

brought to you by 🚲 COR

Cent Eur J Nurs Midw 2019;10(1):958-966

doi: 10.15452/CEJNM.2019.10.0002

ORIGINAL PAPER

MISSED NURSING CARE MEASURED BY MISSCARE SURVEY – THE FIRST PILOT STUDY IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC AND SLOVAKIA

Renáta Zeleníková¹, Elena Gurková², Darja Jarošová¹

¹Department of Nursing and Midwifery, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ostrava, Czech Republic ²Department of Nursing, Faculty of Health Sciences, Palacky University in Olomouc, Czech Republic

Received August 13, 2018; Accepted November 23, 2018. Copyright: This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY). http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Abstract

Aim: The aims of the pilot study were a) to compare the amount, type, and reasons for missed nursing care in the Czech Republic and Slovakia; and b) to investigate the psychometric properties of the Slovak and Czech versions of the *MISSCARE Survey. Design:* Cross-sectional study. *Methods:* For measurement of missed nursing care *The Missed Nursing Care* (MISSCARE) *Survey* was used. The sample consisted of 226 hospital nurses in the Czech Republic and Slovakia. *Results:* The internal consistency of Part A measured by Cronbach alpha was 0.939 for the Czech version and 0.945 for the Slovak version of the *MISSCARE Survey.* The average score for missed nursing care was 1.64 ± 0.51 for the Czech Republic, and 1.99 ± 0.83 for Slovakia. Shortfalls in labor resources were cited as the chief reason for missed nursing care in the countries surveyed. *Conclusion:* Psychometric testing showed that the Czech and Slovak versions of the MISSCARE Survey are reliable and valid tools, and can be used for measuring missed nursing care.

Keywords: hospital, MISSCARE Survey, missed nursing care, nurses, psychometric properties, unfinished nursing care.

Introduction

Recently, missed nursing care has started to be recognized as a significant hidden problem in nursing work. According to Kalisch and Williams (2009), this phenomenon refers to any aspect of required care that is omitted in part or in whole, or delayed (Kalisch, Williams, 2009). Missed nursing care is not the only term used to describe the phenomenon of failure to provide aspects of standard required nursing care. There are several other terms used in the literature, such as "unfinished care", "rationed nursing care", "nursing care rationing", or "care left undone".

The issue of missed care in medicine has been investigated before. Despite general agreement among the majority of professionals that health care expenditure should be taken into account, there is considerable debate concerning the acceptability, under any circumstances, of rationing health care (Ubel, Goold, 1998). Another issue in this debate arises from divergence of opinion over whether healthcare expenditure can be kept within bounds by eliminating waste rather than by rationing care.

Corresponding author: Renáta Zeleníková, Department of Nursing and Midwifery, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ostrava, Syllabova 19, Ostrava, Czech Republic; e-mail: renata.zelenikova@osu.cz Furthermore, there is a failure to agree on what constitutes rationed health care. Members of the public may share identical views on the services that should be provided to patients, but strongly disagree about the suitability of rationing (Ubel, Goold, 1998). The components of appropriate care are covered in the six objectives for improvement: care that is safe, efficient, effective, equitable, patient centered, and timely (VanFosson, Jones, Yoder, 2016).

Several conceptual analyses and conceptual frameworks have been published in terms of rationed/missed/unfinished nursing care (Schubert et al., 2007; Lucero, Lake, Aiken, 2009; Kalisch, Landstrom, Hinshaw, 2009; Hessels et al., 2015; Bail, Grealish, 2016).

The work of Lucero, Lake, Aiken, (2009) was guided by the Process of Care and Outcomes Model. This conceptual framework has its roots in Donabedian's quality paradigm (1966) and the Quality Health Outcomes Model (Mitchell, Ferketich, Jennings, 1998). Donabedian emphasized the linear relationship between doing things properly (i.e. processes) and achieving the desired results (i.e. outcomes), while in their paper, Lucero, Lake, Aiken (2009) investigated nursing care quality by analyzing necessary activities left undone by nurses. The Process of Care and Outcomes Model posits a temporal relationship between patient-related

factors, the care environment, the process of care, and the outcomes achieved. The first three factors have a direct impact on outcomes (Lucero, Lake, Aiken, 2009).

Another well-known model of the phenomenon is the Missed Nursing Care Model (Kalisch, Landstrom, Hinshaw, 2009). This model shows the concept's causes and consequences. Determinants such as labor material resources. resources. and communication/teamwork interact with the nursing process, and are filtered by nurses' internal processes. The consequences are risks to patient safety. In further research, Kalisch, Tschannen, Lee (2011) presented a conceptual framework examining three concepts: structure (e.g., patient care unit, hospital, individual characteristics of nurses), process (missed nursing care), and outcomes (staff outcomes such as job satisfaction, and patient outcomes such as falls or pressure ulcers).

The Kalisch, Landstrom, Hinshaw (2009) model was adapted by Hessels et al. (2015) and published in 2015 as a conceptual model for their work. The model indicates that characteristics of the organizational work environment (material resources: availability of medications, supplies and viable equipment; labor resources: nurses - education, skills; inter-professional relationships. communication, and teamwork) affect nursing care and decisions regarding which nursing tasks are to be omitted, which, in turn, leads to negative patient outcomes. When time is short, each nurse must prioritize which nursing actions to provide and which to omit (Hessels et al., 2015).

Missed nursing care is becoming an important indicator of patient safety, as well as patient satisfaction (Hessels et al., 2015). In recent years the number of papers related to missed nursing care has increased considerably, and a quick review reveals that incomplete care is a problem worldwide, albeit masked by inconsistencies in terminology (Papastavrou, Andreou, Efstathiou, 2014; Jones, Hamilton, Murry, 2015).

As missed nursing care is a new concept in the profession, Czech and Slovak nurses are not yet familiar with it or its meaning. One reason is that missed nursing care is not a commonly used term in either country, and it is very difficult to begin using this term without a deeper understanding of the concept. Although a number of papers and studies have been published throughout the world, there has been no study on missed nursing care in the Czech Republic or Slovakia.

Aim

The aims of the pilot study were a) to compare the amount, type, and reasons for missed nursing care in the Czech Republic and Slovakia; and b) to investigate the psychometric properties of the Slovak and Czech versions of the *MISSCARE Survey*.

