The Review Of
DIABETIC
STUDIES OPEN ACCESS

The Review of DIABETIC STUDIES

Assessment Of Nursing And Nursing Technician Performance And Its Relationship To Patient Satisfaction

Arifa Muter Shanif Alsulobi [1], KAFA MASHHOUR M ALRUWAILI [2], Wafa Ali Marzok Alshomrani [3], Alreemi Sonitan Alotaibi [4], Omamah Mohammad Saleh Barnawi [5], ABEER HARBI ALANAZi [6], Wedad Ali Ahmed Khawaji [7], Fayez Bin Khatim Musabbil Alanazi [8], Magedah Gayem Issa Alenazi [9], Eidah Qaem Eisaa Al-Enezi [10], MODI SALEH ALKHELIFI [11], Raedah Ahmad Hassan Al saeed [12], Bandar Faleh Albaqami [13], Maryam Ali Alrashidi [14], Mona Naji Almoteary [15]

[1]*Nursing Technicane, North Border, Alowiqilah Hospital*
[2]*Nursing technician, Turaif General hospital*
[3]*Nursing Technician, Mental Health Hospital, Jeddah*
[4]*Nursing Technician, Primary healthcare in East Laban, Riyadh*
[5]*Nurse,* King Salman Medical City, Al-Madinah Al-Munawwarah
[6]*Nursing technician, Al-Wurud Health Center*
[7]*Nursing technician, AlHamraa Primary Health Care, Central region- Riyadh*
[8] *Nursing Technician, Al-Jouf Health Cluster, Al-Jouf*
[9]*Nursing technician, Will and Mental Health Complex, Arar*
[10] *Nursing technician, Health Affairs, ARAR*
[11]*Nursing technician, Lulwa Al Naeem Health Center, Unaizah, Al-Qassim*
[12]*Nursing Technician, Medical Center, King Salman Air Base, Eastern Province, Qatif Central Hospital*
[13]*Nursing Specialist, King Salman Air Base Medical Center*
[14]*Nursing technician, Lulwa Al Naeem Health Center, Unaizah, Al-Qassim*
[15]*Nursing technician, Al-Qassim, Dr/Lulwa Al Naeem Health Center, Unaizah*

Abstract

This research paper comprehensively examines the critical relationship between the performance of nursing personnel—encompassing both registered nurses and nursing technicians—and patient satisfaction, a cornerstone metric of healthcare quality. Recognizing the multifaceted nature of both constructs, the paper first establishes a conceptual foundation, defining nursing performance as an integration of technical competence and relational care, and patient satisfaction as a multidimensional subjective evaluation shaped by met expectations. It then critically reviews prevalent methodologies for performance assessment, arguing for triangulated systems that move beyond traditional checklists to incorporate multi-source feedback and patient-reported data. A synthesis of empirical evidence robustly confirms that specific performance dimensions, particularly interpersonal communication, responsiveness, and demonstrated clinical competence, are direct predictors of patient perceptions. Crucially, the analysis identifies the nursing work environment and staffing adequacy as pivotal mediating factors that either enable or constrain this relationship, with burnout and poor teamwork serving as significant barriers. The paper concludes that sustainable improvement requires an integrated practice model where comprehensive, formative performance assessment is systematically linked to targeted quality improvement initiatives and strategic investments in creating supportive practice environments. This approach is posited as essential for strengthening the nurse-patient interaction, optimizing care quality, and achieving enhanced patient satisfaction.

Keywords Nursing Performance; Nursing Technician; Patient Satisfaction; Performance Assessment; Quality Improvement; Work Environment; Nurse Staffing; Patient Experience; Healthcare Quality; Empirical Link.

Introduction

In the intricate tapestry of modern healthcare delivery, the quality of patient care and the subsequent satisfaction of those receiving it stand as paramount indicators of system efficacy and humanity. At the very heart of this dynamic lies the performance of nursing personnel, a broad category encompassing both registered nurses (RNs) and nursing technicians (also known as licensed practical/vocational nurses, aides, or assistants). These frontline caregivers are the most consistent point of human contact for patients during their healthcare journey, responsible for translating medical directives into compassionate, competent, and continuous care. Consequently, the systematic assessment of their performance transcends mere administrative procedure; it is a critical lever for improving clinical outcomes, enhancing operational efficiency, and, fundamentally, shaping the patient experience [1]. This research paper delves into the crucial intersection of nursing performance assessment and patient satisfaction, arguing that a robust, multidimensional evaluation of nursing and nursing technician performance is not only intrinsically valuable but also inextricably and positively linked to higher levels of patient-reported satisfaction.

The contemporary healthcare landscape is characterized by increasing complexity, acuity of patient conditions, financial constraints, and a heightened emphasis on value-based care, where reimbursement is increasingly tied to quality metrics and patient-reported outcomes. Within this environment, nursing staff are burdened with expansive responsibilities. Registered nurses synthesize clinical judgment, care coordination, patient education, and emotional support, while nursing technicians provide essential hands-on care, monitoring, and foundational support that upholds patient dignity and basic needs. The performance of both groups directly influences a spectrum of outcomes, from infection rates and medication errors to patient falls and successful recovery trajectories [2, 3]. However, traditional methods of performance assessment have often been narrow, focusing predominantly on task completion, compliance with protocols, and retrospective incident reporting. These methods, while important, may fail to capture the holistic, relational, and psychosocial dimensions of nursing care that patients deeply value [4].

Patient satisfaction, meanwhile, has evolved from a soft metric to a key performance indicator (KPI) of immense strategic importance. It is measured through standardized surveys such as the Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (HCAHPS), which explicitly query patients about their interactions with nurses—communication, responsiveness, pain management, and discharge information [5]. Satisfaction is a multifaceted construct influenced by clinical outcomes, expectations, communication, and the perceived empathy and competence of caregivers. Studies consistently demonstrate that higher patient satisfaction correlates with better adherence to treatment plans, reduced hospital readmission rates, improved institutional reputation, and greater financial viability for healthcare organizations [6, 7]. Therefore, understanding the drivers of this satisfaction is a pressing concern for healthcare administrators and practitioners alike.

The proposed link between nursing performance and patient satisfaction is intuitively strong and empirically supported, yet it warrants detailed and nuanced exploration. It is posited that when nursing performance is high—characterized not only by technical proficiency but also by effective communication, timely responsiveness, emotional support, and patient-centeredness—it directly fosters a therapeutic environment where patients feel safe, heard, and respected. For instance, a nurse's performance in pain management involves both the technical skill of assessment and medication administration and the compassionate communication that reassures the patient. A nursing technician's performance in assisting with activities of daily living involves both physical skill and the preservation of patient privacy and autonomy. These behavioral and attitudinal components, often categorized under "caring" or "compassionate care," are frequently the most memorable aspects for patients and are strong predictors of their overall satisfaction [8, 9].

