The University of Chicago
Graduate School of Business
Center for Health Administration Studies (CHAS)
1101 East 58th Street, Walker 111
Chicago, Illinois 60637
(312) 702-7104

WORKSHOP IN HEALTH ADMINISTRATION STUDIES

STEVE SHORTELL, Ph.D.
A. C. Buehler Professor
J. L. Kellogg Graduate
School of Management
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

"Do Organization and Management Influence Outcome in Intensive Care:Findings from a National Study."

for

Thursday, October 18, 1990

Rosenwald 405

3:30 - 5:00

NOT FOR CITATION
OR QUOTATION WITHOUT
AUTHOR'S PERMISSION

ORGANIZATIONAL ASSESSMENT IN INTENSIVE

CARE UNITS:

CONSTRUCT DEVELOPMENT, RELIABILITY,

AND VALIDITY OF THE ICU NURSE
PHYSICIAN QUESTIONNAIRE

- Stephen M. Shortell, Ph.D., A.C. Buehler
 Distinguished Professor of Hospital and
 Health Services Management, Professor of
 Organization Behavior, J.L. Kellogg Graduate
 School of Management, Center for Health Services
 and Policy Research, Northwestern University
- Denise M. Rousseau, Ph.D., Professor of Organization Behavior, J.L. Kellogg Graduate School of Management, Northwestern University
- Robin R. Gillies, Ph.D., Project Director, ICU Research Project, The Center for Health Services and Policy Research, Northwestern University
- Tony L. Simons, B.A., Department of Organization Behavior, Northwestern University

Table 1: Characteristics of the Hospitals and ICUs Involved in the Study Compared to Hospitals and ICUs Nationwide¹

	(TOTIC=42)	NATIONALLY (HOSPITALS=1691)
Percent of Types of Hospitals:	1.00	
Non-Profit	88	77
For-Profit	8	8
State or Local Government	5	13
Percent of Hospitals Affiliated with a Medical School:	đ 53	53
Percent of Hospitals in Each Geographic Region: Northeast (N=7)	16.0	
	16.2	25.1
South (N=13)	35.1	32.2
Midwest (N=15)	29.7	27.3
West (N=8)	18.9	15.3
Average Number of Hospital Beds (N=26 random hospitals)	358	371.5
Average Number of ICU Beds:	13	242
Average Hospital Occupancy Rate	71.1	70.6
Average ICU Occupancy Rate:	79.1	*
Average Number of Registered Nurses Working per Shift:		
Day	7.2	*
Evening	6.1	*
Night	6.7	*
Average Number of Physicians: Full-time Paid (N=17)	5	*
Part-time Paid (N=12)	3	*
Attending (N=41)	25	*
House Staff (N=26)	27	*
Percent of types of ICUs:		
Medical	9	*
Surgical	16	*
Mixed	70	*
Specialty	5	*

RESPONSE RATES OF INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONNAIRES

TYPE	# RETURNED	% RETURNED	
NURSES	1,418		96
PHYSICIANS	790	65	25 - 100
WARD CLERKS/UNIT SECRETARIES	111	9	100
ALL ICU CATEGORIES	2,319	72	39 - 67
HOSPITAL ADMINISTRATORS	221	8 51	1

STNDIR: Nursing Leadership

DEF: The degree to which nursing leadership sets and communicates clear goals and expectations, and is responsive to changing needs and situations.

Cite: Northwestern

TNDIR1 ICU nursing leadership emphasizes standards of excellence to the staff.

TNDIR2 ICU nursing leadership is sufficiently sensitive to the different needs of unit members.

TNDIR3 The ICU nursing leadership fails to make clear what they expect from unit members. (NEG)

TNDIR4 ICU nursing leadership discourages physicians from taking initiative. (NEG)

TNDIR5 Unit physicians are uncertain where they stand with the ICU nursing leadership. (NEG)

TNDIR6 The ICU nursing leadership is out of touch with physician perceptions and concerns. (NEG)

TNDIR7 ICU nursing leadership often makes decisions without input from unit physicians. (NEG)

TNDIR8 ICU nursing leadership effectively adapts its problem-solving style to changing circumstances.

STIME: Communication Timeliness

DEF: The degree to which patient care information is relayed

promptly to the people who need to be informed.

Cite: Northwestern

ITIME1 I get information on the status of patients when I need it.

ITIME2 When a patient's status changes, I get relevant information quickly.

ITIME4 In matters pertaining to patient care, nurses call physicians in a timely manner.

STUNIT: Unit Relations with other Units

DEF: The degree to which relationships with other units in the

hospital facilitate ICU performance.

Cite: Northwestern

TUNIT1 Our unit has constructive work relationships with other groups in this hospital.