Methods

Design

Cross-sectional study.

Sample

To ensure variation in hospital size (from 200 to 1300 beds) and type (teaching, general, private, public) a purposive sample of five acute care hospitals was used, in the Czech Republic and Slovakia. In this pilot study 11 medical – surgical, geriatric, and intensive care units in hospitals were included.

The study sample consisted of 226 hospital nurses (registered nurses - RNs) providing direct patient care (Table 1). The response rate was 77.93%. Ninety-two (40.2%) nurses were from Slovakia, and 134 nurses (59.8%) were from the Czech Republic. Most respondents were female (94.7%). The majority (71.3%) of nurses in the sample had graduated from secondary nursing schools. Almost one third (28.7%) of nurses had a batchelor degree or higher, and 37.2% of nurses had a specialization. Two hundred nine nurses (92.9%) reported a working week of over 30 hours. The study population had worked over ten years in their current job (38.9%). A significant proportion of the respondents (68.9%) reported working rotating shifts. 52.4% of the nurses worked more than 12 hours of overtime per week. Staff and unit characteristics are summarized in Table 1.

Data collection

Data were collected during years 2017 and 2018.

For measurement of missed nursing care, *The Missed Nursing Care* (MISSCARE) *Survey* (Kalisch, Williams, 2009) was used.

The *MISSCARE Survey* consists of three parts. The initial part of the instrument includes items related to demographic and background variables (work conditions and satisfaction). The second part (Part A) includes 24 items related to missed nursing care activities (missed nursing care themes, Kalisch, 2006). Part B consists of 17 items related to the reasons for routinely missed nursing care. In order to calculate the overall score, answers should be recoded, with higher scores indicating higher levels of missed care or a stronger reason for missed nursing care activities. A higher score indicates a higher level of missed nursing care (Part A), and a stronger reason for missed nursing care (Part B).

Translation procedure for the Czech and Slovak versions of the MISSCARE Survey

First, we obtained official approval from the author to use the MISSCARE Survey for the purpose of this study. Subsequently, a translation into Czech and Slovak was completed. The standard translation process comprised the following stages: the creation of two independent forward translations, which were combined to form a single forward translation; then two independent reverse translations were produced and analyzed; followed by a review by a nurse expert, and pilot testing. The first step (forward translation) was performed by two independent translators and combined to form a single version, which was subsequently translated back into English and compared with the original English version by another two independent translators. Forward and reverse translators, and nurse experts were Slovak/Czech native speakers, fluent in English. The third phase of linguistic validation was an evaluation of the relevance and applicability of the translated versions by a panel of experts (five experienced nurses).

Data analysis

The statistical analysis was performed by the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences 20.0. Means, standard deviation (± SD), absolute and relative frequencies were calculated within descriptive statistical analysis. Since the data were normally distributed, the analysis was performed using parametric tests. For group comparisons, a one way ANOVA procedure was performed. Proportion comparisons were carried out with Pearson's chi-square test. To determine the associations and correlations between variables, parametric Pearson correlations were used. A p-value < 0.05 was taken to indicate statistical significance for all comparisons. Psychometric procedures included factor analysis and reliability analysis procedures. The structure of the Slovak and Czech versions of the MISSCARE Survey (Part B) was studied using exploratory factor analysis (EFA). Dimensionality of both versions was confirmed by Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with Varimax rotation. Cronbach's alpha, item total correlations, and item domain correlations were calculated to determine the internal reliability of the MISSCARE Survey. Overall missing data were also reported.

 Table 1 The characteristics of participants in the pilot-testing

Variable	n	%
Age (n = 226)		
< 25 years	24	10.6
25–34 years	44	19.5
35–44 years	71	31.4
45–54 years	59	26.1
55–64 years	28	12.4
> 65 years	0.00	0.00
Highest nursing degree $(n = 223)$		
Secondary nursing school or diploma	159	71.3
Bachelor degree or higher	64	28.7
Professional experience $(n = 221)$		
less than 6 months	4	1.8
from 6 months to 2 years	17	7.7
from 2 years to 5 years	17	77
from 5 years to 10 years	25	11.3
more than 10 years	158	71.5
Vears of experience on current unit $(n - 226)$	150	/1.5
less than 6 months	12	53
from 6 months to 2 years	32	14.2
from 2 years to 5 years	35	15.5
from 5 years to 10 years	50	26.1
more than 10 years	88	38.9
Postgraduate Education – specialized	00	50.7
rograms for purses (n = 226)		
\mathbf{P} N without specialization	142	62.8
DN with specialization	142 Q/	37.2
Work hours $(n - 180)$	04	57.2
davs	/19	27.2
evenings		27.2
nights	3	17
rotating shifts	124	68.0
Hours of overtime in past 3 months $(n - 225)$	124	00.9
none	61	27.1
1-12 hours	<u>/</u> 6	27.1 20.4
more than 12 hours	118	20. 4 52.4
Hours worked per week $(n - 225)$	110	52.4
loss than 30 hours	16	71
30 hours or more	200	02.0
Days or shifts absent in past 3 months $(n - 226)$	209	92.9
p_{ays} of shifts absent in past 5 months (ii = 220) none = 1 day or shift	18/	81 /
2 or more days or shifts	104 12	18.6
Perceived adequacy of staffing $(n - 222)$	74	10.0
100% of the time	11	10
75% of the time	10	$\frac{4.9}{21.7}$
50% of the time	47 77	21.7
25% or loss of the time	05	27.6
25% of less of the time	05	57.0
Leaving intentions of current position $(II - 223)$	22	110
In the next 0 months -1 year no plane to loave	100	14.0 75 0
Hospital $(n - 226)$	190	15.2
$\frac{1105ptd1}{11-220}$	57	25.2
private	J/ 160	23.2 71 0
private	109	/4.0

Results

Job satisfaction

The initial part of the instrument includes three items related to job satisfaction: satisfaction with the profession, satisfaction with teamwork on the unit, satisfaction with current job position. and Respondents evaluated each item of the questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale (1 = very dissatisfied)to 5 = very satisfied). The mean scores of satisfaction with the profession (3.92 ± 0.74) ; current position (3.95 ± 0.75) ; and level of teamwork (3.77 ± 0.99) demonstrate balanced levels of satisfaction with nurses' current positions, as well as with the profession, and the level of teamwork. Significant differences were found between Czech and Slovak nurses in their satisfaction with the profession (F = 5.03; p = 0.02); current position (F = 4.32;p = 0.03), and level of teamwork (F = 24.47;

p = 0.000). Czech nurses scored higher on all the aforementioned items relating to job satisfaction.