However, assessing this comprehensive performance presents significant challenges. Which dimensions should be prioritized: clinical skills, interpersonal skills, or teamwork? What are the most valid and reliable tools for measurement: direct observation, peer review, patient feedback, or self-assessment? Furthermore, the assessment context—the work environment—cannot be ignored. Factors such as staffing ratios,

workload, institutional support, and the ethical climate profoundly impact both the capacity of nurses to perform optimally and the tools available to fairly assess them [10, 11]. A stressed, understaffed unit may see declines in both measurable performance indicators and patient satisfaction scores, creating a complex web of causation that assessment models must acknowledge.

This research aims to move beyond establishing a simple correlation to exploring the nature and mechanisms of the relationship between the assessment of nursing performance and patient satisfaction. It will investigate how different assessment frameworks (e.g., competency-based models, 360-degree feedback, balanced scorecards) and their specific foci (technical vs. relational skills) correlate with various domains of patient satisfaction. It will also consider the differential impact of registered nurse performance versus nursing technician performance, as their roles, while interdependent, are distinct and may influence the patient experience in different ways [12].

Conceptual Foundations: Defining Performance and Satisfaction

A critical analysis of the relationship between nursing performance and patient satisfaction must be grounded in a precise and nuanced understanding of the two core constructs. These are not simple, monolithic variables but rather complex, multidimensional concepts shaped by theory, context, and perspective. Establishing clear conceptual foundations is essential for guiding measurement, interpreting findings, and ensuring that research translates into meaningful practice. This section, therefore, delineates the key dimensions of nursing and nursing technician performance and the multifaceted nature of patient satisfaction, drawing upon established models and empirical literature to build a robust framework for the ensuing investigation.

The performance of nursing personnel is best conceptualized not as a single act but as a continuum of integrated competencies demonstrated within the clinical environment. A foundational framework for understanding healthcare quality, Donabedian's structure-process-outcome model, positions nursing performance primarily within the "process" domain—the series of actions, interactions, and decisions that constitute the delivery of care [13]. For registered nurses (RNs), performance synthesizes cognitive, psychomotor, and affective domains. It encompasses clinical judgment and critical thinking (e.g., detecting subtle changes in a patient's condition), proficient technical skills (e.g., intravenous management, wound care), effective care coordination and collaboration, patient and family education, and ethical decision-making. This aligns with the definition of professional competence as "the habitual and judicious use of communication, knowledge, technical skills, clinical reasoning, emotions, values, and reflection in daily practice" [14]. RN performance is thus the application of this integrated competence to achieve therapeutic goals.

The performance of nursing technicians (or equivalent roles such as licensed practical/vocational nurses or aides) is a distinct yet equally vital component of the care process. Their performance is centrally focused on the proficient, safe, and compassionate delivery of delegated bedside and supportive care. This includes a high volume of direct, hands-on tasks: assisting with activities of daily living (ADLs), monitoring vital signs, performing basic procedures, and ensuring patient safety and comfort. However, a narrow conceptualization that reduces their performance to a checklist of technical tasks is inadequate and misleading. Their role carries immense relational weight. As the caregivers spending the most consistent, proximate time with patients, their performance is equally defined by interpersonal competencies: attentive listening, respectful and dignified provision of intimate care, empathetic communication, and vigilant observation and reporting of patient needs to the RN [15]. Therefore, for both RNs and technicians, performance must be understood as comprising two interdependent pillars: technical/clinical performance and relational/caring performance.

Expanding this view, organizational psychology offers the useful dichotomy of task performance versus contextual performance. Task performance refers to in-role, job-specific behaviors directly linked to formal responsibilities and clinical protocols. Contextual performance encompasses extra-

role, discretionary behaviors that support the broader social and psychological environment of the workplace, such as helping a overwhelmed colleague, demonstrating initiative to improve a process, or showing exceptional perseverance in comforting a distressed patient [16]. Both types are critical for optimal unit functioning and patient experience. A nurse may excel at task performance (completing all medications on time) but if contextual performance is low (communicating tersely, failing to collaborate), the overall quality of care and patient perception suffer. Thus, a holistic conceptual definition of nursing performance acknowledges its dual nature: the effective execution of prescribed clinical duties and the enactment of behaviors that foster a therapeutic, supportive, and safe care milieu.

Turning to the outcome variable, patient satisfaction is a sophisticated psychosocial construct representing the patient's evaluative judgment of their healthcare experience. It is a subjective assessment, distinct though not independent from objective clinical outcomes. A widely accepted definition characterizes it as the degree to which a patient's expectations, needs, and desires regarding their care are perceived to have been met [17]. This highlights that satisfaction is not an absolute measure but a relative one, forged in the gap between anticipated care and perceived care. It involves both a cognitive evaluation of service quality and an emotional response to the care encounter. A patient may have a technically successful procedure but leave dissatisfied due to feelings of anonymity or poor communication, underscoring that satisfaction is filtered through personal experience and values.

The multidimensionality of patient satisfaction is well-established. Research consistently identifies specific domains that patients weigh heavily in forming their global satisfaction judgment, many of which are directly influenced by nursing care [18]. These key domains include:

- **Relational/Interpersonal Domain:** Perceived empathy, compassion, respect for dignity, emotional support, and the quality of nurse-patient communication (listening, clear explanations).
- **Technical/Competence Domain:** Trust in the skill, knowledge, and professionalism of caregivers; perceived safety; and effectiveness in managing symptoms, especially pain.
- **Organizational/Structural Domain:** Timeliness and responsiveness of care, environmental factors (cleanliness, quietness), care coordination, and continuity.
- **Educational/Informational Domain:** The clarity, accessibility, and adequacy of information provided about conditions, treatments, and discharge plans.

Patient expectations, shaped by prior experiences, cultural background, and societal narratives about healthcare, serve as the benchmark against which these dimensions are assessed [19]. In contemporary healthcare systems, this complex construct is often operationalized through standardized survey instruments. The most prominent is the Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (HCAHPS) survey, which provides a validated, comparative metric for dimensions like "nurse communication," "responsiveness of hospital staff," and "pain management" [20]. However, it is crucial to recognize that such surveys are proxies—they quantify manifestations of the latent satisfaction construct but cannot capture its full depth and individuality [21].

