

Aligning Perspectives on Health, Safety and Well-Being

Anthony Montgomery
Margot van der Doef
Efharis Panagopoulou
Michael P. Leiter *Editors*

Connecting Healthcare Worker Well-Being, Patient Safety and Organisational Change

The Triple Challenge

 Springer

Aligning Perspectives on Health, Safety and Well-Being

Series Editors

Stavroula Leka, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Aditya Jain, Nottingham University Business School and Centre for Organizational Health and Development, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK

Gerard Zwetsloot, University of Nottingham, Centre for Organizational Health and Development, Nottingham, United Kingdom, TNO InGerard Zwetsloot Research & Consultancy, Amsterdam, Noord-Holland, The Netherlands

Raising awareness of the interdisciplinary and complementary relationship of different research perspectives on health, safety and well-being is the main aim of the book series *Aligning Perspectives on Health, Safety and Well-being*. Combined research approaches on health, safety and well-being are becoming more and more popular in several research disciplines across and between the social, behavioural and medical sciences. Therefore, *Aligning Perspectives on Health, Safety and Well-being* stimulates the publication of interdisciplinary approaches to the promotion of health, safety and well-being. Recognizing a need within societies and workplaces for more integrated approaches to problem solving, the series caters to the notion that most innovation stems from combining knowledge and research results from related but so far separated areas. Volumes will be edited by expert authors and editors and will contain contributions from different disciplines. All authors, and especially volume editors are encouraged to engage in developing more robust theoretical models that can be applied in actual practice and lead to policy development. Editorial Board: Professor Johannes Siegrist, University of Dusseldorf, Germany Professor Peter Chen, University of South Australia Professor Katherine Lippel, University of Ottawa, Canada Professor Nicholas Ashford, MIT, USA Dr Steve Sauter, NIOSH, USA Dr Peter Hasle, Aalborg University, Denmark.

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/10757>

Anthony Montgomery • Margot van der Doef •
Efharis Panagopoulou • Michael P. Leiter
Editors

Connecting Healthcare Worker Well-Being, Patient Safety and Organisational Change

The Triple Challenge



Springer

Editors

Anthony Montgomery
Department of Education & Social Policy
University of Macedonia
Thessaloniki, Greece

Margot van der Doef
Health Psychology
Leiden University
Leiden, Zuid-Holland, The Netherlands

Efharis Panagopoulou
Health Psychology
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
Thessaloniki, Greece

Michael P. Leiter
Industrial and Organisational Psychology
Deakin University
Burwood, Australia

ISSN 2213-0497

ISSN 2213-0470 (electronic)

Aligning Perspectives on Health, Safety and Well-Being

ISBN 978-3-030-60997-9

ISBN 978-3-030-60998-6 (eBook)

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-60998-6>

© Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2020

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG.
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Contents

1	Connecting Health Care Worker Well-being, Patient Safety and Organizational Change: The Triple Challenge	1
	Anthony J. Montgomery, Margot Van der Doef, Efharis Panagopoulou, and Michael P. Leiter	
Part I Linking Organisational Factors, Health Care Worker Well-being, and Patient Outcomes		
2	Job Strain, Burnout, Wellbeing and Patient Safety in Healthcare Professionals	11
	Daryl B. O'Connor, Louise H. Hall, and Judith Johnson	
3	Missed Nursing Care: The Impact on Patients, Nurses and Organisations	25
	Marcia Kirwan and Anne Matthews	
4	Linking Organisational Factors and Patient Care: Does Healthcare Workers' Well-being Matter?	41
	Kevin Teoh and Juliet Hassard	
5	Burnout in Primary Care Workforce	59
	Anli Yue Zhou, Maria Panagioti, Henry Galleta-Williams, and Aneez Esmail	
Part II Zooming in on the Health Care Context		
6	Between Balance and Burnout: Contrasting the Working-Time Conditions of Irish-Trained Hospital Doctors in Ireland and Australia	75
	John-Paul Byrne, Edel Conway, Aoife M. McDermott, Richard W. Costello, Lucia Prihodova, Anne Matthews, and Niamh Humphries	

7	Doctors Well-being, Quality of Patient Care and Organizational Change: Norwegian Experiences	91
	Karin Isaksson Rø, Judith Rosta, Reidar Tyssen, and Fredrik Bååthe	
8	The Relationship Between Employee Engagement and Organisational Outcomes in the English National Health Service: An Analysis of Employee and Employer Data in 28 Healthcare Organisations	115
	Christian van Stolk and Marco Hafner	
9	Governing Health Care Provision: Clinicians' Experiences	131
	Berit Bringedal, Inger Lise Teig, and Kristine Bærøe	
10	Speaking up about Bullying and Harassment in Healthcare: Reflections Following the Introduction of an Innovative "Speak Up" Role in NHS England	145
	A. Jones, J. Blake, C. Banks, M. Adams, D. Kelly, R. Mannion, and J. Maben	
Part III Developing Cultures that Enable Organisational Change		
11	Between Taking Care of Others and Yourself: The Role of Work Recovery in Health Professionals	165
	Claudia L. Rus, Cristina C. Vâjâean, Cătălina Oțoiu, and Adriana Băban	
12	Creating Optimal Clinical Workplaces by Transforming Leadership and Empowering Clinicians	187
	Paul DeChant and Diane Shannon	
13	Compassionate and Collective Leadership for Cultures of High-Quality Care	207
	Michael A. West	
14	Workforce and Excellence in Nursing Care: Challenges for Leaders and Professionals	227
	P. Van Bogaert, O. Timmermans, S. Slotmans, E. Goossens, and E. Franck	
15	Mindful Practice: Organizational Change and Health Professional Flourishing Through Cultivating Presence and Courageous Conversations	247
	Michael S. Krasner and Ronald Epstein	

Part IV Towards Individual- and Organisation-Focused Interventions and Their Effectiveness

16 Training as a Facilitator of Organizational Change in Health Care: The Input-Mediator/Moderator-Outcome-Input Model 263
Megan E. Gregory, Clayton D. Rothwell,
and Ann Scheck McAlearney

17 Schwartz Center Rounds: An Intervention to Enhance Staff Well-Being and Promote Organisational Change 281
Jill Maben and Cath Taylor

18 How Healthcare Worker Well-Being Intersects with Safety Culture, Workforce Engagement, and Operational Outcomes 299
Kathryn C. Adair, Kyle Rehder, and J. Bryan Sexton

19 Mindfulness as a Way to Improve Well-Being in Healthcare Professionals: Separating the Wheat from the Chaff 319
Anthony Montgomery, Katerina Georganta, Ashvimi Gilbeth,
Yugan Subramaniam, and Karen Morgan

20 Using Transformative Learning to Develop Skills for Managing Conflict: Lessons Learnt over 10 Years 331
Eva Doherty

21 Well-Being, Patient Safety and Organizational Change: Quo Vadis? 345
Anthony J. Montgomery

Chapter 1

Connecting Health Care Worker Well-being, Patient Safety and Organizational Change: The Triple Challenge



Anthony J. Montgomery, Margot Van der Doef, Efharis Panagopoulou, and Michael P. Leiter

There is a growing realisation within healthcare that healthcare worker well-being, patient outcomes and organizational change are symbiotically linked (Montgomery & Maslach, 2019). We have accumulated enough evidence to demonstrate that job burnout has become a major problem within the field of healthcare. It is a response to prolonged exposure to occupational stressors, and it has serious consequences for healthcare professionals (HPs) and the organizations in which they work. Burnout is associated with sleep deprivation (Vela-Bueno et al., 2008), medical errors (Fahrenkopf et al., 2008; Prins et al., 2009; Shanafelt et al., 2010), poor quality of care (Linzer, 2018; Shirom, Nirel, & Vinokur, 2006), and low ratings of patient satisfaction (Vahey et al., 2004). Indeed, for US surgeons, burnout and depression were among the strongest factors related to reporting a recent major medical error (Shanafelt et al., 2011). Contrary to research findings and theory developments, there is growing acceptance among managers and the general public for viewing burnout as an individual failing while de-emphasizing the extent to which the syndrome reflects organizational and healthcare system shortcomings. The most recent meta-analysis in the field of burnout point to the fact there is a need for organisational solutions that address the factors that drive and maintain burnout (Panagioti et al., 2017). Unfortunately, the most common responses have put the responsibility on

A. J. Montgomery (✉)
University of Macedonia, Thessaloniki, Greece
e-mail: antmont@uom.edu.gr

M. Van der Doef
Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands

E. Panagopoulou
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece

M. P. Leiter
Industrial and Organisational Psychology, Deakin University, Burwood, VIC, Australia

© Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2020

A. Montgomery et al. (eds.), *Connecting Healthcare Worker Well-Being, Patient Safety and Organisational Change*, Aligning Perspectives on Health, Safety and Well-Being, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-60998-6_1

healthcare professionals to take better care of themselves, become more resilient, and cope with stressors on their own (Montgomery, Panagopoulou, Esmail, Richards, & Maslach, 2019).