Elements of missed nursing care

For Part A, 83.7 % of participants answered all items in the Slovak version, and 87.3% of participants answered all items in the Czech version. Internal consistency was used to measure the reliability of both versions. Cronbach alpha for Part A was 0.939 for the Czech version, and 0.945 for the Slovak version, indicating that items had very good consistency.

Staff nurses in Slovakia reported more missed care than their counterparts in the Czech Republic. A comparison of specific elements of nursing care in the Czech Republic versus Slovakia based on mean scores (mean frequencies) is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2 Elements of	Missed Nursing Car	e: Comparison of the	Czech Republic and Slovakia	(one way ANOVA)
		The second secon		

Item	Czech Republic		Slovakia			
	mean (± SD)	Rank*	mean (± SD)	Rank*	F**	p ***
Assessment						
Full documentation of all necessary data	1.92 (0.82)	10	2.09 (1.13)	4	1.55	0.21
IV site care and assessment according to hospital	1 30 (0 76)	17	1 73 (0.86)	21	0.26	0.003
policy	1.39 (0.70)	17	1.75 (0.80)	21	9.20	0.005
Monitoring intake/output	1.50 (0.80)	6	2.17 (3.29)	17	5.03	0.02
Vital signs assessed as ordered	1.63 (0.88)	18	1.71 (0.89)	10	0.38	0.53
Focused reassessment according to patient	1.58 (0.77)	7	2.13 (1.24)	12	16.10	0.000
Hand washing	1.56 (0.85)	22	1.49 (0.79)	13	0.41	0.52
Bedside glucose monitoring as ordered	1.15 (0.57)	23	1.48 (0.74)	24	14.02	0.000
Patient assessments performed each shift	1.41 (0.86)	19	1.71 (0.91)	20	6.04	0.01
Interventions – Individual Needs						
Assess effectiveness of medications	1.66 (0.92)	9	2.10 (1.21)	9	9.21	0.003
PRN ¹ medication requests acted on within five	1 47 (077)	1.4	1.02(1.06)	10	12.05	0.000
minutes	1.47 (0.77)	14	1.92 (1.00)	10	15.85	0.000
Medications administered within 30 minutes	1.00 (0.00)	12	1.02(0.06)	6	0.15	0.60
before or after scheduled time	1.88 (0.89)	15	1.95 (0.90)	0	0.15	0.09
Assist with toileting needs within five minutes of	1 62 (0.76)	15	1 97 (0.02)	11	1 57	0.02
request	1.05 (0.70)	15	1.87 (0.92)	11	4.37	0.05
Response to call light is provided within five minutes	1.45 (0.81)	16	1.79 (0.94)	19	8.15	0.005
Emotional Support to patient and/or family	1.98 (0.86)	2	2.34 (1.18)	3	6.84	0.01
Interventions – Basic Care						
Ambulation three times per day or as ordered	3.06 (1.03)	1	2.81 (1.28)	1	2.53	0.11
Turning patient every two hours	1.87 (0.93)	4	2.24 (1.11)	8	7.17	0.008
Mouth Care	1.88 (0.93)	5	2.22 (1.05)	7	6.68	0.01
Feeding patient when the food is still warm	1.52 (0.86)	8	2.12 (1.01)	15	22.68	0.000
Patient bathing/skin care	1.55 (0.79)	11	1.97 (0.85)	14	13.94	0.000
Skin/wound care					4.14	0.04
Setting up meals for patients who feed themselves	1.36 (0.81)	20	1.62 (0.85)	23	5.15	0.02
Planning						
Patient teaching	1.89 (0.88)	3	2.25 (1.10)	5	7.18	0.008
Attend interdisciplinary care conferences	220(0.00)	24	1 47 (0 70)	2	47.07	0.000
whenever held	2.30 (0.99)	24	1.47 (0.70)	L	47.07	0.000
Ensuring discharge planning	1.51 (0.89)	7	1.96 (1.04)	16	11.52	0.001
Overall mean score	1.64 (0.51)		1.99 (0.83)		12.61	0.000

*The items of the MISSCARE Survey are ranked according to the mean score from the elements perceived as most frequently missed to the least frequently missed; **F – statistic; ***p-value, ¹, pro re nata" = as needed

Significant differences were found in 19 elements of the *MISSCARE Survey*, as well as in the overall mean score (Table 2). Slovak nurses reported more missed nursing care than Czech nurses for 18 of the 24 domains of nursing care (Table 2). Five elements of missed care were not significantly different in the two countries: documentation of all necessary data; vital signs assessed; bedside glucose monitoring; medications administered within 30 minutes, and ambulation. Although Slovak nurses reported missing most of the elements in Part A more often than Czech nurses, there is a discernible pattern in the amount and type of missed nursing care, especially vis-a-vis categories related to mobility (ambulation), and emotional and psychological needs of patients (patient/family education, emotional support). However, results based on the percentage of positive responses (occasionally, frequently, or always missed activities) indicated differences in 18 elements of the *MISSCARE Survey* (Table 3).

