

# Sacred Heart UNIVERSITY

# Abstract

### Objective

Describing patient safety culture in hospitals is an important step in the development of safe work environments. Research has confirmed that Magnet<sup>®</sup> hospitals provide a positive work environment for nurses; research related to patient safety culture in Magnet hospitals versus non-Magnet hospitals is scarce. This study, using secondary data analysis from the Agency for Health Care Research (AHRQ) compared Hospital Survey on Patient Safety Culture (Hospital SOPS) data in Magnet and non-Magnet hospitals in United States.

### **Methods**

The study was a correlational descriptive design and the data were unidentifiable. The Hospital SOPS instrument measures hospital staffs' perceptions about patient safety issues, medical error and events reporting. The only hospital characteristics were Magnet status (variable of interest) and hospital bed size (categorical measure). The sample consisted of respondents in 1,295 hospitals, 149 Magnet hospitals and 1,146 non-Magnet hospitals that voluntarily submitted information in the AHRQ Research Hospital SOPS 2012 and 2013 Database.

### **Results**

All results were reported in positive percent scores. Regression analysis, descriptive statistics, and hierarchical linear modeling described the comparisons of Hospital SOPS measures in Magnet and non-Magnet hospitals. Magnet hospitals showed small statistically significant positive differences (2-4%) in all categories.

### Conclusion

In large data bases, AHRQ recommends percentage differences of at least 5% to be considered meaningful; therefore, it was not determined that Magnet hospitals showed more positive safety culture than non-Magnet hospitals. For both hospital groups, teamwork within units stood out as the most strongly positive attributes and punitive response to error and under reporting of errors the greatest weakness.

### Discussion

Magnet hospitals have recently focused attention on patient outcomes. Understanding how Magnet hospitals positively influence patient safety culture is evolving and will be discussed.

# Background & Purpose

- Despite much effort in the past 10 years, patient injury rates due to medical error remain unchanged (Landrigan et al., 2010; Levinson, 2010)
- Nurse Executives are pressured by government and by hospital administrators to demonstrate patients are safe from medical harm (Sammer, Lykens, Singh, Mains & Lackan, 2010)
- Magnet designation has been proven to be a positive work environment for nurses
- (Kramer, Schmalenberg & Maguire, 2010; Upenieks, 2003; Wolf et al., 2008) • Compare through secondary data hospital staffs' perceptions of patient safety culture in Magnet and non-Magnet hospitals

# Conceptual Framework



### **Research Questions**

Using Hospital Survey on Patient Safety Culture (Hospital SOPS ) data:

- 1. Are there differences in the 12 Hospital SOPS patient safety composites between Magnet and non-Magnet hospitals?
- 2. Is there a difference in the overall Hospital SOPS composite average score between Magnet and non-Magnet hospitals?
- 3. Is there a difference in the number of reported adverse events between Magnet and non-Magnet hospitals?
- 4. Is there a difference in overall patient safety grade in Magnet and non-Magnet hospitals?

# A Comparison of Hospital Patient Safety Culture Data in Magnet<sup>®</sup> and non-Magnet Hospitals Presented by Melanie M. McCloskey, RN, DNP, NE-BC

# Sample & Methods

- Consisted of staffs' perceptions in 1,295 hospitals, 149 Magnet <sup>®</sup> & 1,146 non- Magnet • Though percentage of Magnet Hospitals <sup>®</sup> (11.5%) was small versus non- Magnet hospitals (88.5%). This data represent Magnet hospitals ® (7%) across the nation
- (Kelly, McHugh & Aiken, 2011) All hospital staff who interact with patients were invited to respond

### Methods:

- The study was a correlational descriptive design
- Secondary Data analysis from the AHRQ & Westat was used (AHRQ, 2013)
- The Hospital SOPS instrument measured hospital staffs' perceptions about patient
- safety issues, medical error and events reporting
- Hospital characteristics were Magnet status (variable of interest) and hospital bed size
- Regression analysis, descriptive statistics & hierarchical linear modeling were used to describe the comparisons of Hospital SOPS measures in Magnet and non-Magnet hospitals
- Results were reported in positive percent scores

### **Hospital SOPS Measures**

### (12 composites, 2 single item & one overall average) Staffing-Hospital SOPS

- **Communication openness**
- Frequency of events reported
- Feedback and communication
- about error
- Handoffs and transitions