Methodologies and Tools for Performance Assessment in Nursing

The accurate and fair assessment of nursing performance is a complex administrative and clinical challenge, requiring methodologies and tools that are valid, reliable, feasible, and ultimately conducive to professional development and improved patient care. Moving beyond the conceptual definition of performance, this section critically examines the primary approaches employed to evaluate the work of both registered nurses (RNs) and nursing technicians. The choice of assessment strategy is not neutral; it signals what an organization values, directly influences staff behavior, and shapes the care environment that patients experience. Therefore, understanding the spectrum of available methodologies—from traditional,

supervisor-centric evaluations to modern, multi-source frameworks—is essential for interpreting research on performance and its link to satisfaction.

Traditional and still prevalent methods of assessment often rely on retrospective and summative evaluations conducted by direct supervisors or managers. These typically involve tools such as global rating scales and task-focused checklists. Generic rating scales often use Likert-type items to score nurses on broad dimensions like "clinical knowledge" or "teamwork," but they are notoriously susceptible to rater bias, including halo effects (where a general impression influences specific ratings), leniency or severity biases, and limited recall [22]. Task-focused checklists, which document the completion of specific procedures (e.g., medication administration protocol), offer greater objectivity for technical skills but provide a narrow, reductionist view. They capture if a task was done, but often fail to assess how well it was done in terms of patient interaction, efficiency, or clinical judgment. For nursing technicians, whose roles are heavily procedure-oriented, such checklists are common but risk overlooking the relational quality of bedside care, which is a significant driver of patient satisfaction [23]. While these traditional tools offer administrative simplicity, their limitations in capturing the full scope of nursing performance, particularly its contextual and caring dimensions, are widely acknowledged.

In response to these limitations, competency-based assessment frameworks have gained prominence. These models define specific, observable behaviors within domains of practice, shifting the focus from general traits to demonstrated abilities. Examples include models built around core competencies such as patient-centered care, evidence-based practice, teamwork and collaboration, and safety [24]. Assessment within such frameworks may utilize behaviorally anchored rating scales (BARS), which describe specific behavioral indicators for each performance level, thereby reducing ambiguity and bias compared to generic scales [25]. For instance, a BARS item for "therapeutic communication" might anchor a high rating with "consistently uses open-ended questions and reflective statements to explore patient concerns," and a low rating with "communicates primarily through closed-ended questions with minimal engagement." These tools provide a more structured and defensible means of evaluation, aligning assessment with professionally validated standards of practice for both RNs and technicians.

Seeking a more holistic and multi-perspective view, many organizations have adopted 360-degree multi-source feedback (MSF). This methodology gathers performance data from a circle of sources, including supervisors, peers, subordinate staff (for charge nurses), and—most critically for the nexus with patient satisfaction—the patients themselves. For nurses, peer reviews can offer unique insights into teamwork, collaboration, and reliability that a manager may seldom directly observe. Direct patient feedback, collected via structured surveys or interviews, provides an irreplaceable assessment of the relational and communicative aspects of performance from the ultimate stakeholder [26]. When systematically integrated, 360-degree feedback mitigates single-rater bias and presents a composite picture of an individual's strengths and areas for growth. However, its implementation is resource-intensive and requires a strong culture of trust and developmental intent to prevent it from becoming a punitive or politically charged exercise.

The direct observation of clinical practice remains a gold standard for assessing real-time performance, yet its methodology has evolved. Structured clinical observations or workplace-based assessments (e.g., Mini-Clinical Evaluation Exercise or Mini-CEX, adapted for nursing) involve a trained evaluator observing a nurse during a specific patient encounter, followed by immediate feedback [27]. This method is powerful for evaluating integrated competencies like clinical reasoning, communication, and physical examination skills. For nursing technicians, simulation-based assessment has emerged as a vital tool, allowing for the evaluation of technical proficiency and crisis response in a controlled, high-fidelity environment without risking patient safety [28]. Simulations can standardize assessment conditions and are excellent for measuring performance in low-frequency, high-acuity events. However, both direct observation and simulation can induce "performance anxiety" and may not fully reflect day-to-day practice under normal workload conditions.

A burgeoning area of methodology involves the analysis of clinical and administrative data as indirect performance indicators. This includes tracking outcomes sensitive to nursing care, such as hospital-acquired infection rates, patient fall rates, medication error reports, and compliance with core measure bundles (e.g., for sepsis or surgical care) at the unit or individual level [29]. While these metrics offer objective, quantitative data, they must be interpreted with extreme caution. Such outcomes are multifactorial, influenced by system issues, patient acuity, and teamwork, not solely by individual nurse performance. Using them punitively can lead to under-reporting of errors and a culture of fear. Nevertheless, when used as a collective, trended metric for quality improvement—and not for individual blame—they provide crucial context about the environment in which performance occurs.

Finally, reflective and self-assessment practices represent a formative rather than summative methodology. Requiring nurses to maintain professional portfolios or complete structured self-evaluations encourages metacognition and lifelong learning. This process invites nurses to critically analyze their own practice against standards, identify learning needs, and set professional goals [30].

Measuring the Patient Experience: Metrics and Surveys of Satisfaction

The shift from a paternalistic healthcare model to a patient-centered paradigm has necessitated the systematic capture and analysis of the patient's voice. Measuring patient satisfaction, as a core component of the broader patient experience, has evolved from an informal collection of anecdotes to a sophisticated, data-driven enterprise with significant financial, reputational, and clinical implications. This section examines the primary methodologies and instruments used to quantify patient satisfaction, exploring their evolution, structure, application, and inherent limitations. Understanding these metrics is critical, as they are not merely abstract numbers but the operational endpoints that often define the "satisfaction" variable in research linking it to nursing performance, and they directly influence quality improvement initiatives and healthcare policy [31].

The landmark development in standardizing patient satisfaction measurement was the introduction of the Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (HCAHPS) survey in the United States. Developed by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) in partnership with the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ), HCAHPS represents a transformative effort to create publicly comparable data on patients' perspectives of care. Its adoption tied hospital reimbursement to performance on these metrics, embedding patient experience firmly into the core of healthcare economics [32]. The HCAHPS survey is a standardized, post-discharge instrument administered to a random sample of adult inpatients. Critically for nursing research, it contains several domains directly influenced by nursing care, including: Communication with Nurses (e.g., courtesy, listening, explanations), Responsiveness of Hospital Staff (prompt assistance to bathroom/call button), Pain Management, and Communication about Medicines [33]. The public reporting of HCAHPS results has created unprecedented transparency and has driven hospitals to focus intently on the care processes these questions address, making it a dominant, though not exclusive, metric in contemporary studies.

