) | 92 (40%) | 65 (25%) | 34 (45%) | 148 (51%) |  |
| Fair | 392 (37%) | 63 (32%) | 97 (42%) | 129 (50%) | 33 (44%) | 70 (24%) |  |
| Poor | 119 (11%) | 11 (5.6%) | 28 (12%) | 44 (17%) | 6 (8.0%) | 30 (10%) |  |
| Communication between Nurses and unit Nursing Managers |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 197 (19%) | 28 (14%) | 16 (6.9%) | 24 (9.3%) | 4 (5.3%) | 125 (43%) |  |
| Good | 374 (36%) | 88 (45%) | 80 (34%) | 67 (26%) | 28 (37%) | 111 (38%) |  |
| Fair | 321 (30%) | 63 (32%) | 83 (36%) | 107 (42%) | 33 (44%) | 35 (12%) |  |
| Poor | 161 (15%) | 17 (8.7%) | 53 (23%) | 59 (23%) | 10 (13%) | 22 (7.5%) |  |
| Communication between Nurses and Hospital Administration |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 56 (5.3%) | 9 (4.6%) | 1 (0.4%) | 10 (3.9%) | 0 (0%) | 36 (12%) |  |
| Good | 199 (19%) | 44 (22%) | 16 (6.9%) | 42 (16%) | 8 (11%) | 89 (30%) |  |
| Fair | 364 (35%) | 88 (45%) | 43 (19%) | 110 (43%) | 30 (40%) | 93 (32%) |  |
| Poor | 434 (41%) | 55 (28%) | 172 (74%) | 95 (37%) | 37 (49%) | 75 (26%) |  |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test | | | | | | | |

* Distribution of Combined Proportion - Excellent/Good

The table shows the distribution of the combined response of Excellent/ Good across the four communication items [Nurses, Physicians, Nursing managers, and Hospital administration].

Overall, 70% of the respondents rate the quality of communication between Nurses, as **Excellent or Good**, 51% the communication between Nurses and Physicians, 54% the communication between Nurses and Nursing managers, and 24% the communication between Nurses and Hospital administration. There are statistically significant differences across the 5 countries with respect to all the communication items (p<0.001)

**Table 12**: How would you rate the quality of communication in your unit among the following?

Combined proportion of: Excellent/ Good

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Communication between Nurses | 734 (70%) | 158 (81%) | 189 (81%) | 114 (44%) | 49 (65%) | 224 (76%) | <0.001 |
| Communication between nurses and Physicians | 542 (51%) | 122 (62%) | 107 (46%) | 84 (33%) | 36 (48%) | 193 (66%) | <0.001 |
| Communication between Nurses and unit Nursing Managers | 571 (54%) | 116 (59%) | 96 (41%) | 91 (35%) | 32 (43%) | 236 (81%) | <0.001 |
| Communication between Nurses and Hospital Administration | 255 (24%) | 53 (27%) | 17 (7.3%) | 52 (20%) | 8 (11%) | 125 (43%) | <0.001 |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test | | | | | | | |

### Collaboration

* Distribution of responses

The table shows the distribution of responses across the four collaboration items [Nurses, Physicians, Nursing managers, and Hospital administration].

**Table 13**: How would you rate the quality of collaboration in your unit among the following?

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Collaboration between Nurses |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 244 (23%) | 68 (35%) | 50 (22%) | 39 (15%) | 9 (12%) | 78 (27%) |  |
| Good | 540 (51%) | 106 (54%) | 140 (60%) | 103 (40%) | 46 (61%) | 145 (49%) |  |
| Fair | 232 (22%) | 20 (10%) | 39 (17%) | 103 (40%) | 19 (25%) | 51 (17%) |  |
| Poor | 37 (3.5%) | 2 (1.0%) | 3 (1.3%) | 12 (4.7%) | 1 (1.3%) | 19 (6.5%) |  |
| Collaboration between nurses and Physicians |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 103 (9.8%) | 19 (9.7%) | 9 (3.9%) | 24 (9.3%) | 3 (4.0%) | 48 (16%) |  |
| Good | 501 (48%) | 120 (61%) | 110 (47%) | 76 (30%) | 42 (56%) | 153 (52%) |  |
| Fair | 368 (35%) | 53 (27%) | 88 (38%) | 132 (51%) | 27 (36%) | 68 (23%) |  |
| Poor | 81 (7.7%) | 4 (2.0%) | 25 (11%) | 25 (9.7%) | 3 (4.0%) | 24 (8.2%) |  |
| Collaboration between Nurses and unit Nursing Managers |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 180 (17%) | 31 (16%) | 11 (4.7%) | 28 (11%) | 3 (4.0%) | 107 (37%) |  |
| Good | 374 (36%) | 90 (46%) | 70 (30%) | 66 (26%) | 29 (39%) | 119 (41%) |  |
| Fair | 350 (33%) | 62 (32%) | 94 (41%) | 119 (46%) | 33 (44%) | 42 (14%) |  |
| Poor | 149 (14%) | 13 (6.6%) | 57 (25%) | 44 (17%) | 10 (13%) | 25 (8.5%) |  |
| Collaboration between Nurses and Hospital Administration |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 54 (5.1%) | 11 (5.6%) | 1 (0.4%) | 9 (3.5%) | 0 (0%) | 33 (11%) |  |
| Good | 228 (22%) | 56 (29%) | 16 (6.9%) | 45 (18%) | 7 (9.3%) | 104 (35%) |  |
| Fair | 372 (35%) | 79 (40%) | 53 (23%) | 124 (48%) | 30 (40%) | 86 (29%) |  |
| Poor | 399 (38%) | 50 (26%) | 162 (70%) | 79 (31%) | 38 (51%) | 70 (24%) |  |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test | | | | | | | |

* Distribution of Combined Proportion - Excellent/Good

The table shows the distribution of the combined response of Excellent/ Good across the four collaboration items [Nurses, Physicians, Nursing managers, and Hospital administration].

Overall, 74% of the respondents rate the quality of collaboration between Nurses, as **Excellent or Good**, 57% the collaboration between Nurses and Physicians, 53% the collaboration between Nurses and Nursing managers, and 27% the collaboration between Nurses and Hospital administration. There are statistically significant differences across the 5 countries with respect to all the collaboration items (p<0.001)

**Table 14**: How would you rate the quality of collaboration in your unit among the following?

Combined proportion of: Excellent/ Good

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Collaboration between Nurses | 784 (74%) | 174 (89%) | 190 (82%) | 142 (55%) | 55 (73%) | 223 (76%) | <0.001 |
| Collaboration between nurses and Physicians | 604 (57%) | 139 (71%) | 119 (51%) | 100 (39%) | 45 (60%) | 201 (69%) | <0.001 |
| Collaboration between Nurses and unit Nursing Managers | 554 (53%) | 121 (62%) | 81 (35%) | 94 (37%) | 32 (43%) | 226 (77%) | <0.001 |
| Collaboration between Nurses and Hospital Administration | 282 (27%) | 67 (34%) | 17 (7.3%) | 54 (21%) | 7 (9.3%) | 137 (47%) | <0.001 |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test | | | | | | | |

### Respect for nurses

* Distribution of responses

The table shows the distribution of responses for the perceived responses from ‘Other Nurses’ , ‘Physicians’, ‘Other Health Care colleagues’, ‘Unit Nursing Managers’ and ‘Hospital Administration’.