**Organizational learning** 

Management support for patient safety

Non punitive response to error

• Overall perception of safety

Patient safety grade on unit

Teamwork across units

Teamwork within units

 Number of adverse events reported in past 12 months

Supervisor/manager expectations & actions

 Hospital SOPS composite average (12 composites)

promoting patient safety

Results

### **Hospital Bed Size** Distribution of Hospitals by Bed Size and Magnet Status

Distribution of hospitals by Ded Size and Magnet Status						
BED SIZE	HOSPI <sup>-</sup> n	TALS %	MAG n	NET %	NON-MA n	AGNET %
25-99 beds	490	38	10	6.7	480	41.9
100-199 beds	290	22	16	10.7	274	23.9
200-299 beds	202	16	33	22.1	169	14.7
300-399 beds	123	9	29	19.5	94	8.2
400-499 beds	73	6	21	14.1	52	4.5
500 beds+	117	9	40	26.8	77	6.7

### **Research Question #1**

Were the differences in the 12 Hospital SOPS patient safety composites between Magnet and non-Magnet hospitals?

### **Estimated means for 12 H-SOPS composites** by Magnet Status

Estimated Marginal Means for the 12 Hospital SOPs Composites by Magnet Status

Hospital SOPS Composite	Magn n Mear	et 1 (%)*	Non-Ma n Mea		Р
Communication openness	149	64	1143	62	.004**
Frequency of events reported	147	65	1143	64	.36
Feedback and communication about error	148	66	1143	65	.40
Handoffs and transitions	149	48	1143	46	.04*
Management support for patient safety	149	75	1142	72	.001**
Nonpunitive response to error	148	46	1141	44	.03*
Organizational learning	148	74	1146	72	.03*
Overall perceptions of safety	147	68	1131	66	.001**
Staffing - HSOPS	148	59	1143	56	.002**
Supervisor/management expectations and actions promoting patient safety	149	76	1137	75	.18
Teamwork across units	148	62	1138	59	.001**
Teamwork within units	148	82	1145	80	.002**

\*Estimated Marginal Means; \*p < .05; \*\* p < .001

Category of adverse events	Total Sample Mean (%)	Magnet Mean (%)ª	Non-Magnet Mean (%)ª	р
Hospitals reporting no events	54	54	54	.30
Hospitals reporting 1 or 2 events	27	28	27	.13
Hospitals reporting 3 to 5 events	12	13	12	.16
Hospitals reporting 6 to 10 events	4	4	4	.40
Hospitals reporting 11 to 20 events	1	2	2	.44
Hospitals reporting >20 events	1	1	1	.07

\* p<.001

### **Research Question #2**

Was there a difference in the overall Hospital SOPS composite average score (12 composites) between Magnet and non-Magnet hospitals?

- Magnet status again showed significant difference in overall average but percentage point practical difference not met
- Magnet (65%) and non-Magnet (63%)

### **Research Question #3**

Was there a difference in the number of adverse events, as assessed by Hospital SOPS, between Magnet and non-Magnet hospitals?

### **Adverse Events in Means by Magnet Status**

Hospitals Reports on Adverse Events by Hospital Sample (N=1295) in Means and by Magnet Status in Means

<sup>a</sup>EMM–estimated marginal means

### **Research Question #4**

Was there a difference in the patient safety grade, as assessed by Hospital SOPS, between Magnet and non-Magnet hospitals?

### Safety Grades by Magnet Hospital Status in Estimated Marginal Means

Safety Grade	Magnet Mean (%)ª	Non-Magnet Mean (%)ª	р		
A (Excellent)	33	30	.004*		
B (Very Good)	46	45	.09		
C (Acceptable)	17	20	.001*		
D (Poor)	3	4	.004*		
E (Failing)	.5	.8	.007*		

<sup>a</sup>EMM–estimated marginal means

### Summary of Results

- Magnet hospitals showed small significant positive differences (2-4%) in 9 out of 12 multi-item categories
- However, AHRQ recommends, in such a large data base, that percentage differences of at least 5% between hospitals is considered meaningful
- Therefore, It could not be determined that Magnet hospitals showed more positive safety culture than non-Magnet hospitals
- Results between Magnet and non-Magnet hospitals in the 2 variables of reporting adverse events and patient safety grades showed no meaningful differences between the two hospital groups.
- · Under reporting of adverse events occurred at alarmingly high rates in both hospitals. 54% of both hospital groups reported no adverse events in the past 12 months More Magnet hospitals rated patient safety grades in their units as excellent or very good, and more non-Magnet hospitals rated safety grade, in their units as less favorable or failing