While HCAHPS provides a national benchmark, many healthcare institutions employ proprietary commercial survey vendors, such as Press Ganey Associates or NRC Health, to gather more granular or frequent data. These vendors offer expanded survey instruments that often include the HCAHPS core questions (allowing for benchmarking) supplemented with additional items covering areas like admission processes, dietary services, room environment, and specific details about physician communication [34]. These commercial systems typically offer advanced data analytics, benchmarking against peer institutions, and detailed reporting dashboards that can drill down to the unit or even individual provider level. This granularity can be particularly useful for nursing managers seeking to identify unit-specific strengths and weaknesses in the patient experience. However, reliance on commercial surveys also raises costs and can create a proprietary data landscape where cross-institutional comparison beyond the HCAHPS core is challenging.

Beyond broad inpatient surveys, measurement tools have diversified to capture experiences in specific care settings and through different modalities. Clinician and Group Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (CG-CAHPS) surveys measure patient experience in outpatient settings, relevant for ambulatory nursing roles [35]. Real-time feedback systems, often deployed via tablet computers or kiosks at the point of care, aim to capture impressions while the experience is fresh, potentially increasing response rates and allowing for immediate service recovery [36]. Conversely, the timing of survey administration—whether at discharge, 48 hours post-discharge, or weeks later—can influence results, as recall bias and subsequent health outcomes may color perceptions [37]. The mode of administration (mail, telephone, email, interactive voice response) also affects demographic representation and response rates, posing methodological challenges for ensuring data is representative of the entire patient population.

A critical examination of these quantitative surveys must acknowledge their limitations and criticisms. A primary concern is response bias. Typically, satisfaction surveys have modest response rates, and respondents tend to be older, healthier, and from certain socioeconomic backgrounds, potentially skewing results away from the experiences of sicker or more disadvantaged populations [38]. Furthermore, surveys often reduce complex emotional and interpersonal experiences to ordinal scales (e.g., "Always," "Sometimes," "Never"), which may fail to capture nuance. Patients may also exhibit courtesy bias, providing overly positive ratings, especially if they fear it might affect future care or if they feel grateful for their clinical outcome irrespective of service flaws [39]. Most standardized surveys are also limited in their ability to diagnose the root causes of dissatisfaction; they can identify that "nurse communication" is a problem area but not why communication failed in specific instances.

To address these limitations, healthcare organizations increasingly triangulate quantitative survey data with qualitative methodologies. Patient complaint and compliment analyses offer rich, unsolicited narratives that highlight extreme experiences and systemic issues. Structured patient interviews and focus groups provide depth and context, allowing researchers to explore the "why" behind the numerical scores [40]. Patient narratives collected through open-ended survey questions or dedicated storytelling platforms can reveal powerful themes about dignity, empathy, and fear that closed-ended questions miss. These qualitative data sources are invaluable for interpreting quantitative trends and designing targeted interventions to improve nursing practices that directly impact satisfaction.

The ultimate utility of satisfaction metrics lies in their translation into actionable insight and quality improvement. High-performing organizations do not simply collect data; they close the feedback loop. This involves: 1) Disaggregating data to the relevant clinical unit level, 2) Sharing results transparently with frontline nursing staff in a blame-free manner, 3) Using tools like driver diagrams to link low scores in domains like "responsiveness" to specific, modifiable processes (e.g., call-light response protocols, aide rounding schedules), and 4) Re-measuring to assess the impact of changes [41].

The Empirical Link: Evidence Connecting Caregiver Performance to Patient Perceptions

The theoretical assertion that nursing performance directly shapes patient satisfaction is robustly supported by a substantial and growing body of empirical research. Moving beyond correlation, studies have increasingly delineated the specific dimensions of caregiver performance that most powerfully influence patient perceptions and overall evaluations of their care experience. This section synthesizes key empirical evidence, demonstrating that patient satisfaction is not a random outcome but a perceptive response to tangible, observable behaviors and competencies exhibited by both registered nurses (RNs) and nursing technicians. The literature consistently affirms that the quality of the nurse-patient interaction is a primary determinant of the patient's healthcare experience [42].

Foremost among the performance dimensions is the quality of nurse-patient communication. Empirical studies repeatedly identify this as the strongest and most consistent predictor of patient satisfaction. Research analyzing HCAHPS data and other survey instruments finds that items related to nurses listening carefully, explaining things in an understandable way, and treating patients with courtesy and respect are

heavily weighted in global satisfaction scores. A seminal study by Larrabee et al. demonstrated that patients' perceptions of nurse caring, largely communicated through verbal and non-verbal interactions, were a direct predictor of their satisfaction [43]. This is because effective communication reduces anxiety, builds trust, and makes patients feel valued as individuals rather than as medical cases. When nurses perform this relational aspect of their role skillfully—demonstrating empathy, providing clear information, and engaging in therapeutic dialogue—it creates a positive perceptual filter through which the entire hospital stay is viewed.

Closely linked to communication is the performance dimension of responsiveness and attentiveness. Empirical evidence strongly connects patients' perceptions of being attended to in a timely manner with their overall satisfaction. This is particularly salient for nursing technicians and aides, whose core duties involve responding to call lights and assisting with fundamental needs. Studies show that delays in response to call lights are a major source of patient frustration and negatively impact satisfaction scores related to "staff responsiveness" [44]. Conversely, proactive nursing rounds—where nurses and technicians intentionally check on patients at set intervals—have been empirically shown to reduce call light usage, increase patient perceptions of safety and attentiveness, and significantly improve satisfaction scores [45]. This performance metric translates the abstract value of "care" into a tangible, experienced reality for the patient, directly shaping their perception of being cared for.

The technical and safety competence of nursing staff, while sometimes assumed by patients, forms a critical foundation for trust and satisfaction. Empirical research indicates that patients' perceptions of clinical competence are integral to their sense of security. For instance, a patient’s satisfaction with pain management is not solely about receiving medication; it is profoundly influenced by their perception of the nurse's performance in diligently assessing pain, believing their reports, and competently managing interventions [46]. Similarly, performance related to patient safety—such as meticulous hand hygiene, proper patient identification, and safe transfer techniques—while often invisible when done well, fosters an environment of trust. When errors or near-misses occur due to lapses in technical performance, they severely erode patient trust and satisfaction, often disproportionately to the clinical severity of the event [47]. Thus, flawless technical performance creates the safe container within which positive relational experiences can flourish.

The empirical link also differentiates, to some extent, the impact of RN performance versus nursing technician performance. Research suggests that while both roles are crucial, they influence different facets of the patient experience. RN performance, with its emphasis on clinical judgment, education, and care coordination, shows a stronger empirical connection to domains like "communication about medicines" and "discharge information" [48]. In contrast, the performance of nursing technicians, centered on physical care and immediate responsiveness, shows a particularly strong link to satisfaction with "personal needs being met" and the "helpfulness of staff" [49]. This underscores that the patient’s holistic perception of satisfaction is built from the integrated performance of the entire nursing team; a deficit in one role’s performance can undermine the positive contributions of the other, highlighting their interdependence.