**Table 15**: In your unit how would you rate the respect for nurses by each of the following?

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Other Nurses |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 215 (20%) | 55 (28%) | 58 (25%) | 28 (11%) | 8 (11%) | 66 (23%) |  |
| Good | 562 (53%) | 115 (59%) | 141 (61%) | 97 (38%) | 51 (68%) | 158 (54%) |  |
| Fair | 228 (22%) | 21 (11%) | 28 (12%) | 112 (44%) | 14 (19%) | 53 (18%) |  |
| Poor | 48 (4.6%) | 5 (2.6%) | 5 (2.2%) | 20 (7.8%) | 2 (2.7%) | 16 (5.5%) |  |
| Physicians |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 122 (12%) | 23 (12%) | 27 (12%) | 18 (7.0%) | 2 (2.7%) | 52 (18%) |  |
| Good | 467 (44%) | 85 (43%) | 119 (51%) | 68 (26%) | 44 (59%) | 151 (52%) |  |
| Fair | 347 (33%) | 74 (38%) | 68 (29%) | 126 (49%) | 24 (32%) | 55 (19%) |  |
| Poor | 117 (11%) | 14 (7.1%) | 18 (7.8%) | 45 (18%) | 5 (6.7%) | 35 (12%) |  |
| Other Health Care colleagues |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 137 (13%) | 35 (18%) | 36 (16%) | 19 (7.4%) | 4 (5.3%) | 43 (15%) |  |
| Good | 551 (52%) | 116 (59%) | 149 (64%) | 74 (29%) | 46 (61%) | 166 (57%) |  |
| Fair | 304 (29%) | 40 (20%) | 37 (16%) | 140 (54%) | 23 (31%) | 64 (22%) |  |
| Poor | 61 (5.8%) | 5 (2.6%) | 10 (4.3%) | 24 (9.3%) | 2 (2.7%) | 20 (6.8%) |  |
| Unit Nursing Managers |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 195 (19%) | 36 (18%) | 34 (15%) | 29 (11%) | 8 (11%) | 88 (30%) |  |
| Good | 439 (42%) | 78 (40%) | 114 (49%) | 66 (26%) | 34 (45%) | 147 (50%) |  |
| Fair | 303 (29%) | 64 (33%) | 55 (24%) | 122 (47%) | 24 (32%) | 38 (13%) |  |
| Poor | 116 (11%) | 18 (9.2%) | 29 (12%) | 40 (16%) | 9 (12%) | 20 (6.8%) |  |
| Hospital Administration |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 80 (7.6%) | 19 (9.7%) | 6 (2.6%) | 13 (5.1%) | 1 (1.3%) | 41 (14%) |  |
| Good | 267 (25%) | 51 (26%) | 44 (19%) | 43 (17%) | 14 (19%) | 115 (39%) |  |
| Fair | 402 (38%) | 81 (41%) | 78 (34%) | 131 (51%) | 31 (41%) | 81 (28%) |  |
| Poor | 304 (29%) | 45 (23%) | 104 (45%) | 70 (27%) | 29 (39%) | 56 (19%) |  |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test | | | | | | | |

* Distribution of Combined Proportion - Excellent/Good

The table shows the distribution of the combined response of Excellent/ Good.

Overall, 74% of the respondents rate the respect by Other Nurses as **Excellent or Good**, 56% by Physicians, 65% by Other health care colleagues, 65% by Unit nursing managers, and 33% by the Hospital administration. There are statistically significant differences across the 5 countries with respect to all the collaboration items (p<0.001)

**Table 16**: In your unit how would you rate the respect for nurses by each of the following?

Combined proportion of: Excellent/ Good

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Other Nurses | 777 (74%) | 170 (87%) | 199 (86%) | 125 (49%) | 59 (79%) | 224 (76%) | <0.001 |
| Physicians | 589 (56%) | 108 (55%) | 146 (63%) | 86 (33%) | 46 (61%) | 203 (69%) | <0.001 |
| Other Health Care colleagues | 688 (65%) | 151 (77%) | 185 (80%) | 93 (36%) | 50 (67%) | 209 (71%) | <0.001 |
| Unit Nursing Managers | 634 (60%) | 114 (58%) | 148 (64%) | 95 (37%) | 42 (56%) | 235 (80%) | <0.001 |
| Hospital Administration | 347 (33%) | 70 (36%) | 50 (22%) | 56 (22%) | 15 (20%) | 156 (53%) | <0.001 |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test | | | | | | | |

### Moral distress

**Moral distress has been defined as occurring when you know the appropriate action to take, but you are unable to act upon it and/or you act in a manner contrary to your personal and professional values, which undermines your integrity and authenticity.**

* “To what extent, in your work as a nurse do you experience moral distress?”

The table shows the distribution of responses to the question “To what extent, in your work as a nurse do you experience moral distress?”.

**Table 17**: To what extent, in your work as a nurse do you experience moral distress?

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To what extent, in your work as a nurse do you experience moral distress? |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Very Frequently | 104 (9.9%) | 36 (18%) | 18 (7.8%) | 29 (11%) | 8 (11%) | 13 (4.4%) |  |
| Frequently | 279 (26%) | 78 (40%) | 49 (21%) | 71 (28%) | 24 (32%) | 57 (19%) |  |
| Occasionally | 445 (42%) | 64 (33%) | 119 (51%) | 113 (44%) | 29 (39%) | 120 (41%) |  |
| Very Rarely | 225 (21%) | 18 (9.2%) | 46 (20%) | 44 (17%) | 14 (19%) | 103 (35%) |  |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test | | | | | | | |

* Distribution of Combined Proportion - Very Frequently/ Frequently

The table shows the distribution of the combined response of Very Frequently/ Frequently.

Overall, 36% of the respondents experience moral distress, Very Frequently or frequently. There are statistically significant differences across the 5 countries with respect to all the collaboration items (p<0.001)

**Table 18**: To what extent, in your work as a nurse do you experience moral distress?

Combined proportion of: Very frequently, Frequently

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To what extent, in your work as a nurse do you experience moral distress? | 383 (36%) | 114 (58%) | 67 (29%) | 100 (39%) | 32 (43%) | 70 (24%) | <0.001 |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test | | | | | | | |

### Staffing for the unit

* **With regard to staffing for your unit how often do you have the right number of registered nurses with the right knowledge and skills?**

Overall, 20.3% of the respondents indicate that more than 75% of the time or all of the time, the staffing in their unit has the right number of RNs. There are significant differences across the countries, where Poland has the highest proportion [40%] where the staffing is right 75% of the time or all the time, compared to Cyprus [12.3%] or Croatios [13.2%]

**Table 19**: With regard to staffing for your unit how often do you have the right number of registered nurses with the right knowledge and skills?

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| With regard to staffing for your unit how often do you have the right number of registered nurses with the right knowledge and skills? |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Less than 25% of the time | 235 (22%) | 64 (33%) | 28 (12%) | 50 (19%) | 5 (6.7%) | 88 (30%) |  |
| Between 25-49% of the time | 315 (30%) | 79 (40%) | 73 (31%) | 103 (40%) | 15 (20%) | 45 (15%) |  |
| 50-75% of the time | 291 (28%) | 29 (15%) | 85 (37%) | 70 (27%) | 25 (33%) | 82 (28%) |  |
| More than 75% of the time | 156 (15%) | 19 (9.7%) | 35 (15%) | 25 (9.7%) | 24 (32%) | 53 (18%) |  |
| All the time | 56 (5.3%) | 5 (2.6%) | 11 (4.7%) | 9 (3.5%) | 6 (8.0%) | 25 (8.5%) |  |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test | | | | | | | |

### Skills of unit’s nursing managers

* Distribution of responses

The table shows the distribution of responses for the question **Please rate the skill of your unit Nursing managers in the following areas**.