This book will delineate the ways in which the key areas, well-being, patient safety and organizational change, are interrelated and contribute to unhealthy workplaces within healthcare. Contributing authors will ‘take the temperature’ of their subject areas and outline the ways in which we can align these three areas in ways that contribute to a healthy workplace for both healthcare workers and patients. Health care professionals are under increasing pressure to continuously improve quality of care in environments that are not naturally designed to contribute positively to either the health of their employees or to the recipients of care (Montgomery & Maslach, 2019). Improving quality of care requires not only the understanding of the clinical environment, health workers’ motivation and commitment, but also patients’ needs and literacy, health policy, and the social and political context in which health services are delivered (Montgomery, Tordova, Baban, & Panagopoulou, 2013; Panagopoulou, Montgomery, & Tsiga, 2015). The book has attracted a diverse array of authors from different disciplines that include; primary care, clinical medicine, nursing, occupational psychology, sociology, management, health psychology, clinical governance, health policy and health services research. It has been a rewarding endeavor integrating these different voices and reaching some meaningful conclusions about the challenges in connecting healthcare worker well-being, patient outcomes and organisational change.

The book is divided into four parts. Part I is concerned with linking organizational factors to healthcare worker well-being and patient outcomes. In Chap. 2, O’Connor, Hall and Johnson highlight the links between job strain, burnout, wellbeing and patient safety in order to develop effective interventions. The authors also consider research that has tested interventions in the health professional context, and emphasise the need for us to improve employees’ mental health in parallel with the drive for safer work environments. Chapter 3 by Kirwan and Matthews reviews the negative consequences of incomplete nursing care on patient outcomes including higher mortality levels, and outcomes for nurses such as increased levels of burnout and low job satisfaction. The authors examine how greater understanding, awareness, monitoring and addressing of missed care can help overcome the challenges for the nursing profession and healthcare organisations in a context of ever-increasing demands on services. In Chap. 4 Teoh and Hassard bring together organisational factors, well-being and patient care outcomes within a single conceptual model. Within their model, organisational factors are proposed to predict both healthcare workers’ well-being and patient care, with healthcare workers’ well-being postulated as a mediator. The authors remind us that while there has been considerable focus on improving patient care, there has not been an equal emphasis on improving workers’ well-being. In Chap. 5, Zhou et al. review the drivers of burnout in primary care. As the authors note, primary care is responsible for providing over 80% of the patient care across Europe, while general practitioners (GPs) have the highest rates of burnout and turnover across medical specialties. The chapter provides an overview

of the challenges for GPs and provides promising examples of interventions to mitigate burnout and promote engagement in primary care.

Part II zooms in for a finer grained look at the healthcare context across the globe. In Chap. 6, Byrne et al. compares the working time conditions of Irish and Australian hospital doctors. The background to their research is how austerity and emigration have shaped the landscape of healthcare services in Ireland. The authors report on the contrasting experiences of participants in Irish and Australian hospitals to illustrate how this context has impacted on the work-time of hospital doctors. Their chapter demonstrates how the work and non-work time of hospital doctors are shaped by institutional and organisational contexts, and how this interdependence of work and non-work time shapes the experience of burnout. In Chap. 7, Isaksson Rø et al. review the experience of Norwegian doctors. The authors discuss the triple challenge from a Norwegian perspective, which includes; healthcare system reforms in Norway, changes in doctors work-life and wellbeing and Norwegian doctors' understanding of their own the triple challenge (professional well-being, organizational factors and quality of patient care). In Chap. 8, Van Stolk and Hafner look at the concept of employee engagement in the English NHS and draw on two extensive surveys that included large NHS employers (mostly acute hospital trusts). The analyses of the authors suggest that a more holistic approach, which moves beyond single initiatives or interventions are important as various work environment and culture variables show a positive association with staff engagement. In Chap. 9, Bringedal et al. examine the experience of clinicians in the Norwegian health services with regard to the impact of governing instruments on their ability to provide quality care to their patients. The authors highlight how governance will have the opposite effect and that the standardization of clinicians' daily work may give a more transparent and efficient health care service, but that more focus on 'measurable' outcomes will mean other less tangible aspects, equally important, risk being ignored or getting insufficient attention. Chapter 10 reviews a 2016 initiative in the UK NHS aimed at reducing employee silence, named the "Freedom to Speak Up Guardian"(FTSUG) role. Jones and Blake highlight how the FTSUG role was given a broad remit with the hope that it would improve patient safety, but that in practice the majority of FTSUGs time is spent on bullying and harassment concerns, rather than on direct patient safety concerns. The authors recommend the need for FTSUG guidelines to more adequately reflect the fact that employees are using the service to speak up about time-consuming, contentious and antagonistic cases of staff bullying and harassment. The chapter reminds us that employees will not allow us to disconnect clinical performance from employee wellbeing.

Part III explores how developing culture can enable organizational change. In Chap. 11, Rus et al. provide an integrative review of the literature on recovery from work in healthcare professionals. The authors consider the multilevel antecedents and consequences of work recovery, and suggest potential organizational and individual level interventions on work recovery to enhance health professionals' wellbeing and ultimately, patient safety. In Chap. 12, Krasner and Epstein introduce us to Mindful practice, which they describe as moment-to-moment purposeful attentiveness to one's own physical and mental processes during every day work

with the goal of practicing with clarity and compassion. The authors argue that Mindful Practice training can cultivate qualities that most clinicians and educators recognize as qualities of excellent practitioners –attentiveness, self-monitoring, curiosity, beginner’s mind, commitment, resilience, presence, empathy, acceptance and awareness of one’s biases. In Chap. 13, De Chant and Shannon discuss how we can create optimal clinical workplaces by transforming leadership and empowering clinicians. The authors recommend that individual leaders must shift from command-and-control leadership to mentoring, and that healthcare organizations must adopt an inverted organizational chart, which can enable and support servant leadership styles among clinicians. Chapter 14 is a call to embrace compassionate and collective leadership for cultures of high-quality care. West argues that compassion is the key to responding effectively to the triple challenge of ensuring high-quality care for our populations, the well-being of those who provide care, and the effective functioning of health care organizations that provide the context for that care. In Chap. 15, Van Bogaert et al. provide insights on clinical work systems, personal leadership and the nurse practice environment, as well as empirical work investigating associations between nurse work characteristics, such as social capital, decision latitude, workload, work engagement and burnout, and nurses’ perception of excellent job satisfaction and care quality. The authors’ data show that an environment characterized by balanced work characteristics, including workload, decision latitude and social capital, was associated with higher job satisfaction and self-rated excellence of care quality in staff nurses and midwives. All the chapters in this part convergence towards a similar conclusion; that changing our models of leadership is the key to changing the cultures of our healthcare organizations.