Table 3 Elements of Missed Nursin	g Care: Comparison of	of the Slovak and Czech re	publics (Pearson chi-square test)
-----------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------------

n (%)*n (%)*square testPAssessmentFull documentation of all necessary data $30 (13.5)$ $31 (13.9)$ 3.16 0.07 IV site care and assessment according to hospital policy $7 (3.2)$ $18 (8.3)$ 11.59 0.001 Monitoring intake/output $11 (5)$ $26 (11.7)$ 16.92 0.000 Vital signs assessed as ordered $22 (9.8)$ $21 (9.3)$ 1.38 0.23 Focused reassessment according to patient $9 (4.1)$ $31 (14)$ 26.6 0.000 Hand washing $22 (9.9)$ $13 (5.9)$ 0.31 0.57 Bedside glucose monitoring as ordered $4 (1.8)$ $12 (5.4)$ 8.002 0.005 Patient assessments performed each shift $13 (5.9)$ $15 (6.8)$ 1.88 0.17 Interventions – Individual Needs $24 (10.9)$ $33 (15)$ 9.71 0.002 PRN ¹ medication requests acted on within 5 minutes $9 (4)$ $26 (11.7)$ 18.68 0.000 Medications administered within 30 minutes $26 (11.8)$ $22 (9.9)$ 5.23 0.02 Response to call light is provided within five minutes of request $16 (7.2)$ $22 (9.9)$ 5.23 0.02
AssessmentFull documentation of all necessary data $30 (13.5)$ $31 (13.9)$ 3.16 0.07 IV site care and assessment according to hospital policy $7 (3.2)$ $18 (8.3)$ 11.59 0.001 Monitoring intake/output $11 (5)$ $26 (11.7)$ 16.92 0.000 Vital signs assessed as ordered $22 (9.8)$ $21 (9.3)$ 1.38 0.23 Focused reassessment according to patient $9 (4.1)$ $31 (14)$ 26.6 0.000 Hand washing $22 (9.9)$ $13 (5.9)$ 0.31 0.57 Bedside glucose monitoring as ordered $4 (1.8)$ $12 (5.4)$ 8.002 0.005 Patient assessments performed each shift $13 (5.9)$ $15 (6.8)$ 1.88 0.17 Interventions – Individual Needs $24 (10.9)$ $33 (15)$ 9.71 0.002 PRN ¹ medication requests acted on within 5 minutes $9 (4)$ $26 (11.7)$ 18.68 0.000 Medications administered within 30 minutes $26 (11.8)$ $26 (11.8)$ 2.09 0.14 before or after scheduled time $26 (11.8)$ $26 (11.8)$ 2.09 0.14 Assist with toileting needs within five minutes of request $16 (7.2)$ $22 (9.9)$ 5.23 0.02 Response to call light is provided within five minutes $14 (6.4)$ $24 (11)$ 9.66 0.002
Full documentation of all necessary data $30 (13.5)$ $31 (13.9)$ 3.16 0.07 IV site care and assessment according to hospital policy $7 (3.2)$ $18 (8.3)$ 11.59 0.001 Monitoring intake/output $11 (5)$ $26 (11.7)$ 16.92 0.000 Vital signs assessed as ordered $22 (9.8)$ $21 (9.3)$ 1.38 0.23 Focused reassessment according to patient $9 (4.1)$ $31 (14)$ 26.6 0.000 Hand washing $22 (9.9)$ $13 (5.9)$ 0.31 0.57 Bedside glucose monitoring as ordered $4 (1.8)$ $12 (5.4)$ 8.002 0.005 Patient assessments performed each shift $13 (5.9)$ $15 (6.8)$ 1.88 0.17 Interventions – Individual Needs $24 (10.9)$ $33 (15)$ 9.71 0.002 PRN ¹ medication requests acted on within 5 minutes $9 (4)$ $26 (11.7)$ 18.68 0.000 Medications administered within 30 minutes $26 (11.8)$ $26 (11.8)$ 2.09 0.14 before or after scheduled time $26 (11.8)$ $26 (11.8)$ 2.09 0.14 Assist with toileting needs within five minutes of request $16 (7.2)$ $22 (9.9)$ 5.23 0.02 Response to call light is provided within five minutes $14 (6.4)$ $24 (11)$ 9.66 0.002
IV site care and assessment according to hospital policy $7 (3.2)$ $18 (8.3)$ 11.59 0.001 Monitoring intake/output $11 (5)$ $26 (11.7)$ 16.92 0.000 Vital signs assessed as ordered $22 (9.8)$ $21 (9.3)$ 1.38 0.23 Focused reassessment according to patient $9 (4.1)$ $31 (14)$ 26.6 0.000 Hand washing $22 (9.9)$ $13 (5.9)$ 0.31 0.57 Bedside glucose monitoring as ordered $4 (1.8)$ $12 (5.4)$ 8.002 0.005 Patient assessments performed each shift $13 (5.9)$ $15 (6.8)$ 1.88 0.17 Interventions – Individual Needs $24 (10.9)$ $33 (15)$ 9.71 0.002 PRN ¹ medication requests acted on within 5 minutes $9 (4)$ $26 (11.7)$ 18.68 0.000 Medications administered within 30 minutes $26 (11.8)$ $26 (11.8)$ 2.09 0.14 before or after scheduled time $26 (11.8)$ $26 (11.8)$ 2.09 0.14 Assist with toileting needs within five minutes of request $16 (7.2)$ $22 (9.9)$ 5.23 0.02 Response to call light is provided within five minutes $14 (6.4)$ $24 (11)$ 9.66 0.002
policy $16(6.3)$ Monitoring intake/output11 (5) $26(11.7)$ 16.92 0.000 Vital signs assessed as ordered $22(9.8)$ $21(9.3)$ 1.38 0.23 Focused reassessment according to patient $9(4.1)$ $31(14)$ 26.6 0.000 Hand washing $22(9.9)$ $13(5.9)$ 0.31 0.57 Bedside glucose monitoring as ordered $4(1.8)$ $12(5.4)$ 8.002 0.005 Patient assessments performed each shift $13(5.9)$ $15(6.8)$ 1.88 0.17 Interventions – Individual Needs $24(10.9)$ $33(15)$ 9.71 0.002 PRN ¹ medication requests acted on within 5 minutes $9(4)$ $26(11.7)$ 18.68 0.000 Medications administered within 30 minutes $26(11.8)$ $26(11.8)$ 2.09 0.14 before or after scheduled time $26(11.8)$ $22(9.9)$ 5.23 0.02 Response to call light is provided within five minutes $14(6.4)$ $24(11)$ 9.66 0.002
Monitoring intake/output11 (5) $26 (11.7)$ 16.92 0.000 Vital signs assessed as ordered $22 (9.8)$ $21 (9.3)$ 1.38 0.23 Focused reassessment according to patient $9 (4.1)$ $31 (14)$ 26.6 0.000 Hand washing $22 (9.9)$ $13 (5.9)$ 0.31 0.57 Bedside glucose monitoring as ordered $4 (1.8)$ $12 (5.4)$ 8.002 0.005 Patient assessments performed each shift $13 (5.9)$ $15 (6.8)$ 1.88 0.17 Interventions – Individual Needs $24 (10.9)$ $33 (15)$ 9.71 0.002 PRN ¹ medication requests acted on within 5 minutes $9 (4)$ $26 (11.7)$ 18.68 0.000 Medications administered within 30 minutes $26 (11.8)$ $26 (11.8)$ 2.09 0.14 before or after scheduled time $26 (11.8)$ $22 (9.9)$ 5.23 0.02 Response to call light is provided within five minutes $14 (6.4)$ $24 (11)$ 9.66 0.002