**Table 20**: Please rate the skill of your unit Nursing managers in the following areas

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Communication |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 278 (26%) | 47 (24%) | 37 (16%) | 54 (21%) | 4 (5.3%) | 136 (46%) |  |
| Good | 381 (36%) | 88 (45%) | 88 (38%) | 70 (27%) | 29 (39%) | 106 (36%) |  |
| Fair | 269 (26%) | 53 (27%) | 73 (31%) | 87 (34%) | 25 (33%) | 31 (11%) |  |
| Poor | 125 (12%) | 8 (4.1%) | 34 (15%) | 46 (18%) | 17 (23%) | 20 (6.8%) |  |
| Collaboration |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 288 (27%) | 48 (24%) | 44 (19%) | 54 (21%) | 9 (12%) | 133 (45%) |  |
| Good | 407 (39%) | 91 (46%) | 86 (37%) | 89 (35%) | 32 (43%) | 109 (37%) |  |
| Fair | 250 (24%) | 49 (25%) | 70 (30%) | 82 (32%) | 20 (27%) | 29 (9.9%) |  |
| Poor | 108 (10%) | 8 (4.1%) | 32 (14%) | 32 (12%) | 14 (19%) | 22 (7.5%) |  |
| Proving Staff resources |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 177 (17%) | 15 (7.7%) | 23 (9.9%) | 38 (15%) | 3 (4.0%) | 98 (33%) |  |
| Good | 329 (31%) | 65 (33%) | 65 (28%) | 58 (23%) | 27 (36%) | 114 (39%) |  |
| Fair | 365 (35%) | 79 (40%) | 104 (45%) | 92 (36%) | 33 (44%) | 57 (19%) |  |
| Poor | 182 (17%) | 37 (19%) | 40 (17%) | 69 (27%) | 12 (16%) | 24 (8.2%) |  |
| Providing Supplies, Equipment, and other non-human resources |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 288 (27%) | 33 (17%) | 45 (19%) | 71 (28%) | 19 (25%) | 120 (41%) |  |
| Good | 493 (47%) | 106 (54%) | 132 (57%) | 85 (33%) | 38 (51%) | 132 (45%) |  |
| Fair | 206 (20%) | 40 (20%) | 45 (19%) | 80 (31%) | 15 (20%) | 26 (8.9%) |  |
| Poor | 66 (6.3%) | 17 (8.7%) | 10 (4.3%) | 21 (8.2%) | 3 (4.0%) | 15 (5.1%) |  |
| Effective decision making |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 243 (23%) | 26 (13%) | 32 (14%) | 52 (20%) | 7 (9.3%) | 126 (43%) |  |
| Good | 415 (39%) | 94 (48%) | 96 (41%) | 83 (32%) | 27 (36%) | 115 (39%) |  |
| Fair | 275 (26%) | 56 (29%) | 80 (34%) | 80 (31%) | 27 (36%) | 32 (11%) |  |
| Poor | 120 (11%) | 20 (10%) | 24 (10%) | 42 (16%) | 14 (19%) | 20 (6.8%) |  |
| Recognition of others contribution |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 241 (23%) | 37 (19%) | 38 (16%) | 50 (19%) | 5 (6.7%) | 111 (38%) |  |
| Good | 339 (32%) | 83 (42%) | 71 (31%) | 59 (23%) | 22 (29%) | 104 (35%) |  |
| Fair | 296 (28%) | 58 (30%) | 74 (32%) | 92 (36%) | 26 (35%) | 46 (16%) |  |
| Poor | 177 (17%) | 18 (9.2%) | 49 (21%) | 56 (22%) | 22 (29%) | 32 (11%) |  |
| Leadership |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 251 (24%) | 36 (18%) | 34 (15%) | 52 (20%) | 5 (6.7%) | 124 (42%) |  |
| Good | 395 (38%) | 96 (49%) | 85 (37%) | 83 (32%) | 30 (40%) | 101 (34%) |  |
| Fair | 249 (24%) | 44 (22%) | 74 (32%) | 64 (25%) | 22 (29%) | 45 (15%) |  |
| Poor | 158 (15%) | 20 (10%) | 39 (17%) | 58 (23%) | 18 (24%) | 23 (7.8%) |  |
| Ensuring the provision of high quality patient care |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 290 (28%) | 29 (15%) | 35 (15%) | 72 (28%) | 9 (12%) | 145 (49%) |  |
| Good | 436 (41%) | 102 (52%) | 96 (41%) | 92 (36%) | 39 (52%) | 107 (37%) |  |
| Fair | 249 (24%) | 53 (27%) | 69 (30%) | 81 (32%) | 16 (21%) | 30 (10%) |  |
| Poor | 78 (7.4%) | 12 (6.1%) | 32 (14%) | 12 (4.7%) | 11 (15%) | 11 (3.8%) |  |
| Promoting a professional practice environment |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 261 (25%) | 29 (15%) | 34 (15%) | 54 (21%) | 8 (11%) | 136 (46%) |  |
| Good | 405 (38%) | 96 (49%) | 92 (40%) | 75 (29%) | 32 (43%) | 110 (38%) |  |
| Fair | 246 (23%) | 55 (28%) | 69 (30%) | 81 (32%) | 15 (20%) | 26 (8.9%) |  |
| Poor | 141 (13%) | 16 (8.2%) | 37 (16%) | 47 (18%) | 20 (27%) | 21 (7.2%) |  |
| Overall effectiveness |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 255 (24%) | 28 (14%) | 35 (15%) | 58 (23%) | 3 (4.0%) | 131 (45%) |  |
| Good | 430 (41%) | 102 (52%) | 99 (43%) | 82 (32%) | 33 (44%) | 114 (39%) |  |
| Fair | 272 (26%) | 50 (26%) | 70 (30%) | 91 (35%) | 29 (39%) | 32 (11%) |  |
| Poor | 96 (9.1%) | 16 (8.2%) | 28 (12%) | 26 (10%) | 10 (13%) | 16 (5.5%) |  |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test | | | | | | | |

* Distribution of Combined Proportion - Excellent/Good

The table shows the distribution of the combined response of Excellent/ Good.

Overall, the respondents rate the skills of the unit managers with **Excellent or Good** as follows Communication-63%, Collaboration-66%, Proving Staff resources-48%, Providing Supplies, Equipment, and other non-human resources-74%, Effective decision making-62%, Recognition of others contribution-55%, Leadership-61%, Ensuring the provision of high quality patient care-69%, Promoting a professional practice environment-63% and Overall effectiveness-65%.  
There are statistrically significant differences across the countries.

**Table 21**: Please rate the skill of your unit Nursing managers in the following areas

Combined proportion of: Excellent/ Good

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Communication | 659 (63%) | 135 (69%) | 125 (54%) | 124 (48%) | 33 (44%) | 242 (83%) | <0.001 |
| Collaboration | 695 (66%) | 139 (71%) | 130 (56%) | 143 (56%) | 41 (55%) | 242 (83%) | <0.001 |
| Proving Staff resources | 506 (48%) | 80 (41%) | 88 (38%) | 96 (37%) | 30 (40%) | 212 (72%) | <0.001 |
| Providing Supplies, Equipment, and other non-human resources | 781 (74%) | 139 (71%) | 177 (76%) | 156 (61%) | 57 (76%) | 252 (86%) | <0.001 |
| Effective decision making | 658 (62%) | 120 (61%) | 128 (55%) | 135 (53%) | 34 (45%) | 241 (82%) | <0.001 |
| Recognition of others contribution | 580 (55%) | 120 (61%) | 109 (47%) | 109 (42%) | 27 (36%) | 215 (73%) | <0.001 |
| Leadership | 646 (61%) | 132 (67%) | 119 (51%) | 135 (53%) | 35 (47%) | 225 (77%) | <0.001 |
| Ensuring the provision of high quality patient care | 726 (69%) | 131 (67%) | 131 (56%) | 164 (64%) | 48 (64%) | 252 (86%) | <0.001 |
| Promoting a professional practice environment | 666 (63%) | 125 (64%) | 126 (54%) | 129 (50%) | 40 (53%) | 246 (84%) | <0.001 |
| Overall effectiveness | 685 (65%) | 130 (66%) | 134 (58%) | 140 (54%) | 36 (48%) | 245 (84%) | <0.001 |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test | | | | | | | |

### Skills of unit’s nursing administrators

* Distribution of responses

The table shows the distribution of responses for the question **Please rate the skill of your unit Nursing administrators in the following areas**.