# Discussion

### **Possible explanations for Magnet Hospital scores**

## Implications Knowledge:

Practice: Quantify patient safety culture & focus on strengths and weaknesses to make improvements Safety culture within departments stronger than other areas Nurses play a significant leadership role in creating positive safety culture

**Education:** More study needed around safer hospital environments that support error reporting

**Policy:** Both Magnet and non-Magnet hospitals despite government regulations are still not that safe according to hospital staff.

# References

Agency for Healthcare Quality Report. (2013). National healthcare quality report 2012 (AHRQ No.13-0002). Retrieved from http://www.ahrq.gov/research/ findings/nhgrdr/index.html.

Armellino, D., Quinn Griffin, M. T., & Fitzpatrick, J. J. (2010). Structural empowerment and patient safety culture among registered nurses working in adult critical care units. Journal of Nursing Management. **18**, 796-803. Kelly, L. A., McHugh, M. D., & Aiken, L. H. (2011). Nurse outcomes in Magnet and non-Magnet hospitals.

Kramer, M., Schmalenberg, C., & Maguire, P. (2010). Nine structure and leadership practices essential for a magnetic (healthy) work environment. Nursing Administrative Quarterly, 34(1), 4-17.

Landrigan, C. P., Parry, G. J., Bones, C. B., Hackbarth, A. D., Goldman, D. A., & Sharek, P. J. (2010). Temporal trends in rates of patient harm resulting from medical care. New England Journal of Medicine, 363(22), 2124-2134.

Levinson, D. R. (2010). Adverse events in hospitals: National incidence among Medicare beneficiaries (DHHS Publication No. OEI-06-09-00090). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Poe, S., & White, K. M. (2010). Johns Hopkins nursing evidence-based practice: Implementation and translation. Retrieved from http://0-site.ebrary.com. enterprise. sacredheart.edu/lib/sacredheart/doc-Detail.action?docID=10404979. Potera, C. (2012). Outcomes better in Magnet than non-Magnet hospitals? Not so Fast. Retrieved from http://ajonline.com.

Sorra, J., Khanna, K., Dyer, N., Mardon, R., & Famolaro, T. (2012b). Exploring relationships between patient safety culture and patients' assessments of hospital care. Journal Patient Safety, 8(3), 131-139. Upenieks, V. (2003). The interrelationship of organizational characteristics of Magnet hospitals, nursing leadership, and nursing job satisfaction. **Health Care Manager**, 22(2), 83-98.

Wolf, G., Triolo, P., & Ponte, P. R. (2008). Magnet Recognition Program. The next generation. **The Journal** of Nursing Administration, 38(4), 200-204.



Magnet hospitals slightly outperformed non-Magnet hospitals on most scores

• Both hospital groups showed similar strengths (teamwork within unit) and similar weaknesses (non-punitive response to error)

• Magnet and non-Magnet hospitals rated themselves in the low to mid 60% range in the overall average score that determined how safe in general they felt their hospitals were

Both groups reported astonishingly low rates of adverse events

• Magnet hospitals perceived their work unit as safer and non-Magnet hospitals rated their units as less safe

• Magnet Hospitals had larger bed-size than non-Magnet Hospitals. Already proven that the larger the bed size the lower the Hospital-SOPS scores (Sorra et al, 2012) • Magnet Hospitals have implemented superior nursing practice environments. Non-Magnet hospitals may have learned from example without acquiring the Magnet designation

 Too soon to measure Hospital-SOPS differences as Magnet has only started to focus on patient outcomes (Poe &White,2010; Portera, 2012)

• Patient safety grade higher in Magnet . Previous research linked nursing empowerment scores with safety grade. Higher the empowerment the higher the Hospital SOPS scores & as safety grade decreased so did empowerment scores (Armellino et al., 2010). Similar results in this study.

Added to body of knowledge in patient safety culture in hospital organizations.

The Journal of Nursing Administration, 41(10), 428-433. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/.

Sammer, C. E., Lykens, K., Singh, K. P., Mains, D. A., & Lackan, N. A. (2010). What is patient safety? A review of the literature. Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 42(2), 156-165.