Part IV reviews the potential for individual and organizational interventions to resolve the triple challenge of the book. In Chap. 16, Gregory et al. reviews the importance of training as a mechanism to facilitate organizational change and explains the mechanisms via the input-mediator/moderator-output-input (IMOI) model. The authors interweave specific examples of two training programs deployed in healthcare settings: teamwork training and cultural competency training. The chapter highlights how well planned training can improve patient safety and worker wellbeing in the context of organizational change. In Chap. 17, Maben and Taylor introduce us to Schwartz Centre Rounds, which are organization-wide forums for healthcare staff which prompt reflection and discussion of the emotional, social or ethical challenges of healthcare work. The authors argue that Schwartz Rounds can help staff see and connect with the bigger picture of how the organization functions, helping to develop organizational cohesiveness and connectedness to the organizational mission and values, and provide a space to process patient cases and learn from mistakes. In Chap. 18, Adair et al. highlight for us how the prevalence, severity and consequential nature of health worker burnout puts institutions at risk for costly patient safety issues and turnover. The authors review a range of brief individual interventions (many at low/no cost) that use reflective practices to improve well-being indicators such as emotional exhaustion, work-life balance, depression and subjective well-being. In Chap. 19, Montgomery et al. examine the evidence base for the effectiveness of mindfulness based interventions (MBIs) among healthcare

professionals. There is a general narrative within healthcare that mindfulness has positive impacts on both well-being and clinical practice. The authors question this idea and examine whether grouping MBIs together is scientifically meaningful, whether there is evidence that they affect objective outcomes, and whether these interventions are appropriate tools for healthcare professionals. The chapter highlights the fact that the evidence-base is largely based on female participants from developed countries, which should caution us as to the generalizability of such interventions to health care professionals across the globe. In Chap. 19, Doherty describes in detail how a training programme can be designed and delivered to equip doctors with the knowledge and skills to manage incivility and conflict in their workplace. The author provides extensive detail on how the program can be structured and delivered. Incivility is a common problem within healthcare. Learning how to manage conflict is not routinely taught in education and training programmes for either undergraduate or postgraduate health professionals perhaps because the educators themselves are conflict averse. The chapters in this part provide a range of approaches to addressing worker wellbeing, patient safety and organizational change.

Finally, this book is being written during a time when the world has been dominated by COVID-19 pandemic. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) is disrupting nearly every aspect of everyday life and placing unprecedented demands on our society. Healthcare professionals are at the frontline of this pandemic, and research suggests that healthcare professionals are reporting symptoms of depression, anxiety, insomnia and distress as a direct result of working during COVID-19 conditions (Lai et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020). As noted by Kinman, Teoh, and Harriss (2020), there was significant evidence that healthcare workers were already demoralized and mentally and physically depleted, prior to COVID-19. The pandemic has the potential to exacerbate feelings of burnout and disengagement as the burden on healthcare workers increases. It also evident that health workers struggle with having to provide suboptimal care due to high patient numbers, corona restrictions and high emotional burden linked to the isolation of patients on the ICU wards/ and in nursing homes—where patients are dying alone. The pandemic has already created ‘new’ problems with staff being forced to keep silent about the lack of available resources (Dyer, 2020). These restrictions exacerbate the conflict of providers’ professional treatment values with the limitations created by inadequate preparation for pandemics despite many warnings. However, it also represents the possibility to rethink how we organise healthcare and it has brought into sharp focus the connection between health care worker well-being, patient safety and organisational capacity. The current pandemic has forced us to accept that the wellbeing of healthcare workers is an important part of the healthcare equation. The measures being introduced in workplaces to protect workers from contracting COVID-19 may lead to better preparedness in the future for other infections by increases in historically low vaccination rates (Williams et al., 2017), and better personal hygiene at work and work organisation involving greater physical distancing. Additionally, workplace changes introduced due to the COVID-19 crisis, such as the replacement of face-to-face meetings and conferences with online and virtual

assemblies can lead to positive environmental effects through less traffic congestion and lower carbon emissions from reduced motor vehicle and aircraft travel (Sim, 2020). However at present, the pandemic has brought huge strains on the health care system and shows its vulnerability; and has huge impacts on the already affected healthcare professionals. This all makes this book all the more relevant in the current time. Hopefully, there is now a momentum to reconsider the organization of healthcare, and take into account and include the suggestions for improvement provided in each chapter.

References

- Dyer, C. (2020). Covid-19: Doctors are warned not to go public about PPE shortages. *BMJ*, *369*, m1592. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1592>
- Fahrenkopf, A. M., Sectish, T. C., Barger, L. K., Sharek, P. J., Lewin, D., Chiang, V. W., et al. (2008). Rates of medication errors among depressed and burnt out residents: Prospective cohort study. *BMJ*, *336*, 488–491. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.39469.763218.BE18258931>
- Kinman, G., Teoh, K., & Harriss, A. (2020). Supporting the Well-being of healthcare workers during and after COVID-19. *Occupational Medicine*, *70*, 294–296. <https://doi.org/10.1093/occmed/kqaa096>
- Lai, J., Ma, S., Wang, Y., Cai, Z., Hu, J., Wei, N., et al. (2020). Factors associated with mental health outcomes among health care workers exposed to coronavirus disease 2019. *JAMA Network Open*, *3*, e203976.
- Linzer, M. (2018). Clinician burnout and the quality of care. *JAMA Internal Medicine*, *178*, 1331–1332. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2018.370830193370>
- Montgomery, A., & Maslach, C. (2019). Burnout in health professionals. In S. Ayers, C. McManus, S. Newman, K. Petrie, T. Revenson, & J. Weiman (Eds.), *Cambridge handbook of psychology, health and medicine* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Montgomery, A., Panagopoulou, E., Esmail, A., Richards, T., & Maslach, C. (2019). Burnout in healthcare: the case for organisational change. *BMJ*, *366*, 14774. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.14774>
- Montgomery, A., Tordova, I., Baban, A., & Panagopoulou, E. (2013). Improving quality and safety in the hospital: The link between organisational culture, burnout and quality of care. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, *18*, 656–662.
- Panagioti, M., Panagopoulou, E., Bower, P., Lewith, G., Kontopantelis, E., Chew-Graham, C., et al. (2017). Controlled interventions to reduce burnout in physicians: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Internal Medicine*, *177*, 195–205. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.7674.27918798>
- Panagopoulou, E., Montgomery, A., & Tsiga, E. (2015). Bringing the Well-being and patient safety research agenda together: Why healthy HPs equal safe patients. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *6*, 211. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.0021>
- Prins, J. T., van der Heijden, F. M., Hoekstra-Weebers, J. E., Bakker, A. B., van de HBM, W., Jacobs, B., et al. (2009). Burnout, engagement and resident physicians' self-reported errors. *Psychology, Health & Medicine*, *14*, 654–666. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1354850090331155420183538>
- Shanafelt, T. D., Balch, C. M., Bechamps, G., Russell, T., Dyrbye, L., Satele, D., et al. (2010). Burnout and medical errors among American surgeons. *Ann Surg*, *251*, 995–1000. <https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0b013e3181bfdab319934755>
- Shanafelt, T. D., Balch, C. M., Dyrbye, L., Bechamps, G., Russell, T., Satele, D., et al. (2011). Special report: Suicidal ideation among American surgeons. *Archives of Surgery*, *146*, 54–62.