**Table 22**: Please rate the skill of your unit Nursing administrators in the following areas

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Communication |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 82 (7.8%) | 14 (7.1%) | 3 (1.3%) | 16 (6.2%) | 1 (1.3%) | 48 (16%) |  |
| Good | 280 (27%) | 57 (29%) | 35 (15%) | 49 (19%) | 16 (21%) | 123 (42%) |  |
| Fair | 403 (38%) | 88 (45%) | 82 (35%) | 133 (52%) | 32 (43%) | 68 (23%) |  |
| Poor | 288 (27%) | 37 (19%) | 112 (48%) | 59 (23%) | 26 (35%) | 54 (18%) |  |
| Collaboration |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 72 (6.8%) | 12 (6.1%) | 1 (0.4%) | 17 (6.6%) | 1 (1.3%) | 41 (14%) |  |
| Good | 283 (27%) | 62 (32%) | 40 (17%) | 51 (20%) | 16 (21%) | 114 (39%) |  |
| Fair | 424 (40%) | 91 (46%) | 81 (35%) | 129 (50%) | 35 (47%) | 88 (30%) |  |
| Poor | 274 (26%) | 31 (16%) | 110 (47%) | 60 (23%) | 23 (31%) | 50 (17%) |  |
| Proving Staff resources |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 53 (5.0%) | 7 (3.6%) | 4 (1.7%) | 10 (3.9%) | 1 (1.3%) | 31 (11%) |  |
| Good | 272 (26%) | 46 (23%) | 36 (16%) | 46 (18%) | 13 (17%) | 131 (45%) |  |
| Fair | 377 (36%) | 81 (41%) | 77 (33%) | 106 (41%) | 38 (51%) | 75 (26%) |  |
| Poor | 351 (33%) | 62 (32%) | 115 (50%) | 95 (37%) | 23 (31%) | 56 (19%) |  |
| Providing Supplies, Equipment, and other non-human resources |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 92 (8.7%) | 21 (11%) | 9 (3.9%) | 20 (7.8%) | 3 (4.0%) | 39 (13%) |  |
| Good | 419 (40%) | 66 (34%) | 91 (39%) | 75 (29%) | 32 (43%) | 155 (53%) |  |
| Fair | 368 (35%) | 84 (43%) | 76 (33%) | 117 (46%) | 29 (39%) | 62 (21%) |  |
| Poor | 174 (17%) | 25 (13%) | 56 (24%) | 45 (18%) | 11 (15%) | 37 (13%) |  |
| Effective decision making |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 62 (5.9%) | 11 (5.6%) | 2 (0.9%) | 12 (4.7%) | 0 (0%) | 37 (13%) |  |
| Good | 316 (30%) | 48 (24%) | 55 (24%) | 55 (21%) | 25 (33%) | 133 (45%) |  |
| Fair | 425 (40%) | 101 (52%) | 90 (39%) | 124 (48%) | 29 (39%) | 81 (28%) |  |
| Poor | 250 (24%) | 36 (18%) | 85 (37%) | 66 (26%) | 21 (28%) | 42 (14%) |  |
| Recognition of others contribution |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 66 (6.3%) | 12 (6.1%) | 5 (2.2%) | 15 (5.8%) | 2 (2.7%) | 32 (11%) |  |
| Good | 261 (25%) | 46 (23%) | 41 (18%) | 44 (17%) | 10 (13%) | 120 (41%) |  |
| Fair | 388 (37%) | 100 (51%) | 73 (31%) | 113 (44%) | 31 (41%) | 71 (24%) |  |
| Poor | 338 (32%) | 38 (19%) | 113 (49%) | 85 (33%) | 32 (43%) | 70 (24%) |  |
| Leadership |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 67 (6.4%) | 6 (3.1%) | 5 (2.2%) | 16 (6.2%) | 2 (2.7%) | 38 (13%) |  |
| Good | 307 (29%) | 62 (32%) | 53 (23%) | 49 (19%) | 21 (28%) | 122 (42%) |  |
| Fair | 407 (39%) | 88 (45%) | 84 (36%) | 121 (47%) | 34 (45%) | 80 (27%) |  |
| Poor | 272 (26%) | 40 (20%) | 90 (39%) | 71 (28%) | 18 (24%) | 53 (18%) |  |
| Ensuring the provision of high quality patient care |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 89 (8.5%) | 14 (7.1%) | 3 (1.3%) | 18 (7.0%) | 1 (1.3%) | 53 (18%) |  |
| Good | 353 (34%) | 59 (30%) | 58 (25%) | 67 (26%) | 24 (32%) | 145 (49%) |  |
| Fair | 415 (39%) | 95 (48%) | 91 (39%) | 131 (51%) | 38 (51%) | 60 (20%) |  |
| Poor | 196 (19%) | 28 (14%) | 80 (34%) | 41 (16%) | 12 (16%) | 35 (12%) |  |
| Promoting a professional practice environment |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 78 (7.4%) | 11 (5.6%) | 3 (1.3%) | 16 (6.2%) | 3 (4.0%) | 45 (15%) |  |
| Good | 301 (29%) | 54 (28%) | 52 (22%) | 48 (19%) | 17 (23%) | 130 (44%) |  |
| Fair | 402 (38%) | 96 (49%) | 77 (33%) | 122 (47%) | 30 (40%) | 77 (26%) |  |
| Poor | 272 (26%) | 35 (18%) | 100 (43%) | 71 (28%) | 25 (33%) | 41 (14%) |  |
| Overall effectiveness |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Excellent | 74 (7.0%) | 8 (4.1%) | 3 (1.3%) | 15 (5.8%) | 1 (1.3%) | 47 (16%) |  |
| Good | 309 (29%) | 62 (32%) | 48 (21%) | 55 (21%) | 26 (35%) | 118 (40%) |  |
| Fair | 440 (42%) | 98 (50%) | 93 (40%) | 134 (52%) | 30 (40%) | 85 (29%) |  |
| Poor | 230 (22%) | 28 (14%) | 88 (38%) | 53 (21%) | 18 (24%) | 43 (15%) |  |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test | | | | | | | |

* Distribution of Combined Proportion - Excellent/Good

The table shows the distribution of the combined response of Excellent/ Good.

Overall, the respondents rate the skills of the unit nursing administration with **Excellent or Good** as follows Communication-34%, Collaboration-34%, Proving Staff resources-31%, Providing Supplies, Equipment, and other non-human resources-49%, Effective decision making-36%, Recognition of others contribution-31%, Leadership-36%, Ensuring the provision of high quality patient care-42%, Promoting a professional practice environment-36% and Overall effectiveness-36%.

There are statistically significant differences across the countries.

**Table 23**: Please rate the skill of your unit Nursing administrators in the following areas

Combined proportion of: Excellent/ Good

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Communication | 362 (34%) | 71 (36%) | 38 (16%) | 65 (25%) | 17 (23%) | 171 (58%) | <0.001 |
| Collaboration | 355 (34%) | 74 (38%) | 41 (18%) | 68 (26%) | 17 (23%) | 155 (53%) | <0.001 |
| Proving Staff resources | 325 (31%) | 53 (27%) | 40 (17%) | 56 (22%) | 14 (19%) | 162 (55%) | <0.001 |
| Providing Supplies, Equipment, and other non-human resources | 511 (49%) | 87 (44%) | 100 (43%) | 95 (37%) | 35 (47%) | 194 (66%) | <0.001 |
| Effective decision making | 378 (36%) | 59 (30%) | 57 (25%) | 67 (26%) | 25 (33%) | 170 (58%) | <0.001 |
| Recognition of others contribution | 327 (31%) | 58 (30%) | 46 (20%) | 59 (23%) | 12 (16%) | 152 (52%) | <0.001 |
| Leadership | 374 (36%) | 68 (35%) | 58 (25%) | 65 (25%) | 23 (31%) | 160 (55%) | <0.001 |
| Ensuring the provision of high quality patient care | 442 (42%) | 73 (37%) | 61 (26%) | 85 (33%) | 25 (33%) | 198 (68%) | <0.001 |
| Promoting a professional practice environment | 379 (36%) | 65 (33%) | 55 (24%) | 64 (25%) | 20 (27%) | 175 (60%) | <0.001 |
| Overall effectiveness | 383 (36%) | 70 (36%) | 51 (22%) | 70 (27%) | 27 (36%) | 165 (56%) | <0.001 |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test | | | | | | | |

### Main factors that keep RNs working in their current organization

* **What are the main factors that keep you working in your current organization?**

The main factor indicated by the RNs is the ‘Salary and Benefits’[45%] followed by ‘People I work with’ [41%]. Less impact is the ‘Patients I care for’ [26%] and ‘Location’[18%].

The **Salary and benefits** is the main factor for Cyprus RNs [56%] and Croatia [64%].

The **People I work with** is the main factor for Spain [41%] and Romania [52%].

**Table 24**: What are the main factors that keep you working in your current organization?

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Salary and benefits | 475 (45%) | 110 (56%) | 38 (16%) | 164 (64%) | 23 (31%) | 140 (48%) | <0.001 |
| People I work with | 427 (41%) | 65 (33%) | 94 (41%) | 87 (34%) | 29 (39%) | 152 (52%) | <0.001 |
| Patients I care for | 275 (26%) | 51 (26%) | 89 (38%) | 51 (20%) | 24 (32%) | 60 (20%) | <0.001 |
| Location | 186 (18%) | 23 (12%) | 69 (30%) | 42 (16%) | 28 (37%) | 24 (8.2%) | <0.001 |
| Opportunities for professional development | 173 (16%) | 39 (20%) | 46 (20%) | 32 (12%) | 8 (11%) | 48 (16%) | 0.077 |
| Work schedule | 162 (15%) | 18 (9.2%) | 46 (20%) | 44 (17%) | 15 (20%) | 39 (13%) | 0.017 |
| Work environment | 100 (9.5%) | 19 (9.7%) | 33 (14%) | 27 (11%) | 3 (4.0%) | 18 (6.1%) | 0.012 |
| Manager of my work unit | 60 (5.7%) | 8 (4.1%) | 4 (1.7%) | 9 (3.5%) | 3 (4.0%) | 36 (12%) | <0.001 |
| Opportunities for advancement | 41 (3.9%) | 17 (8.7%) | 3 (1.3%) | 20 (7.8%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.3%) | <0.001 |
| Reputation of the organization | 36 (3.4%) | 4 (2.0%) | 7 (3.0%) | 14 (5.4%) | 4 (5.3%) | 7 (2.4%) | 0.2 |
| Other (please specify) | 31 (2.9%) | 2 (1.0%) | 15 (6.5%) | 4 (1.6%) | 6 (8.0%) | 4 (1.4%) | <0.001 |
| Meaningful recognition | 30 (2.8%) | 13 (6.6%) | 6 (2.6%) | 2 (0.8%) | 2 (2.7%) | 7 (2.4%) | 0.006 |
| Support for nurses | 15 (1.4%) | 3 (1.5%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (1.6%) | 1 (1.3%) | 7 (2.4%) | 0.3 |
| Level of staffing | 12 (1.1%) | 4 (2.0%) | 1 (0.4%) | 2 (0.8%) | 3 (4.0%) | 2 (0.7%) | 0.068 |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test | | | | | | | |