TUNIT2 Our unit does not receive the cooperation it needs from other hospital units. (NEG)

TUNIT3 Other hospital subunits seem to have a low opinion of us. (NEG)

TUNIT5 Inadequate working relationships with other hospital groups limit our effectiveness. (NEG)

SCPSBG: Between-group Problem-solving Conflict Strategy

DEF: The degree to which parties to a disagreement between nurses and physicians communicate actively to make sure that all available expertise is brought to bear on a problem, and that the best possible solution is developed.

Cite: Blake & Mouton (1964), Lewicki & Litterer (1985)

CPSBG1 All points of view will be carefully considered in arriving at the best solution of the problem.

CPSBG2 The nurses and physicians will work hard to arrive at the best possible solution.

CPSBG3 Both parties involved will not settle the dispute until all are satisfied with the decision.

CPSBG4 Everyone contributes from their experience and expertise to produce a high quality solution.

SPEABSTQ: Absolute Technical Quality of Care

DEF: The perceived effectiveness of the unit with regard to patient

care needs and outcomes.

Cite: Northwestern

PEFFABS1 Our unit almost always meets its patient care treatment goals.

PEFFABS2 Given the severity of the patients we treat, our unit's patients experience very good outcomes.

PEFFABS4 Our unit does a good job of applying the most recently available technology to patient care needs.

PEFFABS9 Overall, our unit functions very well together as a team.

PEFFABSO Our unit is very good at responding to emergency situations.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics & Cronbach's Alphas for Scales

Scale	# of Items	Mean	Std Dev	Alpha
Leadership				
Nursing Leadership (STNDIR)	8	3.50	.68	.87
Physician Leadership (STMDIR)	8	3.25	.72	.88
Culture				
Team/Satisfaction (FOCITEAM)	(factor)	-0.10	1.00	-
People/Security (FOCIPS)	(factor)	-0.20	1.00	-
Task/Security (FOCITS)	(factor)	0.10	1.00	_
Coordination	0			
Within-Unit (SWUCOORD)	5	3.62	.69	
Between-Unit (SBUCOORD)	4	3.41	.74	.80
Unit Relations with Other Units (STUNIT)	4	3.36	.70	.75
Communication				
Openness – WG (SOPENWG)	4	3.92	.67	.83
Openness BG (SOPENBG)	4	3.60	.77	.88
Accuracy - WG (SACCWG)	4	3.55	.77	.78
Accuracy - BG (SACCBG)	3	3.45	.75	.74
Accuracy - Overall (SACC)	8	3.52	.64	.82
Shift Communication (SSHCWG)	2	3.64	.74	.68
Understanding (SUNDERBG)	8	3.29	.67	.86
Timeliness (STIME)	3	4.01	.52	.64
Satisfaction with Nurse Communication (SSATN)	3	3.94	.56	.68
Satisfaction with Physician Communication (SSATD)	4	3.37	.76	.80

Scale	# of Items	Mean	Std Dev	Alpha
Conflict Management				
Problem-Solving – WG (SCPSWG)	4	3.20	.70	.81
Problem-Solving BG (SCPSBG)	4	3.12	.72	.82
Arbitration – WG (SCARBWG)	3	2.66	.78	.77
Arbitration BG (SCARBBG)	3	2.90	.82	.83
Avoiding - WG (SCAVWG)	3	2.29	.70	.72
Avoiding BG (SCAVBG)	3	2.12	.65	.76
Forcing WG (SCFORCWG)	3	2.93	.66	.62
Forcing BG (SCFORCBG)	3	3.06	.66	.61
Team Cohesion (SCOH)	5	3.83	.63	.79
Perceived Unit Effectiveness			2	
Absolute Technical Quality (SPEABSTQ)	5	3.92	.55	.76
Meeting Family Needs (SPEFAM)	2	3.67	.77	.75

WG = Within Group

BG = Between Group

1.00 - 228 - 34 - 34 .35 315 5 1.00 12021 ÷ 88 å 35.5 922299 .55 300 0 37. 400000000 .45 32 34.650 122001 .43 25 Ė 555555 55555555 14. 23.7 -987245E 22222 8 53 يد Saperanus Paragrama Paragram .37 ¥1.2 S44884848 2522222 9 25 Sandagana 2000 man 55 28 1.00 Ludicide de la constante de la augo augus .37 350 37 1120803385 Service Services 33 500 ÷ See ¥ 35% 1.0 8 1367 400000 -12 -.15 6.0 (1.00) - 2037 ö -.11 -,16 2222222 888 ຍ່ 240000000 200 \$ 347 Table 3: Pearson Correlations of Scales* ď 55. က် ၂၂၂၂ အီးလို့ လို့လုံးမှုနှင့် 25.5 Living Second 3 12: 28 **200** 35.5 7900 mm 20 Suddend wind 35 Ş Cobes Ion SCOR ES B ----

ŗ.