- Shirom, A., Nirel, N., & Vinokur, A. D. (2006). Overload, autonomy, and burnout as predictors of physicians' quality of care. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 11*, 328–342. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.11.4.32817059297>
- Sim, M. R. (2020). The COVID-19 pandemic: Major risks to healthcare and other workers on the front line. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 77*, 281–282.
- Vahey, D. C., Aiken, L. H., Sloane, D. M., Clarke, S. P., & Vargas, D. (2004). Nurse burnout and patient satisfaction. *Medical Care, 42*(Suppl), II57–II66.
- Vela-Bueno, A., Moreno-Jiménez, B., Rodríguez-Muñoz, A., Olavarrieta-Bernardino, S., Fernández-Mendoza, J., de la Cruz-Troca, J. J., et al. (2008). Insomnia and sleep quality among primary care physicians with low and high burnout levels. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 64*, 435–442. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2007.10.01418374744>
- Williams, W. W., Lu, P. J., O'Halloran, A., Kim, D. K., Grohskopf, L. A., Pilishvili, T., et al. (2017). Surveillance of vaccination coverage among adult populations – United States, 2015. *MMWR Surveillance Summaries, 66*, 1–28.
- Zhang, W., Wang, K., Yin, L., Zhao, W. A., Xue, Q. A., Peng, M., et al. (2020). Mental health and psychosocial problems of medical health workers during the COVID-19 epidemic in China. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics, 89*, 242–250. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000507639>

Part I
Linking Organisational Factors, Health
Care Worker Well-being, and Patient
Outcomes

Chapter 2

Job Strain, Burnout, Wellbeing and Patient Safety in Healthcare Professionals



Daryl B. O'Connor, Louise H. Hall, and Judith Johnson

2.1 Introduction

Over the last three to four decades, there has been a marked increase in media coverage of stress and as a result this has led to increased research and public awareness. Indeed stress is now the most common cause of long-term sick leave and is frequently shown to be a very important factor accounting for in excess of ten million working days lost per annum in the UK (HSE, 2018). In 2017/2018, stress accounted for 44% of all cases of work-related illnesses in the UK (i.e., 595,000 cases). In the United States, the impact of stress is also far reaching, with 66% of Americans reporting that stress is impacting on their physical health and 63% believing the same for their mental health (American Psychological Association, 2012). It is also well established that one of the major sources of stress is associated with one's job. Stress arising from work is known by a range of different labels including occupational stress, job stress, work-related stress, and job strain. As a result a large amount of research has focussed on investigating the effects of work-related stress on a myriad of health, behavioural and occupational outcomes.

Moreover, there is growing evidence that high levels of occupational stress are impacting negatively on health, wellbeing and work-related outcomes in healthcare professionals (e.g., Chang et al., 2006; Louch, O'Hara, Gardner, & O'Connor, 2017;

D. B. O'Connor (✉)

School of Psychology, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK
e-mail: d.b.oconnor@leeds.ac.uk

L. H. Hall

Leeds Institute of Health Sciences, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

J. Johnson

School of Psychology, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

Bradford Institute for Health Research, Bradford, UK

© Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2020

A. Montgomery et al. (eds.), *Connecting Healthcare Worker Well-Being, Patient Safety and Organisational Change*, Aligning Perspectives on Health, Safety and Well-Being, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-60998-6_2

Purcell, Kutash, & Cobb, 2011; Tucker, Weymiller, Cutshall, Rhudy, & Lohse, 2012). Johnson et al. (2018) have recently shown that mental healthcare professionals (HCPs) also report clinical symptoms of psychological distress and burnout. Changes in the organisation and the management of health care provision nationally and internationally, coupled with the nature of medical practice, is likely to have increased the experience of work-related stress in healthcare professionals (Chang et al., 2006; Hall, Johnson, Watt, Tsipa, & O'Connor, 2016; Louch et al., 2017). Elevated levels of occupational stress may also have contributed to the increased prevalence of depression, anxiety and burnout in healthcare professionals (e.g., Adriaenssens, De Gucht, & Maes, 2015; Chang et al., 2006; Singh, Aulak, Mangat, & Aulak, 2016; Woodhead, Northrop, & Edelstein, 2016).

The consequences of work-related stress may be far reaching, not only for the health professionals themselves, but also for the patients within their care. The workload and demands placed on nurses continues to increase and health care organisations are under rising pressure (e.g., Carayon & Gurses, 2008; Gifford, Zammuto, Goodman, & Hill, 2002). Moreover, research has confirmed clear associations between stress and poorer physical and psychological health in nurses together with increased sickness absences, intention to leave and turnover rates, reduced job performance, quality of care and patient safety (e.g., Chang et al., 2006; Heinen et al., 2013). In terms of the latter, a recent daily diary study in hospital nurses found higher levels of chronic stress were associated with poorer perceptions of safety in their hospital wards and being less able to practise safely (Louch et al., 2017). To place in context, in the UK, medical errors are estimated to cost the National Health Service (NHS) over a billion pounds in litigation costs, and £2 billion in additional bed days annually (UK Department of Health, 2000) and it is likely that work-related stress is an important contributing factor. Therefore, there is an urgent need to understand the links between job strain, burnout, wellbeing and patient safety in order to develop effective interventions that can target aspects of the work environment and wellbeing that will help reduce levels of burnout and improve patient safety.

2.2 Work Stress, Patient Safety and Quality of Care

There are a number of psychological models that have dominated the work-related stress area over a long period of time that have attempted to characterise what makes the work environment stressful (e.g., Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001; Karasek, 1979; Siegrist, 2002). Of particular note is the job demands-control model or job strain model (Hausser, Mojzisch, Niesl, & Schulz-Hardt, 2010; Heikkila et al., 2013; Karasek, 1979; Van Der Doef & Maes, 1998, 1999). This model incorporates control as a major component in the stress process. The basic axiom of the model is that psychological strain and physical-ill health (and other stress-related outcomes) can be predicted from the synergistic combination of job demands and job control (or decision latitude). The original model argued that a

“high strain job” is one characterised by high job demands and low levels of job control (decision latitude). Typical jobs of this type might include being a junior doctor or a nurse in a busy accident and emergency department. A “low strain job” is characterised by low job demand and high levels of decision latitude. Karasek (1979) proposed two fundamental mechanisms underlying the model; the psychological strain and the active learning mechanisms. The former is characterised by the experience of high job demands with simultaneous low levels of latitude over decision-making. The latter is characterised by the experience of high job demands and high levels of decision latitude and is said to promote the development of new behaviour patterns. The model has subsequently been expanded by the addition of social support to form the job demand–control–support model (Johnson & Hall, 1988). Both forms of the model have stimulated considerable research looking at a wide range of physical and psychological outcomes (for reviews see Van Der Doef & Maes, 1998, 1999; de Lange, Taris, Kompier, Houtman, & Bongers, 2003; Hausser et al., 2010; Heikkilä et al., 2013).

Relatively early research into stress in health professionals has highlighted the potential links between working in “high strain” work environments and health professional errors and quality of patient care (Firth-Cozens, 1998; O’Connor, O’Connor, White, & Bundred, 2000). For example, it has been argued that high levels of stress in general practice are associated with increased likelihood of clinical mistakes and medical errors (Firth-Cozens; O’Connor et al., 2000). A more recent study by Berland, Natvig, and Gundersen (2008) investigated the effects of work-related stress and patient safety in nurses working in anesthesiology, intensive care and operating rooms (Berland et al., 2008). These authors reported that a demanding work environment together with minimal control and social support from colleagues resulted in increased stress that often negatively impacted on patient safety. Relatedly, in a longitudinal study of hospital physicians, hospital environments with high demands (i.e., social stressors, time pressure and patient demands) were found to directly impact on physician-perceived quality of care (Kramer, Schneider, Spieb, Angerer, & Weigl, 2016). Moreover, the poor care practices then also contributed to increased demands. This study was particularly noteworthy given it was a prospective design with two waves of data collection over a 1-year time lag that utilised cross-lagged path models to test the main hypotheses.

2.3 Job Demands-Resources Model, Burnout and Patient Safety

Another model that has attracted a great deal of empirical investigation is the Job Demand-Resources Model (JD-R; Demerouti et al., 2001). This model extends and improves the JDC model and is particularly relevant to healthcare professionals as it was originally proposed as a model of burnout. The latter is a syndrome consisting of exhaustion, depersonalization and lack of personal accomplishment (Maslach,

1982). Those working in human service occupations (healthcare professionals, social workers, teachers etc.) were assumed to be particularly vulnerable to burnout. However, the concept has since been extended to other occupations, as the core dimensions of exhaustion and disengagement may be found in many professions (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007).