Vital signs assessed as ordered $22 (9.8)$ $21 (9.3)$ 1.38 0.23 Focused reassessment according to patient $9 (4.1)$ $31 (14)$ 26.6 0.000 Hand washing $22 (9.9)$ $13 (5.9)$ 0.31 0.57 Bedside glucose monitoring as ordered $4 (1.8)$ $12 (5.4)$ 8.002 0.005 Patient assessments performed each shift $13 (5.9)$ $15 (6.8)$ 1.88 0.17 Interventions – Individual Needs24 (10.9) $33 (15)$ 9.71 0.002 PRN ¹ medication requests acted on within 5 minutes $9 (4)$ $26 (11.7)$ 18.68 0.000 Medications administered within 30 minutes $26 (11.8)$ $26 (11.8)$ 2.09 0.14 before or after scheduled time $26 (11.8)$ $26 (11.8)$ 2.09 0.14 Assist with toileting needs within five minutes of request $16 (7.2)$ $22 (9.9)$ 5.23 0.02 Response to call light is provided within five minutes $14 (6.4)$ $24 (11)$ 9.666 0.002
Focused reassessment according to patient9 (4.1)31 (14)26.60.000Hand washing22 (9.9)13 (5.9)0.310.57Bedside glucose monitoring as ordered4 (1.8)12 (5.4)8.0020.005Patient assessments performed each shift13 (5.9)15 (6.8)1.880.17Interventions – Individual NeedsAssess effectiveness of medications24 (10.9)33 (15)9.710.002PRN ¹ medication requests acted on within 5 minutes9 (4)26 (11.7)18.680.000Medications administered within 30 minutes26 (11.8)26 (11.8)2.090.14before or after scheduled time16 (7.2)22 (9.9)5.230.02Response to call light is provided within five minutes14 (6.4)24 (11)9.6660.002
Hand washing $22 (9.9)$ $13 (5.9)$ 0.31 0.57 Bedside glucose monitoring as ordered $4 (1.8)$ $12 (5.4)$ 8.002 0.005 Patient assessments performed each shift $13 (5.9)$ $15 (6.8)$ 1.88 0.17 Interventions – Individual NeedsAssess effectiveness of medications $24 (10.9)$ $33 (15)$ 9.71 0.002 PRN ¹ medication requests acted on within 5 minutes $9 (4)$ $26 (11.7)$ 18.68 0.000 Medications administered within 30 minutes $26 (11.8)$ $26 (11.8)$ 2.09 0.14 before or after scheduled time $26 (11.8)$ $22 (9.9)$ 5.23 0.02 Response to call light is provided within five minutes $14 (6.4)$ $24 (11)$ 9.66 0.002
Bedside glucose monitoring as ordered $4 (1.8)$ $12 (5.4)$ 8.002 0.005 Patient assessments performed each shift $13 (5.9)$ $15 (6.8)$ 1.88 0.17 Interventions – Individual Needs $24 (10.9)$ $33 (15)$ 9.71 0.002 PRN ¹ medication requests of medications $24 (10.9)$ $33 (15)$ 9.71 0.002 PRN ¹ medication requests acted on within 5 minutes $9 (4)$ $26 (11.7)$ 18.68 0.000 Medications administered within 30 minutes $26 (11.8)$ $26 (11.8)$ 2.09 0.14 before or after scheduled time $16 (7.2)$ $22 (9.9)$ 5.23 0.02 Response to call light is provided within five minutes $14 (6.4)$ $24 (11)$ 9.66 0.002
Patient assessments performed each shift $13 (5.9)$ $15 (6.8)$ 1.88 0.17 Interventions – Individual NeedsAssess effectiveness of medications $24 (10.9)$ $33 (15)$ 9.71 0.002 PRN ¹ medication requests acted on within 5 minutes $9 (4)$ $26 (11.7)$ 18.68 0.000 Medications administered within 30 minutes $26 (11.8)$ $26 (11.8)$ 2.09 0.14 before or after scheduled time $26 (11.8)$ $22 (9.9)$ 5.23 0.02 Response to call light is provided within five minutes $14 (6.4)$ $24 (11)$ 9.66 0.002
Interventions – Individual NeedsAssess effectiveness of medications $24 (10.9)$ $33 (15)$ 9.71 0.002 PRN ¹ medication requests acted on within 5 minutes $9 (4)$ $26 (11.7)$ 18.68 0.000 Medications administered within 30 minutes $26 (11.8)$ $26 (11.8)$ 2.09 0.14 before or after scheduled time $26 (11.8)$ $26 (11.8)$ 2.09 0.12 Assist with toileting needs within five minutes of request $16 (7.2)$ $22 (9.9)$ 5.23 0.02 Response to call light is provided within five minutes $14 (6.4)$ $24 (11)$ 9.66 0.002
Assess effectiveness of medications $24 (10.9)$ $33 (15)$ 9.71 0.002 PRN ¹ medication requests acted on within 5 minutes $9 (4)$ $26 (11.7)$ 18.68 0.000 Medications administered within 30 minutes $26 (11.8)$ $26 (11.8)$ 2.09 0.14 before or after scheduled time $26 (11.8)$ $26 (11.8)$ 2.09 0.14 Assist with toileting needs within five minutes of request $16 (7.2)$ $22 (9.9)$ 5.23 0.02 Response to call light is provided within five minutes $14 (6.4)$ $24 (11)$ 9.66 0.002
PRN1 medication requests acted on within 5 minutes9 (4) $26 (11.7)$ 18.68 0.000 Medications administered within 30 minutes $26 (11.8)$ $26 (11.8)$ 2.09 0.14 before or after scheduled time $26 (11.8)$ $26 (11.8)$ 2.09 0.14 Assist with toileting needs within five minutes of request $16 (7.2)$ $22 (9.9)$ 5.23 0.02 Response to call light is provided within five minutes $14 (6.4)$ $24 (11)$ 9.66 0.002
Medications administered within 30 minutes before or after scheduled time26 (11.8)26 (11.8)2.090.14Assist with toileting needs within five minutes of request Response to call light is provided within five minutes16 (7.2)22 (9.9)5.230.02Response to call light is provided within five minutes14 (6.4)24 (11)9.660.002
before or after scheduled time20 (11.8)20 (11.8)Assist with toileting needs within five minutes of request16 (7.2)22 (9.9)5.230.02Response to call light is provided within five minutes14 (6.4)24 (11)9.660.002
Assist with toileting needs within five minutes of request16 (7.2)22 (9.9)5.230.02Response to call light is provided within five minutes14 (6.4)24 (11)9.660.002
Response to call light is provided within five minutes14 (6.4)24 (11)9.660.0020.0020.0020.0020.0020.0020.002
Emotional Support to patient and/or family $35(15.6)$ $38(17)$ 5.39 0.02
Interventions – Basic Care
Ambulation three times per day or as ordered 90 (41.4) 52 (23.7) 4.04 0.05
Turning patient every two hours 25 (11.3) 39 (17.6) 13.82 0.000
Mouth Care 28 (12.7) 34 (15.4) 6.18 0.01
Feeding patient when the food is still warm 14 (6.4) 37 (16.8) 25.76 0.000
Patient bathing/skin care 13 (5.9) 25 (11.4) 11.29 0.001
Skin/wound care 6 (2.7) 11 (5) 4.13 0.04
Setting up meals for patients who feed themselves 12 (5.5) 14 (6.4) 1.89 0.16
Planning
Patient teaching 29 (13) 34 (15.2) 5.85 0.01
Attend interdisciplinary care conferences $52(22.7)$ $0.(4.1)$ 25.02 0.000
whenever held $32(25.7) \qquad 9(4.1)$
Ensuring discharge planning 15 (6.8) 28 (12.7) 12.12 0.001