* \_Other Please specify\_\_

**Table 25**: What are the main factors that keep you working in your current organization? - Other (please specify)

| **country** | **What are the main factors that keep you working in your current organization?** |
| --- | --- |
| Cyprus | Αλτρουισμός και ανιδιοτέλεια για τον συνάνθρωπο |
| Για τα εσοδα! να μην βρεθω στο δρομο😂 |
| Spain | Me gusta el trabajo con los pacientes críticos |
| Me gusta mi profesión, me siento orgullosa de ser enfermera. |
| No tengo otras alternativas aceptables |
| El contrato |
| Llevo más de 15 años trabajando alli |
| Me gusta mi trabajo y mis compañeros |
| no volver a enpezar de cero |
| Es mi primer contrato |
| ME GUSTA MUCHO MI TRABAJO |
| Volver a empezar de cero en otra institución |
| Plaza fija en esa institución |
| El gusto por cuidar de pacientes críticos |
| La estabilidad, el trabajo fijo |
| La estabilidad |
| Interinaje |
| Croatia | samo plaća |
| nada da ću moći napredovati na intenzivnoj na kojoj se baziraju moji profesionalni interesi te daljnji razvoj, a ne da me se često mijenja po odjelima čime si usporavam vlastiti napredak |
| Usavrsavanje vjestina |
| nemogućnost pronalaska fdrugog adekvatnog radnog mjesta |
| Poland | konieczność dopracowania do emerytury |
| umowa o pracę |
| własne zainteresowania, pasja |
| krótki czas do emerytury |
| Przyzwyczajenie do miejsca i ludzi tam pracujących |
| wynagrodzenie jubileuszowe |
| Romania | Doar pacientii |
| IMI PLACE CEEA CE FAC |

### Abuse incidents

**In the past year, in your work as a nurse, please indicate the number of times you personally experienced each of the following?**

This question was answered by 1053 RNs.

A total of 652 (61.9%) RNs reported at least 1 incident

**Table 26**: Proportion of RNs reporting at least one incident of abuse in the past year

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| At least one incident (Harassment/ Discrimination/ Verbal or Physical Abuse) | 652 (62%) | 134 (68%) | 133 (57%) | 145 (56%) | 63 (84%) | 177 (60%) |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | |

* **Number of Incidents**

Table show the total number of incidents of abuse in the past year, reported by RNs.

The highest amount of incidents is coming form the Patients (2,469), followed by Another Nurse (1,979) and Physicians (1,822).

**Table 27**: Number of incidents of abuse in the past year - by Type and Perpeprator - All Countries

| Perpepretor | Discrimination | Harassment | Physical abuse | Verbal abuse | Total |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Patients | 417 | 56 | 394 | 1,602 | 2,469 |
| Another nurse | 562 | 26 | 47 | 1,344 | 1,979 |
| A physician | 780 | 42 | 31 | 969 | 1,822 |
| A nurse manager | 888 | 4 | 22 | 801 | 1,715 |
| Patients' families | 388 | 10 | 51 | 844 | 1,293 |
| Other health care personnel | 168 | 6 | 8 | 459 | 641 |
| An administrator | 232 | 2 | 14 | 296 | 544 |

* By Country
* Cyprus

**Table 28**: Number of incidents of abuse in the past year - by Type and Perpeprator - Cyprus

| Perpepretor | Discrimination | Harassment | Physical abuse | Verbal abuse | Total |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A physician | 185 | 10 | 7 | 231 | 433 |
| Patients | 120 | 11 | 57 | 162 | 350 |
| Patients' families | 197 | 1 | 8 | 140 | 346 |
| Another nurse | 152 | 8 | 13 | 98 | 271 |
| An administrator | 74 | 1 | 4 | 127 | 206 |
| A nurse manager | 145 | 4 | 3 | 53 | 205 |
| Other health care personnel | 43 | 4 | 3 | 32 | 82 |

* Spain

**Table 29**: Number of incidents of abuse in the past year - by Type and Perpeprator - Spain

| Perpepretor | Discrimination | Harassment | Physical abuse | Verbal abuse | Total |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Patients | 36 | 7 | 26 | 104 | 173 |
| Another nurse | 78 | 4 | 1 | 55 | 138 |
| A physician | 69 | 2 | 4 | 46 | 121 |
| Patients' families | 28 | 1 | 3 | 77 | 109 |
| An administrator | 25 | 1 | 10 | 45 | 81 |
| A nurse manager | 30 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 51 |
| Other health care personnel | 27 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 40 |

* Croatia

**Table 30**: Number of incidents of abuse in the past year - by Type and Perpeprator - Croatia

| Perpepretor | Discrimination | Harassment | Physical abuse | Verbal abuse | Total |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A nurse manager | 593 | 0 | 19 | 590 | 1,202 |
| Another nurse | 180 | 11 | 16 | 952 | 1,159 |
| Patients | 178 | 24 | 100 | 850 | 1,152 |
| A physician | 246 | 21 | 12 | 400 | 679 |
| Patients' families | 81 | 8 | 4 | 336 | 429 |
| Other health care personnel | 63 | 0 | 0 | 364 | 427 |
| An administrator | 27 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 89 |

* Poland

**Table 31**: Number of incidents of abuse in the past year - by Type and Perpeprator - Poland

| Perpepretor | Discrimination | Harassment | Physical abuse | Verbal abuse | Total |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Patients | 62 | 14 | 183 | 346 | 605 |
| A physician | 251 | 9 | 6 | 208 | 474 |
| Patients' families | 70 | 0 | 35 | 212 | 317 |
| Another nurse | 116 | 2 | 15 | 161 | 294 |
| A nurse manager | 74 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 185 |
| An administrator | 87 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 141 |
| Other health care personnel | 29 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 55 |

* Romania

**Table 32**: Number of incidents of abuse in the past year - by Type and Perpeprator - Romania

| Perpepretor | Discrimination | Harassment | Physical abuse | Verbal abuse | Total |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Patients | 21 | 0 | 28 | 140 | 189 |
| Another nurse | 36 | 1 | 2 | 78 | 117 |
| A physician | 29 | 0 | 2 | 84 | 115 |
| Patients' families | 12 | 0 | 1 | 79 | 92 |
| A nurse manager | 46 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 72 |
| Other health care personnel | 6 | 1 | 3 | 27 | 37 |
| An administrator | 19 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 27 |

### Have you reported the incidents?

* Two hundred and ninety-five (295 - 45%) did not report any of the incidents that occurred
* Three hundred and fifty seven (357 - 55%) did report at least some of them.

**Table 33**: Report of the incident

|  | Overall, N = 6521 | Cyprus, N = 1341 | Spain, N = 1331 | Croatia, N = 1451 | Poland, N = 631 | Romania, N = 1771 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Did you report the incident(s) to your supervisor? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No, none of them | 295 (45%) | 38 (28%) | 70 (53%) | 100 (69%) | 26 (41%) | 61 (34%) |
| Yes, but not all them | 162 (25%) | 44 (33%) | 15 (11%) | 27 (19%) | 23 (37%) | 53 (30%) |
| Yes, all of them | 195 (30%) | 52 (39%) | 48 (36%) | 18 (12%) | 14 (22%) | 63 (36%) |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | |

### After the report of the incident

**What happened when you reported the incident(s)?**

Overall, 43% of the RNs reported that that **there was some discussion, but nothing was done or there was no follow up**.

There are significant differences across the countries. In Cyprus (the highest), this type of response was indicate by 65% of the RNs, and in Spain (the lowest) the 33%.