Like the JDC, the JD-R model suggests that stress results from a lack of equilibrium between sets of broadly positive and broadly negative variables. This model focuses on the equilibrium between *job demands* and *resources*. *Job demands* are defined as the ‘physical, social, or organizational aspects of the job that require sustained physical and/or psychological (cognitive and emotional) effort or skills and are therefore associated with certain physiological and/or psychological costs’ (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007, p. 312). *Job resources*, on the other hand consist of a broad range of aspects of the job that serve to either help the individual to achieve their work goals, help reduce their job demands or facilitate personal growth and development (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). This may include control and rewards as well as social resources. The model has also been expanded to include personal resources such as optimism and self-efficacy (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2007).

The model suggests two processes, *the health impairment process* whereby excessive demands may lead to exhaustion and health problems, and *the motivational process* whereby job resources may lead to increased work engagement and performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). A number of studies have now supported these two core processes in relation to psychological burnout and job engagement (e.g., Schaufeli, Leiter, & Maslach, 2009; Xanthopoulou et al., 2007).

In addition to these main effects, the JD-R model, like the JDC model, proposes that interactions between the core variables are also important in predicting strain and motivation. Because of the large number of potential resources and demands, a range of interaction effects are possible whereby specific job resources (control, support, feedback, role clarity etc.) may buffer the impact of different types of demands (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Not only may the effects of job resources reduce the negative impact of high demands, but the model also proposes that resources may aid motivation when demands are high.

Moreover, in 2011 a large-scale meta-analysis was published that established clear links between the JD-R model components and different aspects of workplace safety (Nahrgang, Morgeson, & Hofmann, 2011). In particular, they found support for the health impairment process and for the motivational process as mechanisms through which job demands and resources were associated with safety outcomes. Interestingly, these authors also found that across industries, the most consistent job resource was having a supportive work environment and the most consistent job demands were risks and hazards (i.e., perceived risk, level of risk, number of hazards & perceptions of safety) in relation to predicting variability in burnout, engagement, and safety outcomes (i.e., actual accidents & injuries, adverse events and unsafe behaviours). However, this review did not focus on patient safety outcomes or health professionals specifically and the final study included was published in 2010. In addition, therefore, next we review studies that have investigated whether there are

links between burnout and patient safety outcomes and also broaden the discussion to include wellbeing.

2.4 Associations Between Healthcare Professionals' Wellbeing and Burnout, and Patient Safety

As outlined earlier, ever increasing numbers of healthcare staff, of all disciplines and across the world, are suffering from high levels of stress, burnout, and poor wellbeing (Gibson et al., 2015; NHS England Survey Coordination Centre, 2018; Reith, 2018). Burnout and poor wellbeing have been cited throughout the literature as contributors to reduced patient safety levels and patient safety incidences (Avery et al., 2012; Salyers et al., 2016; Tawfik et al., 2019; Welp & Manser, 2016). Whilst there has been a wealth of research demonstrating this association exists, the terms burnout and wellbeing are often used interchangeably. This is problematic, because wellbeing and burnout have different causes, symptoms, and potentially differing consequences. Burnout is an effective response to chronic organizational stress, resulting in a 'state of vital exhaustion' (WHO, 2004). Whereas, an individual's wellbeing is affected by all areas of their life, including, but not limited to, their occupation. Poor wellbeing is often characterized by symptoms or diagnoses of mental illnesses (e.g. depression), high levels of stress, and/or a reduced quality of life.

To understand whether it is overall wellbeing, or burnout specifically, that is more strongly associated with patient safety, a systematic review was conducted by Hall et al. (2016). We identified nineteen studies measuring the link between burnout and patient safety, sixteen for wellbeing and patient safety, and eleven measuring both wellbeing and burnout in relation to patient safety. Of those that included a measure of wellbeing (such as quality of life, depression, mental health), the majority (22/27; 82%) found that poorer wellbeing was significantly associated with reduced safety levels (e.g. increased errors, lower ratings of safety). Similarly, within the studies that included a measure of burnout (often the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI Maslach et al., 1996)), the majority of these (25/30; 83%) found that higher levels of (at least one subscale of) burnout was significantly associated with decreased safety.

Of particular interest to the question at hand are the eleven studies that measured both burnout and wellbeing. Whilst the majority of these studies (7/11; 64%) found that both variables were significantly associated, in some way, with patient safety, it becomes more complex when you take into account whether self-report or objective measures were used. Of those seven studies that found an association, all bar one used solely self-perceived errors as the patient safety measure. Studies which additionally, or only, used objective measures of safety tell a different story. In these studies, only wellbeing (characterized as stress (Dugan et al., 1996), or depression (Fahrenkopf et al., 2008; Garrouste-Orgeas et al., 2015)) was significantly associated with errors (measured by chart audits). This has implications for

the sensitivity of patient safety measures, and may also speak to differences between healthcare professionals' safety *perceptions* versus *behaviours*. It could be that burnt-out HCPs are more likely to perceive their practice as less safe, regardless of actual safety behaviours, due to feelings of low personal accomplishment and exhaustion. Conversely, HCPs with poor wellbeing (e.g. depression) may be more at risk of actual involvement in patient safety incidences, as a consequence of some of the symptoms of poor mental health (e.g. memory and concentration issues, indecisiveness). Given this, future studies should strive to use both subjective and objective measures of safety, alongside measures of wellbeing and burnout, to better understand these nuances.

Since Hall et al.'s (2016) review, four meta-analyses have been published on this topic, allowing effect sizes to be calculated, in addition to describing more recent studies, and expanding the breadth of focus (to include quality of care, professionalism, patient satisfaction, and teamwork) (Panagioti et al., 2018; Salyers et al., 2016; Welp & Manser, 2016). Welp and Manser's meta-analysis of 25 studies measuring wellbeing and patient safety reported a significant association in the expected direction, in the majority of studies, with effect sizes ranging between $OR = 1.09$ and $OR = 8.3$. However, burnout and wellbeing were conflated, with most studies measuring burnout (using the MBI), and not overall wellbeing. Salyers et al.'s (2016) meta-analysis focused solely on burnout, and included measures of quality of care in addition to safety. The 40 articles investigating safety yielded an overall small but significant relationship in the expected direction ($r = -0.23$), despite high levels of heterogeneity. Interestingly, a stronger relationship was found between burnout with *perceptions* of safety ($r = -0.28$), rather than incidents ($r = -0.16$), which has also since been suggested in a survey study amongst General Practitioners in the United Kingdom (Hall, Johnson, Watt, & O'Connor, 2019). Panagioti et al.'s (2018) meta-analysis reported that both physician burnout, and physician depression/emotional distress were associated with being twice as likely to be involved in a patient safety incident. However, similarly to Salyers et al., burnout was only found to be significantly associated with *physician-reported* incidents ($OR = 2.07$), and not for *system-recorded* incidents ($OR = 1.00$). This sub-analysis was not reported for depression/emotional distress.

Considering all of the aforementioned reviews, it is likely that both wellbeing and burnout are important for patient safety. Potential variances between poor wellbeing and burnout may manifest themselves in the differences between perceived safety behaviours and actual incidents, as touched upon throughout this section. Additionally, there is some evidence to suggest that suffering from both burnout and poor wellbeing (specifically depression), presents an even higher risk of making an error than suffering from one or the other (de Oliveira et al., 2013).

An important limitation of the literature is that the majority of studies within these reviews utilize cross-sectional designs. Thus, causality cannot be inferred. Whilst the previous section of this chapter outlines how job strain, job demands and resources etc. could lead to poor patient safety (through increasing stress, depression, and burnout), the reverse is also known to be true, with a breadth of literature on the 'second victim' effect (Seys et al., 2013; Wu, 2012). This gives rise to the notion that

burnout, (poor) wellbeing, and patient safety are interconnected in a ‘vicious cycle’, whereby increases in one leads to the likelihood of increases in another, regardless of which occurred first.