*Missed = Occasionally + Frequently + Always; **p-value, ¹, pro re nata " = as needed

Reasons for missed nursing care

For Part B, 96.7 % of participants answered all items in the Slovak version and 87.3% in the Czech version. Cronbach alphas for the three subscales of the Czech version – communication, material resources, labor resources – were 0.919, 0.880, and 0.838 respectively. Cronbach alphas for the three subscales of the Slovak version – communication, material resources, labor resources – were 0.965, 0.958, and 0.924 respectively. An exploratory factor analysis (EFA), using the principal components method with Varimax rotation, was conducted in order to determine the *MISSCARE Survey* structure of the Czech and Slovak versions. All predictions regarding the performance of this analysis were confirmed. The Kaisen-Meyer-Olkin value was 0.92 in the Slovak version and 0.93 in the Czech version. The *MISSCARE Survey* – Czech/Slovak versions were significant (p = 0.00) for Bartlett's test of sphericity. The results of the Czech version showed that all 17 items had loaded onto two components, which explained 63.73% of the variance. Variance extracted by factor 1 (communication and material resources) was the highest, and this factor also explained the largest degree of variance (39.52% after rotation). Factor loading of the items in an existent factor was in the range between 0.62 (Caregiver off unit or unavailable) and 0.84 (Tension or communication breakdowns within the nursing team). Factor 2 'labor resources' accounted for a response variance of 24.21% after rotation. Factor loading of the items in an existent factor was in the range between 0.47 (Inadequate number of assistive and/or clerical personnel) and 0.89 (Unexpected rise in patient volume and/or acuity on the unit).

The Slovak version indicated similar results – all items were loaded on two components, explaining 80.43% of variance. Variance extracted by factor 1 (*communication and material resources*) was highest, and this factor also explained the largest degree of variance (53.10% after rotation). Factor loading of the items in an existent factor was in the range between 0.68 (Unbalanced patient assignments) and 0.87 (Tension or communication breakdowns with other ancillary/support departments). Factor 2 'labor resources' accounted for a response variance of 28.32% after rotation. Factor loading of the items in an existent factor was in a range between 0.80 (Inadequate number of assistive and/or clerical personnel) and 0.89 (Inadequate number of staff). For Part B of the MISSCARE Survey-Slovak/Czech, the EFA did not confirm the three-factor solution of the MISSCARE Survey-English: labor resources, material resources, and communication.

In both countries, labor resources were reported to be the most significant reason for missed nursing care. There were significant differences between the two countries in means scores in the domain of communication. Slovak nurses believed, on average, that they had more problems in this domain (Table 4).

Table 4 Reasons of Missed Nursing Care: Comparison of the Czech Republic and Slovakia (one way ANOVA)