**Table 34**: What happened after you reported the incident

|  | Overall, N = 3571 | Cyprus, N = 961 | Spain, N = 631 | Croatia, N = 451 | Poland, N = 371 | Romania, N = 1161 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| What happened when you reported the incident(s)? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The problem was solved satisfactorily | 73 (21%) | 11 (12%) | 8 (13%) | 7 (16%) | 5 (14%) | 42 (37%) |
| The problem was somewhat resolved | 89 (25%) | 17 (18%) | 23 (37%) | 11 (25%) | 9 (24%) | 29 (25%) |
| There was some discussion, but nothing was done or there was no follow up | 152 (43%) | 61 (65%) | 21 (33%) | 21 (48%) | 13 (35%) | 36 (32%) |
| I was blamed for the incident | 10 (2.8%) | 2 (2.1%) | 1 (1.6%) | 2 (4.5%) | 2 (5.4%) | 3 (2.6%) |
| Other (please specify) | 28 (8.0%) | 3 (3.2%) | 10 (16%) | 3 (6.8%) | 8 (22%) | 4 (3.5%) |
| Unknown | 5 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | |

* \_Other Please specify\_\_

**Table 35**: What happened when you reported the incident(s)? - Other (please specify)

| **country** | **What happened when you reported the incident(s)? - Other (please specify)** |
| --- | --- |
| Cyprus | ΤΙΠΟΤΑ |
| Αδιαφορία |
| Αδιαφορια |
| Spain | Represalias institucionales |
| Pacientes desorientados |
| Todo siguió igual. |
| Se nos dice que hablarán con la persona en cuestión, y ahí queda todo |
| Llamé yo a recepción |
| Notifiqué 1 caso y Riesgos Laborales se puso en contacto conmigo |
| Me dijeron que hablara con el enfermero en cuestión, que ellos no podian hacer nada. |
| No ven que existe un problema. Falta de valoración |
| quedó en nada |
| Cambio de zona de trabajo |
| Croatia | Ušutkana sam i izvrijeđana. |
| Nista se nije dogodilo. |
| Poland | brak reakcji |
| Nie podjęto żadnych działań |
| brak działań ze strony bezpośredniego przełożonego demotywujący do zgłaszania |
| zgłoszenia zignorowano |
| nie podjęto żadnych działań |
| Sporządzono notatkę służbową |
| ..nic, no trudno ze tak sie stalo.. |
| Brak jakiejkolwiek reakcji |
| Romania | nu s-a întâmplat nimic |
| Abuzul verbal a continuat prin alți asistenți |
| NU S-A LUAT IN CONSIDERARE |

### Did not report the incident

* **In case you did not report the incident (s), why did you decide not to report it?**

**Table 36**: Why did you decide not to report the incident?

|  | Overall, N = 2951 | Cyprus, N = 381 | Spain, N = 701 | Croatia, N = 1001 | Poland, N = 261 | Romania, N = 611 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| In case you did not report the incident (s), why did you decide not to report it? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Didn’t think it was a major issue | 92 (33%) | 3 (8.6%) | 20 (30%) | 35 (36%) | 6 (23%) | 28 (51%) |
| I was too busy | 7 (2.5%) | 2 (5.7%) | 2 (3.0%) | 3 (3.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Fear of retribution | 27 (9.7%) | 1 (2.9%) | 7 (11%) | 7 (7.3%) | 5 (19%) | 7 (13%) |
| No easy process for reporting | 15 (5.4%) | 5 (14%) | 1 (1.5%) | 3 (3.1%) | 3 (12%) | 3 (5.5%) |
| Didn’t think anything would be done about it | 115 (41%) | 22 (63%) | 27 (41%) | 42 (44%) | 11 (42%) | 13 (24%) |
| Other(please specify) | 22 (7.9%) | 2 (5.7%) | 9 (14%) | 6 (6.2%) | 1 (3.8%) | 4 (7.3%) |
| Unknown | 17 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 6 |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | |

* **In case you did not report the incident (s), why did you decide not to report it? - Other(please specify)**

**Table 37**: Why did you decide not to report it? - Other (please specify)

| **country** | **Other (please specify)** |
| --- | --- |
| Spain | La persona obtuvo respuesta |
| Aquí ha contestdo tres respuestas: estaba demasiado ocupado, tenía miedo a represalias y no pensé que fueran a hacer nada |
| Gestioné la situación personalmente con esa persona sin necesidad de requerir de un cargo superior. |
| Me defendí yo misma |
| Soy hombre |
| Lo arregle directamente con la persona |
| Soy una nueva incorporación, la comunicación con la supervisora no es facil y la discriminación la recibí de una compañera fija |
| Paciente desorientado |
| Estaban presentes junto con una muestra representativa de enfermeras del centro. |
| Croatia | Zato sto su pacijenti dezorijentirani,jadni i bolesni pa nisam to uzimala osobno |
| jos ce na mene sve prebacit i uzet me na zub |
| Ne smatram navedeno incidentom već mišljenjem pojedinca na koje ima pravo. |
| Znam da moja glavna sestra nebi ništa poduzela po tom pitanju |
| Bilo me strah nekome se zamjeriti |
| Poland | Szef obgadałby mnie przed pracownikami |
| Romania | considerente privind starea de sanatate a pacientului |

### Recognition is most meaningful when it comes from

Overall, the source of recognition that is the most important for the RNs, is when it comes from **Patients and families**, as it is indicated by the 43% of the RNs.. This source of recognition is the most important in all countries.

**Table 38**: Meaningful recognition

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Recognition is most meaningful when it comes from: |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Patients and families | 444 (43%) | 81 (43%) | 96 (41%) | 122 (47%) | 39 (52%) | 106 (40%) |  |
| Other nurses | 265 (26%) | 53 (28%) | 58 (25%) | 60 (23%) | 29 (39%) | 65 (24%) |  |
| Unit nursing manager | 150 (15%) | 22 (12%) | 23 (9.9%) | 56 (22%) | 3 (4.0%) | 46 (17%) |  |
| Physicians | 83 (8.1%) | 7 (3.7%) | 21 (9.1%) | 9 (3.5%) | 2 (2.7%) | 44 (16%) |  |
| Hospital administrator | 54 (5.3%) | 24 (13%) | 19 (8.2%) | 8 (3.1%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (1.1%) |  |
| Other health care colleagues (other than nurses and physicians) | 26 (2.5%) | 3 (1.6%) | 15 (6.5%) | 2 (0.8%) | 2 (2.7%) | 4 (1.5%) |  |
| Unknown | 31 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |  |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test | | | | | | | |

### My organization values my health and safety

Overall, 46.4% of the respondents Agree or Strongly agree that with the statement “My organization values my health and safety”.  
There are significant differences across the countries. The highest on average agreement [on the scale 1 to 4] is observed in Romania [2.7 (SD=0.8)] and the lowest in Spain [2.2 (SD=0.9)] and Croatia [2.2 (SD=0.8)]

**Table 39**: My organization values my health and safety

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To what degree do you agree with the statement?  "My organization values my health and safety" |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Strongly agree | 88 (8.4%) | 21 (11%) | 6 (2.6%) | 15 (5.8%) | 3 (4.0%) | 43 (15%) |  |
| Agree | 395 (38%) | 76 (39%) | 71 (31%) | 81 (32%) | 26 (35%) | 141 (48%) |  |
| Disagree | 394 (37%) | 80 (41%) | 107 (46%) | 92 (36%) | 36 (48%) | 79 (27%) |  |
| Strongly disagree | 176 (17%) | 19 (9.7%) | 48 (21%) | 69 (27%) | 10 (13%) | 30 (10%) |  |
| Mean satisfaction (SD) | 2.4 (0.9) | 2.5 (0.8) | 2.2 (0.8) | 2.2 (0.9) | 2.3 (0.7) | 2.7 (0.8) | <0.001 |
| 1n (%); Mean (SD)  Mean agreement (SD): Mean of scores ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test; One-way ANOVA | | | | | | | |