A couple of longitudinal studies attempted to overcome this limitation. West et al. (2006) reported that burnout and error had a circular relationship when measured at three-month intervals. However, whilst self-reported errors predicted subsequent quality of life and screening positive for depression, the reverse was not found to be true. Welp, Meier, and Manser (2016) also measured outcomes at three-month intervals and suggested that clinician burnout leads to reduced interpersonal and cognitive-behavioural teamwork, which then leads to decreased clinician-rated patient safety. Whilst this is a start, it is evident that more prospective studies are needed to better understand the relationships between healthcare professional wellbeing, burnout, and patient safety outcomes. What is clear, however, is that there is indeed a relationship between these variables. As such, it is imperative that healthcare organisations intervene to improve employee wellbeing and burnout levels, for both their workers’ and their patients’ health and safety.

2.5 Interventions

The final section of the chapter considers research that has tested interventions to reduce burnout, work related stress, and improve wellbeing in the health professional context. Interventions for burnout are usually split into those which are targeted at the ‘individual’ or ‘person’ level and those which are focused on organisational-change (Awa, Plaumann, & Walter, 2010; Johnson et al., 2018). They can also be understood as being ‘primary’, ‘secondary’ or ‘tertiary’ in their focus. Primary interventions are those which aim to reduce work stressors; secondary interventions are those which aim to help participants cope with work stressors and tertiary interventions are those which treat individuals who are already suffering with stress due to work (Maslach & Goldberg, 1998). While these taxonomies are distinct there is some overlap, as organisation-directed interventions are often primary interventions, whereas person-directed interventions are often secondary or tertiary interventions.

In healthcare settings, person-directed interventions have included stress-management workshops and mindfulness classes (Goldhagen, Kingsolver, Stinnett, & Rosdahl, 2015; Regehr, Glancy, Pitts, & LeBlanc, 2014). Conceptually, these interventions are context-free; they view workers as stressed individuals and seek to remediate their stress by increasing their capacity to cope. Organisation-directed interventions, in contrast, view workers in context. They conceptualise burnt-out professionals as individuals in environments which are generating stress. Consistent with this view, they seek to reduce the stress which the work environment is causing. In healthcare settings, organisation-directed interventions have included improving inter-professional communications and the introduction of peer support groups (Dreison et al., 2016; Linzer et al., 2015).

Recent years have seen a growing research literature into the evidence-base for burnout interventions in healthcare settings, and three significant reviews of this literature have been published since 2016. The first focused only on interventions in doctors (West, Dyrbye, Erwin, & Shanafelt, 2016). It meta-analysed 15 randomised trials and 37 cohort studies, including 3630 physicians altogether. Results suggested that overall, burnout interventions were effective and decreased burnout on average by 10%, with mean levels dropping from 54% before the intervention to 44% afterwards. The second also focused on studies in doctors. It included 20 randomised trials including a total of 1550 physicians, and similar to the previous review it suggested that overall these resulted in 'small and significant' reductions in burnout (Panagioti et al., 2017). In a departure from the previous two, the third review focused on mental health staff and included studies conducted in all healthcare disciplines (Dreison et al., 2016). It included 13 randomised trials and 14 cohort studies comprising 1894 participants in total, and reported that on average, burnout interventions produced small but significant reductions (Dreison et al., 2016). Taken together, these three reviews suggest that burnout interventions in healthcare professionals are effective, but the level of effectiveness is limited and there is a need to understand how they can be improved.

The issue of intervention type is contentious. Due to increasing demand on healthcare services combined with limited resources, there has been steadily increasing pressure on healthcare professionals to accomplish more with less (Liu, Goryakin, Maeda, Bruckner, & Scheffler, 2017). There is also a growing global healthcare worker shortage, which has led to increased reports of under-staffing and rota gaps in services (Aluttis, Bishaw, & Frank, 2014; RCP, 2018). In this context, many health professionals have rejected person-directed interventions, suggesting they shift blame from government and senior leadership to individual workers (Balme, Gerada, & Page, 2015; Montgomery, Panagopoulou, Esmail, Richards, & Maslach, 2019; Oliver, 2017). Despite this, person-directed interventions have been the most commonly tested in the research literature. For example, in the review by West et al. (2016), person-directed interventions comprised 80% (12 out of 15) of interventions tested in the randomised trials, and 54% (20 out of 37) of the cohort studies. Similarly, in the review by Panagioti and colleagues, 60% of the tested interventions were person-directed (2017). In fact, the only review which suggested that a majority of interventions (70.4%) were organisation-directed was that conducted by Dreison et al. (2016). This variation could be due to an artefact of how 'organisation-directed' interventions were conceptualised. For example, while West et al. (2016) categorised communication training interventions as a form of person-directed intervention, Dreison et al. (2016) grouped these together with other professional training interventions, which they considered to be organisation-directed interventions.

The issue of which type of intervention is most effective is also somewhat controversial. For example, both reviews in doctors provide some indication to suggest that organisation-directed interventions may be more effective than person-directed interventions for reducing burnout. West et al. (2016) reported that organisation-directed interventions had a significantly stronger impact upon

reducing overall burnout than person-directed interventions, although there were no significant differences when specific facets of burnout were examined (emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation). Panagioti et al. (2017) only examined the emotional exhaustion facet of burnout. They found that organisation-directed interventions resulted in medium significant reductions in burnout and they were significantly more effective for reducing burnout than person-directed interventions, which only produced small significant effects. In contrast, however, Dreison et al. (2016) found that person-directed interventions were more effective than those targeted at the organisation-level.

These contrasting findings could be misleading and caused by the overly-broad grouping of intervention types. For example, when Dreison and colleagues (2018) broke down the category of organisation-directed interventions into training interventions and non-training interventions, their results changed. Training interventions were the most common subtype of organisation-directed interventions in their study (comprising 44.4%) and when they separated these out, they found that training interventions were in fact more effective for reducing overall burnout scores than person-directed interventions. These findings highlight the limitations in our current approach to conceptualising burnout interventions and indicate that a shift in approach could be needed if more effective interventions are to be developed.

A paradigm shift to this effect is now becoming visible in the literature with researchers calling for a renewed focus on ameliorating the known causes of burnout, rather than rolling out one-size-fits-all programmes (Johnson et al., 2018; Montgomery et al., 2019). This approach requires innovative thinking that transcends the traditional categories of ‘organisation-directed’ and ‘person-directed’ interventions. For example, drawing on recent research literature, Montgomery et al. (2019) have called for approaches which consider all aspects of work life—workload, control, reward, community, fairness and values—and consider the ‘fit’ between individual workers and their workplace on these areas. Similarly, Hall et al. (2017) sought to generate new solutions for burnout in General Practitioners using a focus group design. General Practitioners in the study identified a range of potential interventions, ranging from the use of strategies to improve support from patients, to increasing opportunity for regular tea and coffee breaks. Several of these did not conform easily to the categories of ‘person-directed’ or ‘organisation-directed’ interventions, but were instead practical solutions which could be viewed as a mixture of the two. Interestingly, however, they could be interpreted in terms of the JD-R model, with many of the suggested interventions aiming to increase support from colleagues or patients. While reduction in job demands was discussed, General Practitioners viewed this as generally being out of their personal control, and something that could only be affected by the higher organisational levels of UK healthcare.

Key Messages for Researchers

There is an urgent need to understand the links between the work environment, burnout and patient safety.

The need to measure healthcare professional wellbeing (i.e. mental health, quality of life, stress) *and* burnout (an affective response to occupational stress), alongside subjective *and* objective measures of safety, is evident: It may be that burnout is only associated with *perceived* safety, whereas wellbeing may be more strongly associated with *actual* safety behaviours.

Definitions of 'organisational' and 'individual' interventions varies; clearer definitions may enhance the consistency of results between studies.