Item	Czech	Slovakia		
	Republic			
	Mean (± SD)	Mean (± SD)	F*	p* *
Communication				
Unbalanced patient assignments	2.47 (0.97)	2.38 (1.15)	0.41	0.52
Inadequate hand-off from previous shift	2.24 (0.84)	2.62 (1.23)	7.14	0.008
Other departments did not provide the care needed	2.25 (0.81)	2.81 (1.10)	19.43	0.000
Lack of back up support from team members	2.16 (1.04)	2.82 (1.17)	19.21	0.000
Tension or communication breakdowns with other ancillary/support	2.22 (0.88)	2.65 (1.15)	9.58	0.002
departments				
Tension or communication breakdowns within the nursing team	2.31 (1.05)	2.89 (1.21)	14.6	0.000
Tension or communication breakdowns with the medical staff	2.46 (1.01)	2.68 (1.17)	2.21	0.13
Nursing assistant did not communicate that care was not provided	2.46 (1.21)	2.79 (1.16)	4.19	0.04
Caregiver off unit or unavailable.	2.57 (1.05)	2.96 (1.26)	5.91	0.01
Mean score	2.35 (0.78)	2.72 (1.05)	8.91	0.003
Material Resources				
Medications were not available when needed.	2.58 (1.13)	2.65 (1.16)	0.21	0.64
Supplies/ equipment not available when needed	2.38 (1.01)	2.69 (1.16)	4.62	0.03
Supplies/ equipment not functioning properly	2.35 (0.98)	2.67 (1.17)	4.62	0.03
Mean score	2.43 (0.94)	2.67 (1.12)	2.70	0.10
Labor resources				
Inadequate number of staff	2.96 (1.01)	2.98 (1.28)	0.01	0.91
Urgent patient situations	2.88 (1.17)	2.52 (1.27)	4.68	0.03
Unexpected rise in patient volume and/or acuity on the unit	3.07 (1.01)	2.76 (1.23)	4.28	0.04
Inadequate number of assistive and/or clerical personnel	2.60 (0.98)	3.03 (1.23)	8.31	0.004
Heavy admission and discharge activity	2.75 (0.92)	2.63 (1.16)	0.72	0.39
Mean score	2.85 (0.80)	2.79 (1.07)	0.23	0.62
*F statistics **n value				

*F – statistic; **p-value

Job satisfaction and missed nursing care

Satisfaction with the profession, satisfaction with teamwork on unit, and satisfaction with current job

position correlated negatively with the overall mean score of Part A in both versions (Table 5).

	Overall mean score (Part A)	Satisfaction with the profession	Satisfaction with job position	Satisfaction with team work
Overall mean score (Part A)		-0.23*	-0.21*	-0.23*
Satisfaction with the profession	-0.45**		0.64^{**}	0.37^{**}
Satisfaction with job position	-0.32**	0.69**		0.41**
Satisfaction with team work	-0.55**	0.51**	0.36**	

Table 5 Correlations between satisfaction with the profession, job position, and teamwork, and overall mean score of Part A in Czech (above diagonal) and Slovak (below diagonal) sample

*p <0.05; **p <0.01

Discussion

The MISSCARE Survey is one of the most widely used tools in evaluating the phenomenon of missed nursing care worldwide. Its content validity, construct validity, internal consistency and stability have been tested in the United States, including both qualitative (focus groups, concept analysis, Kalisch 2006; Kalisch, Landstrom, Hinshaw, 2009) and methods (psychometric quantitative analysis, Kalisch, Williams, 2009). The MISSCARE Survey was developed in US and later translated into several languages, and is used by many researchers worldwide. The psychometric properties of this frequently deployed instrument are well established and compared in a series of empirical studies in the US (Kalisch, Williams, 2009); Brazil (Siqueira et al., 2013), and in Europe (Bragadóttir et al., 2015 -Iceland; Kalisch, Terzioglu, Duygulu, 2012 – Turkey; Sist et al., 2017 - Italian), Asia (Srulovici, Drach-Zahavy, 2017), and Australia and New Zealand (Blackman et al., 2015; Willis et al., 2017). Prior to the current study, the instrument was not available in Czech and Slovak languages, and the psychometric properties were not known.

The pilot study is the first to undertake an examination of missed nursing care in the Czech and Slovak Republics. The response rate in this study was good. Psychometric testing proved that Czech and Slovak versions of the MISSCARE Survey are reliable and valid tools. For Part A, internal consistency was satisfactory, with Cronbach alpha at 0.939 for the Czech version and 0.945 for the Slovak version. For part B, internal consistency was satisfactory for all subscales, with Cronbach alpha at over 0.83 for the three subscales of the Czech version and 0.92 for the Slovak version. Construct validity was examined using factor analysis. There were two factors for Part B of the MISSCARE Survey. In previous studies, the three-factor solution was examined (Kalisch, Williams, 2009; Kalisch, Landstrom, Hinshaw, 2009; Bragadóttir et al., 2015).

Patient safety has become an important priority for hospitals in both countries. However, as Kalisch (2009) points out, the patient safety movement has paid very little attention to missed nursing care. This pilot study provides the first results on how Czech and Slovak nurses perceive the phenomenon of missed nursing care. Both countries reported a significant amount of missed nursing care, with Slovak nurses reporting more missed care than Czech nurses. The average score for missed nursing care was 1.64 ± 0.51 for the Czech Republic, and 1.99 ± 0.83 for Slovakia. Less missed nursing care was reported in a study by Kalisch, Terzioglu, Duygulu (2012) for Turkey (1.40 ± 0.41) and for the United States (1.77 ± 0.39).

Papers presenting results for the MISSCARE survey are not uniform in their interpretation of the findings. Most of the papers presented missed nursing care as a percentage (Kalisch, Williams, 2009; Kalisch, Terzioglu, Duygulu, 2012). In these studies, the percentage of missed care was gauged using the categories "occasionally", "frequently", and "always". Our results are presented in both ways, which, in this respect, is not typical, and there are subtle differences between the results. A Brazilian study similarly presented missed nursing care as both a percentage and a mean (Siqueira et al., 2013). Further work could indicate how the results of MISSCARE should best be interpreted to help researchers compare their findings.

The results of the study indicate that some activities that are integral to nursing care are being neglected. In our study the most frequent missed nursing activities were: ambulation, emotional support, patient teaching, mouth care, turning patients, documentation of necessary data, and medications administered within 30 minutes. In her qualitative study, Kalisch (2006) identified nine elements of nursing care which are regularly missed: ambulation, turning, delayed or missed feedings, education, discharge planning, emotional support, hygiene, intake and output documentation, and surveillance. Most of these elements were also missed in our sample. Among the most missed nursing care activities in US hospitals were: ambulation, assessment of effect of medications, turning, mouth care and teaching (Kalisch, Williams, 2009). If nurses cannot provide all necessary services, they must prioritize. According to Jones, Hamilton, Murry (2015) the prioritization of physiological over emotional and psychological needs is congruent with the pyramid of human needs proposed by Abraham Maslow. Staff nurses in Slovakia reported more missed care than their counterparts in the Czech Republic. Slovak nurses were also less satisfied with their jobs. Czech nurses scored higher on all the aforementioned items relating to job satisfaction. This finding is consistent with a previous study in which Czech nurses reported more job satisfaction in all subscales of The McCloskey/Mueller Satisfaction Scale (Gurková et al., 2013). When nurses are unable to deliver the care they deem necessary, they report dissatisfaction with their jobs. According to Kalisch, Landstrom, Williams (2009) when nurses cannot fulfill their responsibilities in a manner that satisfies their patients' needs, most report feelings of distress and dissatisfaction with their jobs. In addition, the results of our study revealed a negative correlation between overall mean score of missed nursing care and satisfaction with the profession, meaning that nurses who reported more missed care also reported less satisfaction with the profession, and with teamwork.