### Work done at the end of a typical shift

**Table 40**: At the end of a typical shift, to what degree do you get the following work done?

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Direct care (medications, procedures, monitoring etc.) |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| 0-49% of work done | 30 (3.0%) | 7 (3.7%) | 3 (1.3%) | 16 (6.4%) | 1 (1.4%) | 3 (1.1%) |  |
| 50-74% of work done | 114 (11%) | 21 (11%) | 18 (7.9%) | 51 (20%) | 8 (11%) | 16 (5.8%) |  |
| 75-99% of work done | 351 (35%) | 89 (47%) | 62 (27%) | 95 (38%) | 16 (23%) | 89 (32%) |  |
| 100% of work done | 518 (51%) | 73 (38%) | 145 (64%) | 88 (35%) | 46 (65%) | 166 (61%) |  |
| (Not applicable) | 40 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 19 |  |
| Comforting/Talking with patients |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| 0-49% of work done | 198 (20%) | 46 (25%) | 34 (15%) | 76 (30%) | 20 (29%) | 22 (8.4%) |  |
| 50-74% of work done | 272 (27%) | 54 (29%) | 56 (25%) | 81 (32%) | 22 (32%) | 59 (23%) |  |
| 75-99% of work done | 337 (34%) | 68 (37%) | 84 (37%) | 62 (25%) | 20 (29%) | 103 (39%) |  |
| 100% of work done | 185 (19%) | 18 (9.7%) | 51 (23%) | 32 (13%) | 6 (8.8%) | 78 (30%) |  |
| (Not applicable) | 61 | 10 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 31 |  |
| Developing or updating care plans |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| 0-49% of work done | 191 (20%) | 45 (25%) | 61 (29%) | 56 (24%) | 18 (30%) | 11 (4.3%) |  |
| 50-74% of work done | 223 (24%) | 63 (35%) | 54 (26%) | 65 (27%) | 18 (30%) | 23 (8.9%) |  |
| 75-99% of work done | 284 (30%) | 55 (31%) | 58 (27%) | 67 (28%) | 18 (30%) | 86 (33%) |  |
| 100% of work done | 247 (26%) | 16 (8.9%) | 38 (18%) | 49 (21%) | 7 (11%) | 137 (53%) |  |
| (Not applicable) | 108 | 17 | 21 | 20 | 14 | 36 |  |
| Prepring patients and families for discharge |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| 0-49% of work done | 143 (17%) | 36 (22%) | 42 (20%) | 39 (17%) | 12 (21%) | 14 (7.7%) |  |
| 50-74% of work done | 179 (21%) | 45 (28%) | 40 (19%) | 54 (24%) | 18 (32%) | 22 (12%) |  |
| 75-99% of work done | 286 (34%) | 59 (36%) | 62 (30%) | 74 (33%) | 16 (29%) | 75 (41%) |  |
| 100% of work done | 226 (27%) | 22 (14%) | 66 (31%) | 58 (26%) | 10 (18%) | 70 (39%) |  |
| (Not applicable) | 219 | 34 | 22 | 32 | 19 | 112 |  |
| Teaching patients or family |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| 0-49% of work done | 206 (23%) | 48 (27%) | 52 (25%) | 74 (31%) | 17 (29%) | 15 (7.5%) |  |
| 50-74% of work done | 238 (27%) | 49 (27%) | 52 (25%) | 83 (35%) | 22 (37%) | 32 (16%) |  |
| 75-99% of work done | 288 (33%) | 62 (35%) | 68 (32%) | 52 (22%) | 18 (31%) | 88 (44%) |  |
| 100% of work done | 154 (17%) | 20 (11%) | 38 (18%) | 29 (12%) | 2 (3.4%) | 65 (32%) |  |
| (Not applicable) | 167 | 17 | 22 | 19 | 16 | 93 |  |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test | | | | | | | |

### To what extent are you evaluated on how well you contribute to a healthy work environment for you and your colleagues?

**Table 41**: To what extent are you evaluated on how well you contribute to a healthy work environment for you and your colleagues?

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To what extent are you evaluated on how well you contribute to a healthy work environment for you and your colleagues? |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Plays a major part in my evaluation | 200 (19%) | 66 (35%) | 32 (14%) | 27 (11%) | 12 (16%) | 63 (23%) |  |
| Plays a substantial part in my evaluation | 433 (42%) | 76 (40%) | 69 (30%) | 88 (34%) | 48 (64%) | 152 (55%) |  |
| Plays a minor part in my evaluation | 190 (18%) | 26 (14%) | 42 (18%) | 77 (30%) | 14 (19%) | 31 (11%) |  |
| Plays no part in my evaluation | 207 (20%) | 22 (12%) | 89 (38%) | 65 (25%) | 1 (1.3%) | 30 (11%) |  |
| Unknown | 23 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |  |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test | | | | | | | |

### On the whole, how satisfied are you with your current job?

Overall, 83% of the RNs are **Very or somewhat satisfied** with their current job. RNs from Romania are more satisfied (on average, on the scale 1 to 4) [3.2 SD = 0.7] while RNs from Poland are the least satisfied [2.8 (SD=0.6)]

**Table 42**: On the whole, how satisfied are you with your current job?

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| On the whole, how satisfied are you with your current job? |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Very satisfied | 296 (28%) | 36 (18%) | 90 (39%) | 62 (24%) | 6 (8.0%) | 102 (35%) |  |
| Somewhat satisfied | 581 (55%) | 117 (60%) | 97 (42%) | 152 (59%) | 50 (67%) | 165 (56%) |  |
| Somewhat dissatisfied | 132 (13%) | 36 (18%) | 34 (15%) | 25 (9.7%) | 18 (24%) | 19 (6.5%) |  |
| Very dissatisfied | 44 (4.2%) | 7 (3.6%) | 11 (4.7%) | 18 (7.0%) | 1 (1.3%) | 7 (2.4%) |  |
| Mean satisfaction (SD) | 3.1 (0.8) | 2.9 (0.7) | 3.1 (0.8) | 3.0 (0.8) | 2.8 (0.6) | 3.2 (0.7) | <0.001 |
| 1n (%); Mean (SD)  Mean satisfaction (SD): Mean of scores ranging from 1 (Very dissatisfied) to 4 (Very satisfied) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test; One-way ANOVA | | | | | | | |

### Plan to leave their present nursing position

21% of the RNs plan to leave the nursing position within the next 3 years, 11% within the next 12 months, while 68% have no plans on leaving. There are statistically significant differences across the countries, where RNs from SPAIN are more likely to leave their job within 3 or 1 year (49%), compared to Romania where RNs are least likely to leave within 1 or 3 years (15%).

**Table 43**: Do you plan to leave your present nursing position?

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Do you plan to leave your present nursing position? |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Yes, within the next 3 years | 222 (21%) | 31 (16%) | 72 (31%) | 66 (26%) | 24 (32%) | 29 (9.9%) |  |
| Yes, within the next 12 months | 118 (11%) | 28 (14%) | 41 (18%) | 21 (8.2%) | 14 (19%) | 14 (4.8%) |  |
| No plans to leave within the next 3 years | 713 (68%) | 137 (70%) | 119 (51%) | 170 (66%) | 37 (49%) | 250 (85%) |  |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test | | | | | | | |

### Influence in reconsidering plans to leave present position

* Distribution of responses

The table shows the distribution of responses across a range of factors influencing the reconsideration of RNs’ plans to leave their present position.

**Table 44**: How likely would each of the following be to influence you to reconsider your plans to leave your present position?

