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Background & Significance

- Historically, nursing shortages have resulting in nursing turnover.
- Turnover rates are higher among newly graduated nurses than the turnover rates of experienced nurses due the transition shock experienced when entering the profession.
- Nurse economists are predicting a serious nursing shortage due to:
  - A retiring nursing workforce
  - A lack of capacity in schools of nursing to produce new nurses
  - Increased demand due to an aging population
  - Increased demand due to increase access due to healthcare reform
- Nursing turnover is extremely costly to healthcare organizations.
- The Institute of Medicine in its report of the Future of Nursing has recommended the adoption of nurse residency programs to decrease turnover of new graduated nurse.
Research Questions

1. What is the difference in job satisfaction among nurses in the Versant Registered Nurse (RN) Residency in Magnet, Magnet Aspiring, and Non-Magnet Hospitals at 8 weeks into the RN Residency, at the end of the RN Residency, and at 12 months?

2. What is the difference in organizational commitment among nurses in the Versant RN Residency in Magnet, Magnet Aspiring, and Non-Magnet Hospitals at the end of the Versant RN Residency and at 12 months?

3. What is the difference in turnover rate among nurses in the Versant RN Residency in Magnet, Magnet Aspiring, and Non-Magnet Hospitals at 12 months?

4. What are the relationships between job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover, and demographic characteristics among nurses in the Versant RN Residency in Magnet, Magnet Aspiring, and Non-Magnet Hospitals at 12 months?
Case Inclusion/Exclusion Process

6574 Cases in the Versant Database

4773 Cases met Timeframe & Practice Environment Criteria

752 Cases with Complete Data

628 Cases Following Group Size Adjustment
Sample & Selection Criteria

• Following the exclusion of cases for missing data
  – 752 cases remained

• Randomly deleted cases to have a similar number of cases among groups
  – 628 nurse residents

• Stratification by Magnet Status resulted in:
  – 231 Magnet Hospital based cases
  – 231 Magnet Aspiring Hospital based cases
  – 166 Non-Magnet Hospital based cases

• The requirement of the a priori power analysis was fulfilled
Research Question 1

Within groups effect $[F(2, 1000) = 3.87, p = .004]$
Between group effects $[F(2, 1000) = 3.05, p = .048]$
Instrument Reliability – $\alpha = .86$ (subscales= .54-.81)
Research Question 2

Within groups effect \([F (2, 1000) = 2.78, p = .52]\)
Between group effects \([F (2, 1000) = .76, p = .47]\)
Instrument Reliability – \(\alpha = .89\)
Research Question 3

What is the difference in turnover rate among nurses in the Versant Registered Nurse (RN) Residency in Magnet, Magnet Aspiring, and Non-Magnet Hospitals at 12 months?

There was no statistically significant difference in nurse residents’ turnover among the three types of hospitals $[(3, 628) \ X^2 = 2.03, \ p > .05]$
Research Question 4
What are the relationships between job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover, and demographic characteristics among nurses in the Versant RN Residency in Magnet, Magnet Aspiring, and Non-Magnet Hospitals at 12 months?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magnet Status/Education Level</td>
<td>$(r = .14, p &lt; .001)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnet Status/Age Group</td>
<td>$(r = -.18, p &lt; .001)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnet Status/Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>$(r = .10, p &lt; .05)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction/Turnover</td>
<td>$(r = -.08, p &lt; .05)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnet Hospitals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age Group/Education Level</td>
<td>$(r = -.19, p &lt; .05)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction/Turnover</td>
<td>$(r = -.14, p &lt; .05)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnet Aspiring Hospitals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction/Turnover</td>
<td>$(r = -.14, p &lt; .05)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Magnet Hospitals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age Group/Education Level</td>
<td>$(r = -24, p &lt; .05)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

• There was an interaction effect between job satisfaction among nurse residents and work environment (Magnet Status).

• There was no interaction effect between organizational commitment in nurse residents and work environment (Magnet Status).

• Turnover in nurse residents did not significantly differ by work environment (Magnet Status).

• There were no administratively relevant relationships among any of the outcome variables.
Limitations

• Design – Secondary Analysis
  – Lack of Control
  – Volume of Missing Data

• Implementation
  – Versant RN Residency
    • Turnover

• Instrumentation
  – Outcome Variables
    • Job Satisfaction
    • Organizational Commitment
Implications

• Education

• Practice

• Administration

• Research