In the Czech Republic and Slovakia, scarcity of human resources was the chief reason for missed nursing care.

Limitation of study

One of the limitations of the study is that the reliability of the tool was established using only internal consistency. Test-retest reliability was not performed.

Conclusion

Psychometric testing showed that Czech and Slovak versions of the MISSCARE Survey are reliable and valid tools, and can be used for measuring missed nursing care. The results of this study confirm that missed nursing care is a problem in the Czech Republic and Slovakia, and that this critical problem requires intervention to reduce its occurrence.

Ethical aspects and conflict of interest

The directors of Nursing Departments in each of the five hospitals were contacted by researchers prior to data collection; the study was explained; and permission obtained for data collection. All respondents were informed of the objectives of the research, and gave their consent to participation in the survey. The authors hereby declare that they have no conflicts of interest, and have followed all relevant ethical guidelines in conducting the research.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank Prof. Kalisch for her permission to translate and use the *MISSCARE Survey*.

Supported by Ministry of Health of the Czech Republic, grant nr. NV18-09-00420. All rights reserved.

Research study was also supported by COST OC-2015-2-20085 Rationing-Missed Nursing Care: An international and multidimensional problem and INTER-COST LTC18018 Nursing care rationing as related to nurses' perceptions of professional practice environment.

Author contribution

Concept and design (EG, RZ, DJ), data collection (DJ, EG), manuscript draft (RZ, EG), critical revision of the manuscript (EG, RZ, DJ), final approval of the manuscript (RZ, EG, DJ).

References

Bail K, Grealish L. 'Failure to Maintain': a theoretical proposition for a new quality indicator of nurse care rationing for complex older people in hospital. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*. 2016;63:146–161.

Blackman I, Henderson J, Willis E, Hamilton P, Toffoli L, Verrall C, Abery E, Harvey C. Factors influencing why nursing care is missed. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*. 2015;24(1–2):47–56.

Bragadóttir H, Kalisch BJ, Smáradóttir SB, Jónsdóttir HH. Translation and psychometric testing of the Icelandic version of the MISSCARE Survey. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*. 2015;29(3):563–572.

Gurková E, Soósová MS, Haroková S, Žiaková K, Šerfelová R, Zamboriová M. Job satisfaction and leaving intentions of Slovak and Czech nurses. *International Nursing Review*. 2013;60(1):112–121.

Hessels AJ, Flynn L, Cimiotti JP, Cadmus E, Gershon RRM. The impact of the nursing practice environment on missed nursing care. *Clinical Nursing Studies*. 2015;3(4):60–65.

Jones TL, Hamilton P, Murry N. Unfinished nursing care, missed care, and implicitly rationed care: State of the science review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*. 2015;52(6):1121–1137.

Kalisch BJ. Missed nursing care: a qualitative study. *Journal* of Nursing Care Quality. 2006;21(4):306–313.

Kalisch BJ, Landstrom GL, Hinshaw AS. Missed nursing care: a concept analysis. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 2009;65(7):1509–1517.

Kalisch BJ, Landstrom GL, Williams RA. Missed nursing care: errors of omission. *Nursing Outlook.* 2009;57(1):3–9.

Kalisch BJ, Williams RA. Development and psychometric testing of a tool to measure missed nursing care. *The Journal of Nursing Administration*. 2009;39(5):211–219.

Kalisch BJ, Tschannen D, Lee KH. Do staffing levels predict missed nursing care? *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*. 2011;23(3):302–308.

Kalisch BJ, Terzioglu F, Duygulu S. The MISSCARE Survey-Turkish: psychometric properties and findings. *Nursing Economics*. 2012;30(1):29–37.

Lucero RJ, Lake ET, Aiken LH. Variations in nursing care quality across hospitals. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 2009;65(11):2299–2310.

Mitchell PH, Ferketich S, Jennings BM. Quality health outcomes model. *Image – The Journal of Nursing Scholarship*. 1998;30(1):43–46.

Papastavrou E, Andreou P, Efstathiou G. Rationing of nursing care and nurse-patient outcomes: a systematic review of quantitative studies. *International Journal of Health Planning and Management*. 2014;29(1):3–25.

Siqueira LDC, Caliri MHL, Kalisch BJ, Dantas RAS. Cultural adaptation and internal consistency analysis of the MISSCARE Survey for use in Brazil. *Revista Latino-Americana de Enfermagem*. 2013;21(2):610–617.

Sist L, Contini C, Bandini A, Bandini S, Massa L, Zanin R, Maricchio R, Gianesini G, Bassi E, Tartaglini D, Palese A, Ferraresi A. MISSCARE Survey – Italian version: findings from an Italian validation study. *Igiene e Sanita Pubblica*. 2017;73(1):29–45. (in Italian)

Schubert M, Glass TR, Clarke SP, Schaffert-Witvliet B, De Geest S. Validation of the Basel Extent of Rationing of Nursing Care instrument. *Nursing Research*. 2007;56(6):416–424.

Srulovici E, Drach-Zahavy A. Nurses' personal and ward accountability and missed nursing care: a cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*. 2017;75:163–171.

Ubel PA, Goold SD. 'Rationing' health care. Not all definitions are created equal. *Archives of Internal Medicine*. 1998;158(3):209–214.

VanFosson CA, Jones TL, Yoder LH. Unfinished nursing care: an important performance measure for nursing care systems. *Nursing Outlook*. 2016;64(2):124–136.

Willis E, Carryer J, Harvey C, Pearson M, Henderson J. Austerity, new public management and missed nursing care in Australia and New Zealand. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 2017;73(12):3102–3110.