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| More flexible scheduling |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Very likely | 332 (35%) | 63 (34%) | 106 (47%) | 79 (31%) | 20 (27%) | 64 (29%) |  |
| Somewhat likely | 279 (29%) | 71 (39%) | 59 (26%) | 65 (25%) | 22 (29%) | 62 (28%) |  |
| Not very likely | 196 (20%) | 33 (18%) | 45 (20%) | 68 (27%) | 20 (27%) | 30 (14%) |  |
| Not likely at all | 155 (16%) | 17 (9.2%) | 17 (7.5%) | 44 (17%) | 13 (17%) | 64 (29%) |  |
| Unknown | 91 | 12 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 73 |  |
| Higher salary and benefits |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Very likely | 520 (53%) | 97 (51%) | 124 (55%) | 161 (63%) | 47 (63%) | 91 (39%) |  |
| Somewhat likely | 272 (28%) | 61 (32%) | 64 (28%) | 58 (23%) | 21 (28%) | 68 (29%) |  |
| Not very likely | 116 (12%) | 21 (11%) | 28 (12%) | 26 (10%) | 7 (9.3%) | 34 (15%) |  |
| Not likely at all | 72 (7.3%) | 11 (5.8%) | 11 (4.8%) | 11 (4.3%) | 0 (0%) | 39 (17%) |  |
| Unknown | 73 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 61 |  |
| More autonomy |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Very likely | 300 (31%) | 66 (36%) | 85 (37%) | 87 (34%) | 20 (27%) | 42 (20%) |  |
| Somewhat likely | 294 (31%) | 59 (32%) | 53 (23%) | 77 (30%) | 33 (44%) | 72 (34%) |  |
| Not very likely | 239 (25%) | 46 (25%) | 67 (30%) | 62 (24%) | 16 (21%) | 48 (22%) |  |
| Not likely at all | 123 (13%) | 14 (7.6%) | 22 (9.7%) | 29 (11%) | 6 (8.0%) | 52 (24%) |  |
| Unknown | 97 | 11 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 79 |  |
| More opportunities to influence decisions about patient care |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Very likely | 275 (29%) | 51 (27%) | 88 (39%) | 72 (28%) | 18 (24%) | 46 (22%) |  |
| Somewhat likely | 328 (34%) | 74 (40%) | 71 (31%) | 78 (31%) | 41 (55%) | 64 (30%) |  |
| Not very likely | 219 (23%) | 44 (24%) | 45 (20%) | 73 (29%) | 13 (17%) | 44 (21%) |  |
| Not likely at all | 134 (14%) | 18 (9.6%) | 23 (10%) | 32 (13%) | 3 (4.0%) | 58 (27%) |  |
| Unknown | 97 | 9 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 81 |  |
| More respect from unit management |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Very likely | 354 (37%) | 79 (42%) | 78 (34%) | 100 (39%) | 27 (36%) | 70 (32%) |  |
| Somewhat likely | 284 (29%) | 70 (37%) | 57 (25%) | 61 (24%) | 34 (45%) | 62 (28%) |  |
| Not very likely | 187 (19%) | 27 (14%) | 59 (26%) | 61 (24%) | 10 (13%) | 30 (14%) |  |
| Not likely at all | 138 (14%) | 11 (5.9%) | 33 (15%) | 33 (13%) | 4 (5.3%) | 57 (26%) |  |
| Unknown | 90 | 9 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 74 |  |
| Better staffing |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Very likely | 451 (47%) | 80 (43%) | 116 (51%) | 132 (52%) | 34 (45%) | 89 (40%) |  |
| Somewhat likely | 274 (28%) | 70 (37%) | 63 (28%) | 68 (27%) | 25 (33%) | 48 (22%) |  |
| Not very likely | 146 (15%) | 28 (15%) | 35 (15%) | 39 (15%) | 12 (16%) | 32 (14%) |  |
| Not likely at all | 96 (9.9%) | 9 (4.8%) | 13 (5.7%) | 16 (6.3%) | 4 (5.3%) | 54 (24%) |  |
| Unknown | 86 | 9 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 70 |  |
| More respect from administration |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Very likely | 391 (41%) | 79 (42%) | 120 (53%) | 89 (35%) | 26 (35%) | 77 (36%) |  |
| Somewhat likely | 263 (27%) | 67 (36%) | 54 (24%) | 73 (29%) | 19 (25%) | 50 (23%) |  |
| Not very likely | 185 (19%) | 28 (15%) | 37 (16%) | 60 (23%) | 19 (25%) | 41 (19%) |  |
| Not likely at all | 120 (13%) | 12 (6.5%) | 16 (7.0%) | 34 (13%) | 11 (15%) | 47 (22%) |  |
| Unknown | 94 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 78 |  |
| More opportunities for professiona development |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Very likely | 442 (46%) | 85 (45%) | 123 (54%) | 123 (48%) | 31 (41%) | 80 (36%) |  |
| Somewhat likely | 299 (31%) | 66 (35%) | 65 (29%) | 68 (27%) | 28 (37%) | 72 (33%) |  |
| Not very likely | 141 (15%) | 28 (15%) | 26 (11%) | 43 (17%) | 14 (19%) | 30 (14%) |  |
| Not likely at all | 86 (8.9%) | 10 (5.3%) | 13 (5.7%) | 22 (8.6%) | 2 (2.7%) | 39 (18%) |  |
| Unknown | 85 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 72 |  |
| Better leadership |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Very likely | 368 (39%) | 68 (37%) | 99 (44%) | 116 (45%) | 29 (39%) | 56 (27%) |  |
| Somewhat likely | 286 (30%) | 71 (38%) | 66 (29%) | 64 (25%) | 28 (37%) | 57 (27%) |  |
| Not very likely | 175 (18%) | 33 (18%) | 42 (19%) | 52 (20%) | 13 (17%) | 35 (17%) |  |
| Not likely at all | 125 (13%) | 14 (7.5%) | 20 (8.8%) | 24 (9.4%) | 5 (6.7%) | 62 (30%) |  |
| Unknown | 99 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 83 |  |
| More/better equipment and technology resources |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Very likely | 315 (33%) | 64 (34%) | 75 (33%) | 85 (33%) | 17 (23%) | 74 (33%) |  |
| Somewhat likely | 312 (32%) | 64 (34%) | 73 (32%) | 78 (31%) | 31 (41%) | 66 (30%) |  |
| Not very likely | 211 (22%) | 44 (23%) | 54 (24%) | 61 (24%) | 23 (31%) | 29 (13%) |  |
| Not likely at all | 128 (13%) | 16 (8.5%) | 25 (11%) | 31 (12%) | 4 (5.3%) | 52 (24%) |  |
| Unknown | 87 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 72 |  |
| More meaningful recognition for my contribution |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Very likely | 383 (40%) | 77 (41%) | 105 (46%) | 100 (39%) | 26 (35%) | 75 (34%) |  |
| Somewhat likely | 324 (34%) | 70 (37%) | 72 (32%) | 80 (31%) | 34 (45%) | 68 (31%) |  |
| Not very likely | 153 (16%) | 29 (16%) | 34 (15%) | 50 (20%) | 11 (15%) | 29 (13%) |  |
| Not likely at all | 105 (11%) | 11 (5.9%) | 16 (7.0%) | 26 (10%) | 4 (5.3%) | 48 (22%) |  |
| Unknown | 88 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 73 |  |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test | | | | | | | |

* Distribution of Combined Proportion - Very likely/ Somewhat likely

The table shows the distribution of the combined response of Very likely/ Somewhat likely.

The main factor indicated by the RNs is the **Higher salary and benefits** [81%] followed by **More opportunities for professional development** [77%] and **Better Staffing** [75%].

The **Higher salary and benefits** and **More opportunities for professional development** are the main factors for all countries.

**Table 45**: How likely would each of the following be to influence you to reconsider your plans to leave your present position?

Combined proportion of: Very likely/ Somewhat likely

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Higher salary and benefits | 792 (81%) | 158 (83%) | 188 (83%) | 219 (86%) | 68 (91%) | 159 (69%) | <0.001 |
| More opportunities for professiona development | 741 (77%) | 151 (80%) | 188 (83%) | 191 (75%) | 59 (79%) | 152 (69%) | 0.006 |
| Better staffing | 725 (75%) | 150 (80%) | 179 (79%) | 200 (78%) | 59 (79%) | 137 (61%) | <0.001 |
| More meaningful recognition for my contribution | 707 (73%) | 147 (79%) | 177 (78%) | 180 (70%) | 60 (80%) | 143 (65%) | 0.003 |
| Better leadership | 654 (69%) | 139 (75%) | 165 (73%) | 180 (70%) | 57 (76%) | 113 (54%) | <0.001 |
| More respect from administration | 654 (68%) | 146 (78%) | 174 (77%) | 162 (63%) | 45 (60%) | 127 (59%) | <0.001 |
| More respect from unit management | 638 (66%) | 149 (80%) | 135 (59%) | 161 (63%) | 61 (81%) | 132 (60%) | <0.001 |
| More/better equipment and technology resources | 627 (65%) | 128 (68%) | 148 (65%) | 163 (64%) | 48 (64%) | 140 (63%) | 0.9 |
| More flexible scheduling | 611 (64%) | 134 (73%) | 165 (73%) | 144 (56%) | 42 (56%) | 126 (57%) | <0.001 |
| More opportunities to influence decisions about patient care | 603 (63%) | 125 (67%) | 159 (70%) | 150 (59%) | 59 (79%) | 110 (52%) | <0.001 |
| More autonomy | 594 (62%) | 125 (68%) | 138 (61%) | 164 (64%) | 53 (71%) | 114 (53%) | 0.014 |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test | | | | | | | |

### Support of continuing education (CE) and specialty certification

In house Continuous education is provided for 50% of the overall sample. There are differences across countries, where in Spain, the in house CE is offered in the 66% of the RNs and and in Poland the lowest (28%).

Paid time off for CE is provided for 15% of the overall sample. There are differences across countries, where in Cyprus, the paid time off for CE is offered in the 35% of the RNs and and in Spain the lowest (4.7%).

**Table 46**: Support of continuing education (CE) and specialty certification

|  | Overall, N = 1,0531 | Cyprus, N = 1961 | Spain, N = 2321 | Croatia, N = 2571 | Poland, N = 751 | Romania, N = 2931 | p-value2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To what degree does your organization support the continuing education of nurses? |  |  |  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Provides in house CE | 509 (50%) | 74 (39%) | 152 (66%) | 129 (50%) | 21 (28%) | 133 (49%) |  |
| Provides paid time off for CE | 156 (15%) | 67 (35%) | 11 (4.7%) | 37 (14%) | 14 (19%) | 27 (9.9%) |  |
| Provides time off without pay for CE | 58 (5.6%) | 14 (7.3%) | 19 (8.2%) | 10 (3.9%) | 5 (6.7%) | 10 (3.7%) |  |
| Pays CE registration fees | 58 (5.6%) | 6 (3.1%) | 9 (3.9%) | 22 (8.6%) | 1 (1.3%) | 20 (7.3%) |  |
| No support | 247 (24%) | 30 (16%) | 41 (18%) | 59 (23%) | 34 (45%) | 83 (30%) |  |
| Unknown | 25 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |  |
| Does your organization support specialty nursing certification? (Either long or short term courses) | 466 (45%) | 122 (63%) | 94 (41%) | 103 (40%) | 36 (48%) | 111 (41%) | <0.001 |
| Unknown | 27 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |  |
| 1n (%) | | | | | | | |
| 2Pearson's Chi-squared test | | | | | | | |