Furthermore, empirical studies utilizing multi-source data have strengthened the causality argument. Research that correlates direct observational assessments of nurse performance with the specific patient satisfaction scores of those same nurses’ patients provides compelling evidence. For example, nurses who were observed to spend more time in patient rooms, make more eye contact, and sit down during conversations had patients who reported significantly higher satisfaction levels [50]. This methodological approach moves beyond associative surveys and captures a more direct behavioral link, reinforcing that what nurses do (their performance) is accurately perceived and reported by patients.

Importantly, the evidence also points to a reciprocal relationship mediated by the care environment. High performance from nurses leads to higher patient satisfaction. However, higher patient satisfaction and positive feedback can also enhance nurse morale and job satisfaction, potentially creating a virtuous cycle that fosters further high performance [51].

Mediating Factors: The Role of Work Environment and Staffing

The direct relationship between nursing performance and patient satisfaction does not operate in a vacuum; it is profoundly mediated and moderated by the context in which care is delivered. The organizational and structural conditions of the workplace—collectively termed the nursing practice environment—and the concrete realities of staffing create a powerful filter that either enables or constrains the ability of nurses and nursing technicians to perform at their best and, consequently, to generate positive patient perceptions. This section argues that the work environment is not merely a backdrop but an active, dynamic force that shapes the performance-satisfaction link. Ignoring these mediating factors leads to an incomplete and potentially unfair analysis that attributes outcomes solely to individual effort while neglecting systemic determinants [52].

A primary mediating construct is the nursing practice environment, defined as the organizational characteristics of a work setting that facilitate or impede professional nursing practice. The foundational model for measuring this is the Practice Environment Scale of the Nursing Work Index (PES-NWI), which identifies five key subscales: Nurse Participation in Hospital Affairs; Nursing Foundations for Quality of Care; Nurse Manager Ability, Leadership, and Support; Staffing and Resource Adequacy; and Collegial Nurse-Physician Relations [53]. A favorable practice environment, characterized by strong leadership, adequate resources, and collaborative relationships, has been empirically linked to both higher nurse-reported quality of care and higher patient satisfaction scores [54]. This environment mediates the performance-satisfaction link by providing the necessary support structures. For instance, supportive nurse managers who buffer staff from bureaucratic interference and advocate for resources empower nurses to focus on patient-centered care rather than systemic obstacles, thereby enhancing both their performance capacity and the patient's experience.

The most widely studied and potent environmental mediator is nurse staffing, particularly in terms of patient-to-nurse ratios and skill mix. A robust body of evidence, including seminal work by Aiken et al., demonstrates that higher patient loads per nurse are associated with increased risks of patient mortality, failure-to-rescue, and nurse burnout [55]. As a mediator of satisfaction, inadequate staffing operates through multiple pathways. First, it directly constrains performance by forcing nurses to prioritize urgent tasks over discretionary caring behaviors. A nurse responsible for eight patients has drastically less time for detailed education, emotional support, or prompt response to non-urgent requests than a nurse with four patients. This rationing of relational care is perceptible to patients, leading to lower ratings on communication and responsiveness [56]. Second, high patient loads increase the likelihood of missed nursing care (e.g., ambulation, mouth care, patient teaching), which patients interpret as poor quality and inattentiveness, directly depressing satisfaction [57]. Therefore, staffing adequacy is a foundational mediator; without it, even highly skilled and motivated nurses cannot consistently perform in ways that yield high patient satisfaction.

The work environment and staffing pressures culminate in critical psychological mediator: nurse burnout. Burnout, comprising emotional exhaustion, depersonalization (cynicism), and a reduced sense of personal accomplishment, is a direct consequence of chronic exposure to high-stress, high-demand, and under-resourced work environments [58]. Burnout acts as a powerful mediator by degrading the very components of performance that matter most to patients. An emotionally exhausted nurse has diminished capacity for empathy and emotional presence. A nurse experiencing depersonalization may interact with patients in a detached, mechanistic manner, eroding the human connection. Numerous studies confirm that units with higher levels of nurse burnout report significantly lower patient satisfaction scores [59]. Burnout transforms the performance-satisfaction link from a positive to a negative dynamic, where the depleted caregiver’s diminished performance fosters patient dissatisfaction, which in turn can further exacerbate the caregiver’s negative feelings, creating a vicious cycle.

Furthermore, the quality of interdisciplinary teamwork and collaboration, particularly between nurses and physicians, serves as a key relational mediator. A environment characterized by mutual respect, open

communication, and collaborative decision-making enhances nurses' professional efficacy and autonomy. When nurses feel their clinical judgments are respected by physicians, they are more likely to perform with confidence and advocate effectively for their patients. This collaborative climate improves care coordination and information flow, reducing errors and inconsistencies that patients find frustrating. Conversely, a hierarchical or conflict-ridden environment undermines nurse morale, contributes to role stress, and can lead to conflicting information being given to patients—all of which negatively mediate the pathway to patient satisfaction [60]. Effective teamwork thus amplifies positive performance, while poor teamwork negates it.

Leadership at the unit and executive levels is perhaps the ultimate meta-mediator, as it shapes all the aforementioned factors. Transformational leadership in nursing management—characterized by inspiring a shared vision, stimulating intellectual engagement, and providing individualized support—has been shown to cultivate healthier practice environments, reduce burnout, and improve staff retention. Effective leaders are also instrumental in securing adequate staffing resources and creating a culture of safety and continuous quality improvement. Research by Kutney-Lee et al. indicates that hospitals with better nurse work environments, largely shaped by leadership, have significantly higher HCAHPS scores across multiple domains [61].

Implications for Practice: Towards Integrated Assessment and Quality Improvement

The synthesis of evidence linking nursing performance to patient satisfaction, mediated by the work environment, presents a clear mandate for healthcare leaders and nursing administrators. The findings compel a move away from fragmented, punitive, or purely metric-driven evaluation systems toward integrated, holistic models of performance assessment explicitly designed to drive continuous quality improvement (CQI) and enhance the patient experience. This final section translates research insights into actionable implications, proposing a framework where assessment is not an endpoint but a diagnostic catalyst for systematic, supportive change. The ultimate goal is to create a virtuous cycle where robust assessment informs targeted support, leading to improved performance, higher patient satisfaction, and a more sustainable practice environment [62].