8			1.00
- <u>6</u>			1.00
åå.		1.00	37.
**	1.00	-14	999
γ.	1.00	20	98
×	11.0	20	
*	1.000 0.000	-,24	30
٧.	1.00	+0'-	(03)
'n,	0000000	90'-	(00.)
نہ	00000000	.33	30
100	mt () () () () () () () () () (.38	غۇڭ تا
	Conflict Managemen 8. 8CPSMG t. 8CPSBG u. 8CARBMG v. 8CARBMG v. 8CARBMG v. 8CAVBG x. 8CAVBG x. 8CAVBG	Team Cobesion aa. 800H	Performance bb. SPEABSTQ cc. SPEFAN

* Correlations in parentheses not significant at p.>= .05; all other correlations are significant at the p.>= .05 level.

	Tot	al Res (N=22			Nurs (N=14)			hysicia (N=790	
Leadership	n ²	F	Р	n²	F	Р	n²	F	· P
Nurse Leadership	.14	8.42	.00	.22	8.98	.00	.11	1.96	.00
Physician Leadership	.09	5.06	.00	.15	5.74	.00	.12	2.22	.00
Culture	n²	F	Р	n²	F	Р	n²	F	P
Team/Satisfaction	.07	3.58	.00	.14	4.61	.00	.10	1.69	.00
People/Security	.07	3.59	.00	.11	3.67	.00	.11	2.01	.00
Task/Security	.05	2.33	.00	.05	1.62	.01	.09	1.53	.02
Coordination	n²	F	P	n².	F	P	n²	۶	Р
Within-unit Coordination	.10	5.49	.00	.15	5.71	.00	.10	1.85	.00
Between-unit Coordination	.08	3.42	.00	.10	3.01	.00	.13	1.95	.00
Unit Relations w/ Other Units	.12	6.66	.00	.07	6.80	.00	.13	2.32	.00
Communication	n ²	F	p	n ²	F	р	n ²	F	P
Within-group Openness	.08	4.35	.00	.14	5.38	.00	.11	2_11	.00
Between-group Openness	.08	4.57	.00	.12	4.26	.00	.11	2.15	.00
Within-group Accuracy	.10	5.41	.00	.15	5.90	.00	.15	2.95	.00
Between-group Accuracy	.07	3.74	.00	.11	3.91	.00	.10	1.98	.00
Overail Accuracy	.09	4.99	.00	.13	4.76	.00	.14	2.76	.00
Within-group Shift Communication	.09	4.78	.00	.15	5.75	.00	.10	1.78	.00
Between-group Understanding	.08	4.13	.00	.13	4.84	.00	.10	1.95	.00
Timeliness	.05	2.89	.00	.10	3.50	.00	.10	1.88	.00
Satisfaction with Nurse Communication	.07	4.09	.00	.12	4.40	.00	.10	1.93	.00
Satisfaction with Physician Communication	.06	3.40	.00	.09	3.38	.00	.09	1.74	.00

	Total Responses (N=2208)				Nurses (N=1418)			Physicians (N=790)		
Conflict Management	n ²	F	P	n²	F	Р	n²	F	P	
Within-group Problem-Solving	.07	3.62	.00	.12	4.33	.00	.13	2.50	.00	
Between-Group Problem- Solving	.05	2.89	.00	.06	2.16	.00	.12	2.23	.00	
Within-group Arbitration	.07	3.60	.00	.12	4.46	.00	.15	3.03	.00	
Between-group Arbitration	.07	3.64	.00	.11	3.94	.00	.08	1.41	.05	
Within-group Avoiding	.05	2.74	.00	.08	2.64	.00	.14	2.82	.00	
Between-group Avoiding	.04	2.26	.00	.06	2.00	.00	.09	1.80	.00	
Within-group Forcing	.06	3.07	.00	.09	3.22	.00	.10	1.84	.00	
Between-group Forcing	.04	2.23	.00	.05	1.77	.02	.10	1.97	.00	
	n ²	F	p	n².	F	Р	n²	F	P	
Team Cohesion	.07	3.62	.00	.12	4.29	.00	.09	1.70	.00	
Perceived Unit Effectiveness	п2	F	∵P -	···n²	F	P	n ²	F	Р	
Absolute Technical Quality	.13	7.79	.00	.18	7.29	.00	.19	3.97	.00	
Meeting Family Needs	.14	7.54	.00	.15	5.50	.00	.22	4.31	.00	