Key Messages for Healthcare Delivery

Stress arising from the work environment can impact on the health and wellbeing of healthcare professionals *and* can lead to reduced quality of patient care and increased medical errors

Healthcare organisations should consider what they could do to improve employee wellbeing and prevent burnout, with implications being evident for patient safety outcomes.

Overall, interventions to reduce burnout in healthcare professionals are effective, supporting their general use in healthcare settings.

References

- Adriaenssens, J., De Gucht, V., & Maes, S. (2015). Causes and consequences of occupational stress in emergency nurses, a longitudinal study. *Journal of Nursing Management*, *23*, 346–358.
- Aluttis, C., Bishaw, T., & Frank, M. W. (2014). The workforce for health in a globalized context – Global shortages and international migration. *Global Health Action*, *7*, 23611.
- American Psychological Association. (2012). *Stress in America survey*. Retrieved March 25, 2014, from <http://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/stress/2012/impact.aspx>.
- Avery, T., Barber, N., Ghaleb, M., Franklin, B. D., Armstrong, S., Crowe, S., et al. (2012). *Investigating the prevalence and causes of prescribing errors in general practice*. London: The General Medical Council: PRACtICE Study.
- Awa, W. L., Plaumann, M., & Walter, U. (2010). Burnout prevention: A review of intervention programs. *Patient Education and Counseling*, *78*, 184–190.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *22*, 309–328.
- Balme, E., Gerada, C., & Page, L. (2015). Doctors need to be supported, not trained in resilience. *British Medical Journal*, *351*, h4709.
- Berland, A., Natvig, G. K., & Gundersen, D. (2008). Patient safety and job-related stress: A focus group study. *Intensive and Critical Care Nursing*, *24*, 90–97.
- Carayon, P., & Gurses, A. P. (2008). Nursing workload and patient safety—A human factors engineering perspective. In R. Hughes (Ed.), *Patient safety and quality: An evidence-based handbook for nurses [internet]*. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality: Rockville, MD. Available from http://archive.ahrq.gov/professionals/clinicians-providers/resources/nursing/resources/nurseshdhk/CarayonP_NWPS.pdf

- Chang, E. M., Daly, J. W., Hancock, K. M., Bidewell, J., Johnson, A., Lambert, V. A., et al. (2006). The relationships among workplace stressors, coping methods, demographic characteristics, and health in Australian nurses. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 22, 30–38.
- de Lange, A. H., Taris, T. W., Kompier, M. A., Houtman, I. L., & Bongers, P. M. (2003). “The very best of the millennium”: Longitudinal research and the demand-control-(support) model. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 8, 282–305.
- de Oliveira Jr, G. S., Chang, R., Fitzgerald, P. C., Almeida, M. D., Castro-Alves, L. S., Ahmad, S., et al. (2013). The prevalence of burnout and depression and their association with adherence to safety and practice standards: A survey of United States anesthesiology trainees. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*, 117, 182–193.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 499–512.
- Dreison, K. C., Luther, L., Bonfils, K. A., Sliter, M. T., McGrew, J. H., & Salyers, M. P. (2016). Job burnout in mental health providers: A meta-analysis of 35 years of intervention research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23, 18–30.
- Dugan, J., Lauer, E., Bouquot, Z., Dutro, B. K., Smith, M., & Widmeyer, G. (1996). Stressful nurses: The effect on patient outcomes. *Journal of Nursing Care Quality*, 10, 46–58.
- Fahrenkopf, A. M., Sectish, T. C., Barger, L. K., Sharek, P. J., Lewin, D., Chiang, V. W., et al. (2008). Rates of medication errors among depressed and burnt out residents: Prospective cohort study. *British Medical Journal*, 336, 488–491.
- Firth-Cozens, J. (1998). Individual and organisational predictors of depression in general practitioners. *British Journal of General Practice*, 48, 1647–1651.
- Garrouste-Orgeas, M., Perrin, M., Soufir, L., Vesin, A., Blot, F., Maxime, V., et al. (2015). The Iatref study: Medical errors are associated with symptoms of depression in ICU staff but not burnout or safety culture. *Intensive Care Medicine*, 41, 273–284.
- Gibson, J., Checkland, K., Coleman, A., Hann, M., McCall, R., Spooner, S., et al. (2015). *Eighth national GP worklife survey*. Manchester: Policy Research Unit in Commissioning and the Healthcare System Manchester Centre for Health Economics, University of Manchester.
- Gifford, B. D., Zammuto, R. F., Goodman, E. A., & Hill, K. S. (2002). The relationship between hospital unit culture and nurses’ quality of work life/practitioner application. *Journal of Healthcare Management*, 47, 13–25.
- Goldhagen, B. E., Kingsolver, K., Stinnett, S. S., & Rosdahl, J. A. (2015). Stress and burnout in residents: Impact of mindfulness-based resilience training. *Advances in Medical Education and Practice*, 6, 525.
- Hall, L. H., Johnson, J., Heyhoe, J., Watt, I., Anderson, K., & O’Connor, D. B. (2017). Strategies to improve general practitioner Well-being: Findings from a focus group study. *Family Practice*, 35, 511–516.
- Hall, L. H., Johnson, J., Watt, I., & O’Connor, D. B. (2019). Association of GP wellbeing and burnout with patient safety in UK primary care: A cross-sectional survey. *British Journal of General Practice*, 69, e507–e514.
- Hall, L. H., Johnson, J., Watt, I., Tsipa, A., & O’Connor, D. B. (2016). Healthcare staff wellbeing, burnout, and patient safety: A systematic review. *PLoS One*, 11(7).
- Hausser, J. A., Mojzisch, A., Niesl, M., & Schulz-Hardt, S. (2010). Ten years on: A review of recent research on the job demand-control (-support) model and psychological wellbeing. *Work & Stress*, 24, 1–35.
- Health and Safety Executive. (2018). *Work related stress, anxiety and depression statistics in Great Britain 2017*. London: Crown Copyright.
- Heikkila, K., Fransson, E. I., Nyberg, S. T., Zins, M., Westerlund, H., Westerholm, P., et al. (2013). Job strain and health-related lifestyle: Findings from an individual-participant meta-analysis of 118,000 working adults. *American Journal of Public Health*, 103, 2090–2097.
- Heinen, M. M., van Achterberg, T., Schwendimann, R., Zander, B., Matthews, A., Kózka, M., et al. (2013). Nurses’ intention to leave their profession: A cross sectional observational study in 10 European countries. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 50, 174–184.