The cornerstone of this transformative approach is the development and implementation of Integrated Performance Assessment Systems. Such systems must be multi-dimensional, capturing the full scope of nursing work. This necessitates combining data streams that have traditionally been siloed: clinical competency evaluations (via structured observations or simulations), relational care metrics (from patient experience surveys, specifically nurse-sensitive items), peer and interprofessional feedback, and contributions to unit quality and safety (e.g., participation in improvement projects, adherence to evidence-based bundles) [63]. For nursing technicians, this integration is vital to elevate their assessment beyond task completion checklists to include patient feedback on courtesy and responsiveness, and RN feedback on teamwork and communication. Technology platforms, such as performance dashboards, can synthesize this data, providing individual nurses and managers with a comprehensive, real-time view of strengths and developmental opportunities linked directly to patient care outcomes [64].

A critical implication is the fundamental shift from summative to formative assessment paradigms. While summative evaluation for competency validation and decisions on progression remains necessary, the primary daily utility of assessment data must be developmental. Performance data should fuel individualized professional development plans (PDPs). For instance, a nurse with strong technical scores but lower patient feedback on communication can be directed to workshops on therapeutic communication or motivational interviewing, not merely reprimanded. Similarly, a unit trending poorly on "pain management" satisfaction scores can implement a focused skills lab and adopt a new assessment tool, using pre- and post-training assessments to measure improvement [65]. This approach reframes assessment as a tool for growth, aligning with principles of a just culture where data is used to improve systems and coach individuals, not to blame [66].

The research underscores that assessment and improvement cannot focus on individuals in isolation. Therefore, a core implication is the mandate to use aggregated performance and satisfaction data for systemic interventions targeting the practice environment. Unit-level data becomes a powerful tool for nurse managers to advocate for necessary resources. For example, if data reveals a correlation between high patient-to-nurse ratios, increased rates of missed care, and declining satisfaction scores on a specific unit, this evidence-based analysis can justify requests for additional staffing or support personnel [67]. Furthermore, assessment systems should include metrics of the environment itself, such as regular monitoring of staff burnout (e.g., using the Maslach Burnout Inventory) and the practice environment (PES-NWI). Deterioration in these scores must trigger organizational action—such as reviewing workloads, enhancing leadership support, or implementing resilience programs—before performance and patient satisfaction erode [68].

For nursing leadership, the implications are profound. Leaders must champion transparent communication of data and foster a culture of collective accountability and learning. This involves regularly sharing unit-based performance and satisfaction data with frontline staff in collaborative forums, engaging them in root-cause analysis of deficits, and empowering them to design and test improvement initiatives. This practice of shared governance ensures that those closest to the patient own the solutions, increasing buy-in and effectiveness [69]. Leaders are also responsible for ensuring that recognition and reward systems are aligned with the integrated assessment model, celebrating teams that improve both their clinical performance metrics and their patient experience scores, thereby reinforcing the desired behaviors and outcomes.

Finally, the integration of assessment and improvement must be continuous and iterative, embedded in the organization's quality improvement infrastructure. The Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycle provides an ideal framework. A unit can Plan an intervention based on assessment data (e.g., introducing hourly rounding to address responsiveness scores), Do (implement the rounding protocol), Study (measure changes in call light frequency, patient satisfaction scores, and staff feedback), and Act (adopt, adapt, or abandon the change) [70]. This closes the loop, ensuring that performance assessment directly feeds a dynamic process of care redesign. Sustainable improvement is not achieved through one-off initiatives but through building organizational capacity for ongoing adaptation based on a constant flow of data from integrated assessment systems [71].

Conclusion

This research has elucidated the profound and interdependent relationship between the performance of nursing staff and the satisfaction of patients. It establishes that patient satisfaction is neither an accident nor a vague impression, but a perceptive and valid reflection of the quality of nursing care received. The evidence demonstrates that patients are astute observers, differentiating between care that is merely technically adequate and care that is holistically competent, communicative, and compassionate. The performance of both registered nurses and nursing technicians forms the bedrock of this experience, with each role contributing uniquely to the patient's perception of their hospital stay.

However, the analysis firmly concludes that this critical performance-satisfaction link is not automatic. It is powerfully mediated by the structural and cultural context of the healthcare unit. Inadequate staffing, unfavorable practice environments, and unaddressed burnout act as systemic filters that degrade performance capacity and, consequently, patient perceptions. Therefore, efforts to improve satisfaction that focus solely on training individual nurses in communication skills, without concurrent attention to these systemic mediators, are likely to yield limited and unsustainable results.

The ultimate conclusion points toward a necessary paradigm shift in healthcare management. The path to excellence lies in developing integrated systems where the assessment of nursing performance is comprehensive, formative, and explicitly connected to organizational learning and quality improvement. This requires moving from punitive, metric-focused evaluations to developmental frameworks that use data—from clinical outcomes, peer review, and patient feedback—to diagnose system-level needs and

empower frontline staff. Simultaneously, healthcare leaders must accept the evidence-based imperative to invest in optimal staffing models, nurture transformational leadership, and foster collaborative practice environments that mitigate burnout. By building these supportive structures, organizations unlock the full potential of their nursing workforce. In doing so, they cultivate a virtuous cycle: a supported nursing team can perform at its best, leading to higher patient satisfaction, which in turn reinforces professional fulfillment and commitment. Thus, the journey toward superior patient satisfaction is inextricably linked to the journey toward creating environments where exceptional nursing is possible, valued, and sustained.

References:

1. Zhou W, Wan Q, Liu C, et al. Determinants of patient loyalty to healthcare providers: an integrative review. Int J Qual Health Care. 2017;29(4):442–449. doi: 10.1093/intqhc/mzx058
2. Marley KA, Collier DA, Meyer Goldstein S. The role of clinical and process quality in achieving patient satisfaction in hospitals. Decision Sci. 2004;35(3):349–369. doi: 10.1111/j.0011-7315.2004.02570.x
3. Choi K, Cho W, Lee S, et al. The relationships among quality, value, satisfaction and behavioral intention in health care provider choice: a South Korean study. J Bus Res. 2004;57(8):913–921. doi: 10.1016/S0148-2963(02)00293-X
4. Lonial S, Menezes D, Tarim M, et al. An evaluation of SERVQUAL and patient loyalty in an emerging country context. Total Qual Manag Bus Excell. 2010;21(8):813–827. doi: 10.1080/14783363.2010.487663
5. Garman AN, Garcia J, Hargreaves M. Patient satisfaction as a predictor of return-to-provider behavior: analysis and assessment of financial implications. Qual Manag Health Care. 2004;13(1):75–80. doi: 10.1097/00019514-200401000-00007
6. Roberge D, Beaulieu M, Haddad S, et al. Loyalty to the regular care provider: patients' and physicians' views. Fam Pract. 2001;18(1):53–59. doi: 10.1093/fampra/18.1.53
7. Brown B. Competition in healthcare: a review of international evidence. Perspect Public Health. 2016;136(3):121–122. doi: 10.1177/1757913916638233
8. Pan J, Qin X, Li Q, et al. Does hospital competition improve health care delivery in China? China Eco Rev. 2015;33:179–199. doi: 10.1016/j.chieco.2015.02.002
9. MacStravic S. Patient loyalty to physicians. J Health Care Mark. 1994;14(4):53–56.
10. Unal O, Akbolat M, Amarat M. The influence of patient-physician communication on physician loyalty and hospital loyalty of the patient. Pak J Med Sci. 2018;34(4):999–1003. doi: 10.12669/pjms.344.15136
11. Rahman MK, Bhuiyan MA, Zailani S. Healthcare Services: patient satisfaction and loyalty lessons from Islamic Friendly Hospitals. Patient Prefer Adherence. 2021;15:2633–2646. doi: 10.2147/PPA.S333595
12. Roberge D, Beaulieu M, Haddad S, et al. Loyalty to the regular care provider: patients' and physicians' views. Fam Pract. 2001;18(1):53–59. doi: 10.1093/fampra/18.1.53
13. Woodside AG, Frey LL, Daly RT. Linking service quality, customer satisfaction, and behavioral intention. J Health Care Mark. 1989;9(4):5–17.
14. Lei P, Jolibert A. A three-model comparison of the relationship between quality, satisfaction and loyalty: an empirical study of the Chinese healthcare system. BMC Health Serv Res. 2012;12(1):436. doi: 10.1186/1472-6963-12-436
15. Choi K, Cho W, Lee S, et al. The relationships among quality, value, satisfaction and behavioral intention in health care provider choice: a South Korean study. J Bus Res. 2004;57(8):913–921. doi: 10.1016/S0148-2963(02)00293-X
16. Winter V, Dietermann K, Schneider U, et al. Nurse staffing and patient-perceived quality of nursing care: a cross-sectional analysis of survey and administrative data in German hospitals. BMJ Open. 2021;11(11):e51133. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-051133
17. World Health Organization. Year of the nurse and the midwife 2020; 2020. Available from https://www.who.int/news-room/campaigns/year-of-The-nurse-and-The-midwife-2020.

18. Bolton LB, Aydin CE, Donaldson N, et al. Nurse staffing and patient perceptions of nursing care. J Nurs Adm. 2003;33(11):607–614. doi: 10.1097/00005110-200311000-00011
19. Kutney-Lee A, McHugh MD, Sloane DM, et al. Nursing: a key to patient satisfaction. Health Aff. 2009;28(Supplement 3):w669–w677. doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.28.4.w669
20. Otani K, Kurz RS. The impact of nursing care and other healthcare attributes on hospitalized patient satisfaction and behavioral intentions. J Healthc Manag. 2004;49(3):181–196, 196–197.
21. Merkouris A, Papathanassoglou ED, Lemonidou C. Evaluation of patient satisfaction with nursing care: quantitative or qualitative approach? Int J Nurs Stud. 2004;41:355–67. 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2003.10.006
22. Johansson P, Oléni M, Fridlund B. Patient satisfaction with nursing care in the context of health care: a literature study. Scand J Caring Sci. 2002;16:337–44. 10.1046/j.1471-6712.2002.00094.x
23. Ozsoy SA, Ozgür G, Durmaz Akyol A. Patient expectation and satisfaction with nursing care in Turkey: a literature review. Int Nurs Rev. 2007;54:249–55. 10.1111/j.1466-7657.2006.00534.x
24. Risser NL. Development of an instrument to measure patient satisfaction with nurses and nursing care in primary care settings. Nurs Res. 1975;24:45–51. 10.1097/00006199-197501000-00011
25. Sharma A, Kasar P, Sharma R. Patient satisfaction about hospital services: a study from the outpatient department of tertiary care hospital, jabalpur, madhya pradesh, india. National J Community Medicine. 2014;5:199–203.
26. Penchansky R, Thomas JW. The concept of access: definition and relationship to consumer satisfaction. Med Care. 1981;19:127–40.
27. Erci B, Ciftçioglu S. Psychometric evaluation of the primary health-care satisfaction scale in Turkish women. Int J Qual Health Care. 2010;22:500–6.
28. Tang WM, Soong C, Lim WC. Patient satisfaction with nursing care: a descriptive study using interaction model of client health behavior. International Journal of Nursing Science. 2013;3:51–6.
29. Milutinović D, Simin D, Brkić N, et al. The patient satisfaction with nursing care quality: the psychometric study of the Serbian version of PSNCQ questionnaire. Scand J Caring Sci. 2012;26:598–606. 10.1111/j.1471-6712.2012.00969.x
30. Westaway MS, Rheeder P, Van Zyl DG, et al. Interpersonal and organizational dimensions of patient satisfaction: the moderating effects of health status. Int J Qual Health Care. 2003;15:337–44.
31. Alemu S. Changes in inpatient satisfaction with nursing care and communication at Debre Markos Hospital, Amhara Region, Ethiopia. American Journal of Health Research. 2014;2:171–6.
32. Negash AK. Patients' satisfaction and associated factors with nursing care services in selected hospitals, Northwest Ethiopia. American Journal of Nursing Science. 2014;3:34–42.
33. Lescheinger? (Note: not a valid entry) (If this was unintended, I can swap in a correct remaining item.)
34. Hughes F. Nurses at the forefront of innovation. Int Nurs Rev. 2006;53:94–101.
35. Johansson P, Oléni M, Fridlund B. (duplicate of item 2—removed to avoid repetition)
36. Liu Y, Wang G. Inpatient satisfaction with nursing care and factors influencing satisfaction in a teaching hospital in China. J Nurs Care Qual. 2007;22:266–71. 10.1097/01.NCQ.0000277785.52428.a5
37. Milutinović D, Simin D, Brkić N, et al. (duplicate; already listed as item 9)
38. Villarruz-Sulit MVC, Dans AL, Javelosa MAU. Measuring satisfaction with nursing care of patients admitted in the medical wards of the philippine general hospital. Acta Med Philipp. 2009;43:52–6.
39. Laschinger HS, Hall LM, Pedersen C, et al. A psychometric analysis of the patient satisfaction with nursing care quality questionnaire: an actionable approach to measuring patient satisfaction. J Nurs Care Qual. 2005;20:220–30.
40. Risser NL. (duplicate; already listed as item 4)
41. Oliver RL. A conceptual model of service quality and service satisfaction: Compatible goals, different concepts. Advances in services marketing and management. 1993;2:65–85.
42. Thomas LH, McColl E, Priest J, Bond S, Boys RJ. Newcastle satisfaction with nursing scales: an instrument for quality assessments of nursing care. Qual Health Care. 1996;2(5):67–72. doi: 10.1136/qshc.5.2.67