- Johnson, J. V., & Hall, E. M. (1988). Job strain, work place social support and cardiovascular disease: A cross-sectional study of a random sample of the working population. *American Journal of Public Health*, 78, 1336–1342.
- Johnson, J., Hall, L. H., Berzins, K., Baker, J., Melling, K., & Thompson, C. (2018). Mental healthcare staff wellbeing and burnout: A narrative review of trends, causes, implications, and recommendations for future interventions. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*, 27, 20–32.
- Karasek, R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administration Science Quarterly*, 24, 285–307.
- Kramer, T., Schneider, A., Spieb, E., Angerer, P., & Weigl, M. (2016). Associations between job demands, work-related strain and perceived quality of care: A longitudinal study among hospital physicians. *International Journal of Quality in Health Care*, 28, 824–829.
- Linzer, M., Poplau, S., Grossman, E., Varkey, A., Yale, S., Williams, E., et al. (2015). A cluster randomized trial of interventions to improve work conditions and clinician burnout in primary care: Results from the healthy work place (HWP) study. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 30, 1105–1111.
- Liu, J. X., Goryakin, Y., Maeda, A., Bruckner, T., & Scheffler, R. J. (2017). Global health workforce labor market projections for 2030. *Human Resources for Health*, 15, 11.
- Louch, G., O'Hara, J., Gardner, P. H., & O'Connor, D. B. (2017). A daily diary approach to the examination of chronic stress, daily hassles and safety perceptions in hospital nursing. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 24, 946–956.
- Maslach, C. (1982). Understanding burnout: Definitional issues in analyzing a complex phenomenon. In W. S. Paine (Ed.), *Job stress and burnout* (pp. 29–40). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Maslach, C., & Goldberg, J. (1998). Prevention of burnout: New perspectives. *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 7(1), 63–74.
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1996). *Maslach burnout inventory manual*. Mountain View, CA: CPP and Davies-Black.
- Montgomery, A., Panagopoulou, E., Esmail, A., Richards, T., & Maslach, C. (2019). Burnout in healthcare: The case for organisational change. *British Medical Journal*, 366, 14774.
- Nahrgang, J. D., Morgeson, F. P., & Hofmann, D. A. (2011). Safety at work: A meta-analytic investigation of the link between job demands, job resources, burnout, engagement, and safety outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 71–94.
- NHS England Survey Coordination Centre. (2018). *NHS Staff Survey 2018: National results briefing*. National Health Service England. Retrieved from https://www.nhsstaffsurveys.com/Caches/Files/ST18_National%20briefing_FINAL_20190225.pdf
- O'Connor, D. B., O'Connor, R. C., White, B. L., & Bundred, P. E. (2000). The effect of job strain on British general practitioners' mental health. *Journal of Mental Health*, 9, 637–654.
- Oliver, D. (2017). David Oliver: When “resilience” becomes a dirty word. *British Medical Journal*, 358, j3604. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j3604>
- Panagioti, M., Geraghty, K., Johnson, J., Zhou, A., Panagopoulou, E., Chew-Graham, C., et al. (2018). Association between physician burnout and patient safety, professionalism, and patient satisfaction: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of the American Medical Association: Internal Medicine*, 178, 1317–1331.
- Panagioti, M., Panagopoulou, E., Bower, P., Lewith, G., Kontopantelis, E., Chew-Graham, C., et al. (2017). Controlled interventions to reduce burnout in physicians: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of the American Medical Association: Internal Medicine*, 177, 195–205.
- Purcell, S. R., Kutash, M., & Cobb, S. (2011). The relationship between nurses' stress and nurse staffing factors in a hospital setting. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 19, 714–720.
- RCP. (2018). *Focus on physicians: 2017–18 census (UK consultants and higher specialty trainees)*. Retrieved August 15, 2019, from <https://www.rcplondon.ac.uk/projects/outputs/focus-physicians-2017-18-census-uk-consultants-and-higher-specialty-trainees>

- Regehr, C., Glancy, D., Pitts, A., & LeBlanc, V. (2014). Interventions to reduce the consequences of stress in physicians: A review and meta-analysis. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 202, 353–359.
- Reith, T. P. J. C. (2018). Burnout in United States healthcare professionals: A narrative review. *Cureus*, 10(12), e3681.
- Salyers, M. P., Bonfils, K. A., Luther, L., Firmin, R. L., White, D. A., Adams, E. L., et al. (2016). The relationship between professional burnout and quality and safety in healthcare: A meta-analysis. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 32, 475–482.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2009). Burnout: 35 years of research and practice. *Career Development International*, 14, 204–220.
- Seys, D., Wu, A. W., Gerven, E. V., Vleugels, A., Euwema, M., Panella, M., et al. (2013). Health care professionals as second victims after adverse events: A systematic review. *Evaluation & the Health Professions*, 3, 135–162.
- Siegrist, J. (2002). Effort-reward imbalance at work and health. *Historical and Current Perspectives on Stress and Health*, 2, 261–291.
- Singh, P., Aulak, D. S., Mangat, S., & Aulak, M. (2016). Systematic review: Factors contributing to burnout in dentistry. *Occupational Medicine*, 66, 27–31.
- Tawfik, D. S., Scheid, A., Profit, J., Shanfelt, T., Trockel, M., Adair, K. C., et al. (2019). Evidence relating health care provider burnout and quality of care: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 171, 555–567.
- Tucker, S. J., Weymiller, A. J., Cutshall, S. M., Rhudy, L. M., & Lohse, C. M. (2012). Stress ratings and health promotion practices among RNs: A case for action. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 42, 282–292.
- UK Department of Health (2000). An Organisation with a Memory: Report of an Expert Group on Learning from Adverse Events in the NHS Chaired by the Chief Medical Officer: The Stationery Office London.
- Van Der Doef, M., & Maes, S. (1998). The job demand-control (–support) model and physical health outcomes: A review of the strain and buffer hypotheses. *Psychology and Health*, 13, 909–936.
- Van Der Doef, M., & Maes, S. (1999). The job demands-control (–support) model and psychological Well-being: A review of 20 years of empirical research. *Work & Stress*, 13, 87–114.
- Welp, A., & Manser, T. (2016). Integrating teamwork, clinician occupational well-being and patient safety—development of a conceptual framework based on a systematic review. *BMC Health Services Research*, 16, 281. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-016-1535-y>
- Welp, A., Meier, L. L., & Manser, T. (2016). The interplay between teamwork, clinicians' emotional exhaustion, and clinician-rated patient safety: A longitudinal study. *Critical Care*, 20(1), 110. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-016-1282-9>
- West, C. P., Dyrbye, L. N., Erwin, P. J., & Shanafelt, T. D. (2016). Interventions to prevent and reduce physician burnout: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet*, 388, 2272–2281.
- West, C. P., Huschka, M. M., Novotny, P. J., Sloan, J. A., Kolars, J. C., Habermann, T. M., et al. (2006). Association of perceived medical errors with resident distress and empathy: A prospective longitudinal study. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 296(9), 1071–1078.
- Woodhead, E. L., Northrop, L., & Edelstein, B. (2016). Stress, social support, and burnout among long-term care nursing staff. *Journal of Applied Gerontology*, 35(1), 84–105.
- World Health Organisation. (2004). *International statistical classification of diseases and related health problems* (Vol. 1). Geneva: World Health Organisation.
- Wu, A. W. (2012). Medical error: The second victim. *British Journal of Hospital Medicine (London)*, 73(10), C146–C148.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2007). The role of personal resources in the job demands-resources model. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 14, 121–141.

Chapter 3

Missed Nursing Care: The Impact on Patients, Nurses and Organisations

Marcia Kirwan and Anne Matthews

3.1 Introduction

Rationing of healthcare is a subject that prompts political debate, both within healthcare professions and amongst members of the public. The term ‘rationing’ is one that is, largely, morally charged, and is viewed inherently negatively overall, with some arguing that ‘rationing’, of any kind, is never an acceptable option in healthcare. Others suggest that rationing is justifiable in many cases, and ultimately inevitable due to limited resources. Few would argue that in contemporary societies where healthcare needs are many, and treatment options vast, there is a need to control overall costs, to consider the costs of choices made, and to use available resources for the benefit of both the individual and society. Balancing limited resources to benefit those in greatest need is a challenge for governments and professionals alike. How costs and resources in healthcare are controlled or rationed can be controversial and may be subject to intense public scrutiny. It seems that an equilibrium between limited resources and infinite need is increasingly difficult to achieve, with rapid advancements in treatments, technology and care approaches occurring in a context of changing (ageing) demographics and disease patterns.

Definitions of rationing in healthcare differ widely, with suggestions that the term should only be applied in situations where absolute scarcity exists, such as organs for transplant i.e. organs are scarce, therefore a list is compiled based on compatibility and urgency, and available organs are allocated to the most compatible patient in the most urgent need. Others suggest that rationing takes place around the allocation of most medicines and treatments. This might involve decisions to choose one

M. Kirwan (✉) · A. Matthews
School of Nursing, Psychotherapy and Community Health, Dublin City University, Dublin,
Ireland
e-mail: marcia.kirwan@dcu.ie

© Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2020

A. Montgomery et al. (eds.), *Connecting Healthcare Worker Well-Being, Patient Safety and Organisational Change*, Aligning Perspectives on Health, Safety and Well-Being, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-60998-6_3