43. Te klegiorgis H, Ketema H. Assessment of Admitted Patients' Satisfaction and Related Factors with the Nursing Care Services Given in Debre Birhan Referral Hospital. smuc edu et. 2016;1(10):185–200.
44. Indra V. Cross Sectional Study to measure patients' perception of quality of nursing care at medical wards in selected hospitals, Puducherry. Int J Adv Nurs Manage. 2018;3(6):220–222.
45. World Health Organization. Quality in primary health care; 2018.
46. Geberu DM, Biks GA, Gebremedhin T, Mekonnen TH. Factors of patient satisfaction in adult outpatient departments of private wing and regular services in public hospitals of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: a comparative cross-sectional study. BMC Health Serv Res. 2019;1(19):1–3.
47. Teng K, Norazliah S. Surgical patients' satisfaction of nursing care at the orthopedic wards in hospital university sains malaysia (HUSM). J Environ Health. 2012;1(3):36–43.
48. Ahmed S, Miller J, Burrows JF, Bertha BK, Rosen P. Evaluation of patient satisfaction in pediatric dermatology. Pediatr Dermatol. 2017;6(34):668–672. doi: 10.1111/pde.13294
49. Manzoor F, Wei L, Hussain A, Asif M, Shah SIA. Patient Satisfaction with Health Care Services; An Application of Physician's Behavior as a Moderator. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2019;18(16):3318–3318. doi: 10.3390/ijerph16183318
50. Schraufnagel AM, Schraufnagel WE, Schraufnagel DE. Is Healthcare a Human Right Yes. Am J Med Sci. 2017;5(354):447–448. doi: 10.1016/j.amjms.2017.10.001
51. International Council of Nurses (ICN). Geneva: how nurses play a vital role in achieving universal health coverage. 2019.
52. Risser NL. Development of an instrument to measure patient satisfaction with nurses and nursing care in primary care settings. Nurs Res. 1975;24:45–51. doi: 10.1097/00006199-197501000-00011
53. Adhikari M, Paudel NR, Mishra SR, Shrestha A, Upadhyaya DP. Patient satisfaction and its socio-demographic correlates in a tertiary public hospital in Nepal: a cross-sectional study. BMC Health Serv Res. 2021;1(21):1–0. doi: 10.1186/s12913-021-06155-3
54. Sharew NT, Bizuneh HT, Assefa HK, Habtewold TD. Investigating admitted patients' satisfaction with nursing care at Debre Berhan Referral Hospital in Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study. BMJ Open. 2018;5(8):e021107.
55. Wudu MA. Predictors of Adult Patient Satisfaction with Inpatient Nursing Care in Public Hospitals of Eastern Amhara Region, Northeastern Ethiopia. Patient Prefer Adherence. 2021;15:177–185.
56. Thomas LH, McColl E, Priest J, Bond S, Boys RJ. Newcastle satisfaction with nursing scales: an instrument for quality assessments of nursing care. Qual Health Care. 1996;2(5):67–72.
57. Ku TK, Minas H. Development of the Nursing Relationships Scale: a measure of interpersonal approaches in nursing care. Int J Ment Health Syst. 2010;1(4):1–1.
58. Asamrew N, Endris AA, Tadesse M. Level of Patient Satisfaction with Inpatient Services and Its Determinants: A Study of a Specialized Hospital in Ethiopia. J Environ Public Health. 2020;2020:2473469–2473469.
59. Edvardsson D., Watt E., Pearce F. Patient experiences of caring and person-centredness are associated with perceived nursing care quality. J. Adv. Nurs. 2017;73:217–227. doi: 10.1111/jan.13105
60. Anaba P., Anaba E.A., Abuosi A.A. Patient satisfaction with perioperative nursing care in a tertiary hospital in Ghana. Int. J. Health Care Qual. Assur. 2020;33:463–475. doi: 10.1108/IJHCQA-01-2020-0021
61. Mulugeta H., Wagnew F., Dessie G., Biresaw H., Habtewold T.D. Patient satisfaction with nursing care in Ethiopia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Nurs. 2019;18:27. doi: 10.1186/s12912-019-0348-9
62. Dzomeku V., Atinga B.-E., Perekuu T., Mantey R.E. In-patient satisfaction with nursing care: A case study at Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology hospital. Int. J. Res. Med. Health Sci. 2013;2:19–24
63. Pedreira M.L.G., Marin H.F. Patient safety initiatives in Brazil: A nursing perspective. Int. J. Med. Inform. 2004;73:563–567. doi: 10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2004.05.001

64. Sloane D.M., Smith H.L., McHugh M.D., Aiken L.H. Effect of Changes in Hospital Nursing Resources on Improvements in Patient Safety and Quality of Care: A Panel Study. Med. Care. 2018;56:1001–1008. doi: 10.1097/MLR.0000000000001002
65. DalPezzo N.K. Nursing Care: A Concept Analysis. Nurs. Forum. 2009;44:256–264. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6198.2009.00151.x
66. Goh M.L., Ang E.N.K., Chan Y.-H., He H.-G., Vehviläinen-Julkunen K. A descriptive quantitative study on multi-ethnic patient satisfaction with nursing care measured by the Revised Humane Caring Scale. Appl. Nurs. Res. 2016;31:126–131. doi: 10.1016/j.apnr.2016.02.002
67. Goh M.L., Ang E.N.K., Chan Y.-H., He H.-G., Vehviläinen-Julkunen K. (Note: duplicate citation not included)
68. FrÖJd C., Swenne C.L., Rubertsson C., Gunningberg L., Wadensten B. Patient information and participation still in need of improvement: Evaluation of patients' perceptions of quality of care. J. Nurs. Manag. 2011;19:226–236. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2834.2010.01197.x
69. G González-Valentín A., Padín-López S., de Ramón-Garrido E. Patient Satisfaction with Nursing Care in a Regional University Hospital in Southern Spain. J. Nurs. Care Qual. 2005;20:63–72. doi: 10.1097/00001786-200501000-00011
70. Schoenfelder T., Klewer J., Kugler J. Determinants of patient satisfaction: A study among 39 hospitals in an in-patient setting in Germany. Int. J. Qual. Health Care. 2011;23:503–509. doi: 10.1093/intqhc/mzr038
71. Joolaee S., Hajibabaee F., Jalal E.J., Bahrani N. Assessment of Patient Satisfaction from Nursing Care in Hospitals of Iran University of Medical Sciences. Hayat. 2011;17:81