International Journal of Computational and Experimental Science and ENgineering (IJCESEN)

Vol. 10-No.4 (2024) pp. 3807-3815
http://www.ijcesen.com

ISSN: 2149-9144

Research Article

Impact of Nursing Surveillance on Preventing Failure-to-Rescue Events

Aeshah Arar Ahmed Alasmre[1]*, Noor Khalaf Musaad Alanazi[2], Alruwaili, Sultanah Tuhmur S[3], Alruwaili, Sultan Tuhmur S[4], Alsulami, Samira Saad S[5], Khloud Musallam Alanazi[6], Abdulrahman Melih M Alenezi[7], Albanaqi, Hamidah Faraj H[8], Alanoud Muflih Hasan Alruwaili[9], Alshammari Fahad Moutlak A[10], Majidah Hannaf Alruwaili[11]

[1]Nursing Technician – King Fahd General Hospital, Second Jeddah Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Jeddah, Makkah Region, Saudi Arabia
* **Corresponding Author Email:** aialasmri@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5200-9050

[2]Nursing Technician – Maternity and Children's Hospital, Northern Borders Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Arar, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: shmalyea@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5290-9950

[3]Nursing Technician – Dental Center, Turaif, Northern Borders Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Turaif, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: salrewily@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5280-8850

[4]Nursing – Turaif General Hospital, Northern Borders Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Turaif, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: sutalruwaili@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5270-7750

[5]Nursing Technician – Al-Harazat Primary Health Care Center, First Jeddah Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Jeddah, Makkah Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: rere-2222@hotmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5260-6650

[6]Nursing Technician – North Medical Tower Hospital, Northern Borders Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Arar, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: trkyalnzy281@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5250-0150

[7]Nursing Technician – Branch of the Ministry of Health, Ministry of Health, Arar, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: abmealenezi@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5240-1150

[8]Nursing Technician – Al Manar Primary Health Care Center, Northern Borders Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Al Uwayqilah, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: hfalsulobi@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5230-9050

[9]Nurse Specialist – Maternity and Children's Hospital, Al Jouf Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Sakaka, Al Jouf Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: alanoudma@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5210-0050

[10]Nurse Specialist – Rafha Health Sector, Northern Borders Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Rafha, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: falshammari2@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5231-0050

[11]Nursing Technician – Al Jawharah Primary Health Care Center, Northern Borders Health Cluster, Ministry of Health, Arar, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: majidaha@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5119-0050

Article Info:

DOI: 10.22399/ijcesen.4725
Received : 01 July 2024
Accepted : 30 July 2024

Keywords

Nursing Surveillance,
Failure-to-Rescue,
Clinical Deterioration,
Early Warning Systems,
Rapid Response Team

Abstract:

Nursing surveillance serves as the critical foundation for preventing failure-to-rescue (FTR) events in hospitalized patients, functioning as an active, continuous process of data acquisition, clinical interpretation, and timely communication. This essential nursing role bridges the gap between the onset of a complication and the initiation of life-saving interventions, relying on both objective assessment and subjective intuition to detect subtle early signs of clinical deterioration. However, its effectiveness is frequently compromised by systemic barriers such as high nurse-patient ratios, excessive documentation burdens, and hierarchical workplace cultures that inhibit communication. Enhancing surveillance through structured early warning systems, intelligent technology, interprofessional collaboration, and supportive leadership directly improves patient outcomes by reducing preventable mortality and morbidity, while also yielding significant organizational and economic benefits through shorter hospital stays and avoided costs of crisis care. Ultimately, strengthening nursing surveillance is not merely a clinical improvement strategy but a moral imperative to ensure that every patient receives the vigilant, proactive care necessary to intercept decline and facilitate successful rescue.

1. Introduction

The modern hospital environment is a complex, high-stakes arena where patient conditions can deteriorate with alarming rapidity. Within this dynamic landscape, the concept of "failure-to-rescue" (FTR) has emerged as a critical indicator of healthcare quality and patient safety. Clinically defined as the death of a patient following a potentially manageable complication, FTR moves beyond measuring the complication itself to scrutinize the system's ability to recognize and intervene effectively when a patient's status declines [1]. These events represent a profound breakdown in the chain of clinical response, often stemming not from a lack of available treatments, but from failures in detection, communication, and timely action. The consequences are severe, encompassing preventable patient mortality, increased morbidity, extended hospital stays, and significant financial burdens on healthcare systems. As such, identifying and fortifying the key mechanisms that prevent FTR has become a central imperative in patient safety research and clinical practice.

At the heart of an effective rescue system lies the vigilant, knowledgeable, and empowered bedside nurse. Nursing surveillance is the fundamental process that bridges the gap between a stable patient and one in crisis. It is far more than periodic vital sign checks; it is a sophisticated, continuous, and cognitive process encompassing the purposeful and ongoing acquisition, interpretation, and synthesis of patient data to inform clinical decisions and initiate timely interventions [2]. This process is the first and most crucial line of defense against FTR, serving as the early warning system for the entire healthcare team. Unlike intermittent physician assessments, nursing surveillance provides a constant, holistic appraisal of the patient's condition, integrating objective data with subtle subjective cues gleaned from sustained presence at the bedside. It is this unique perspective that positions the nurse as the sentinel, capable of detecting the earliest whispers of clinical deterioration long before they crescendo into catastrophic failure.

The evolution of nursing surveillance is deeply intertwined with the history of nursing itself, yet its formal recognition as a distinct and measurable competency has gained prominence alongside the patient safety movement. Pioneering work by Aiken and colleagues established clear links between nursing staffing levels, education, and patient outcomes, implicitly highlighting the role of surveillance capacity [3]. Subsequent research began to deconstruct the "black box" of nursing practice, identifying surveillance as a core mechanism through which nurses exert their protective influence. The seminal work of Clarke and Aiken further conceptualized the pathway from nursing characteristics to patient outcomes, positioning surveillance as a mediating variable that directly impacts the prevention of adverse events like FTR [4]. This theoretical grounding provided a framework for investigating how nurses' watchful oversight intercepts complications.

Understanding the multifaceted nature of nursing surveillance requires an appreciation of its composite skills. It is built upon a foundation of expert clinical knowledge, which allows the nurse to differentiate between normal variation and sinister change. It demands keen assessment skills, both in structured physical examination and in the nuanced observation of patient appearance, behavior, and reported symptoms. Critical thinking is its engine, enabling the nurse to synthesize disparate pieces of information—a slight increase in respiratory rate, a subtle change in mentation, a

reported sense of unease—into a coherent clinical picture that suggests impending crisis [5]. Furthermore, effective surveillance is inherently collaborative. It involves knowing not just *what* to look for, but *when* and *to whom* to report concerns, ensuring that worrisome findings trigger an appropriate and escalating response from the broader team, including rapid response systems.

The stakes of ineffective surveillance are tragically illustrated in the narrative of FTR events. Consider a postoperative patient developing subtle signs of intra-abdominal hemorrhage. The early indicators—perhaps a minimally elevated heart rate, a slight restlessness, or a borderline drop in blood pressure—are easy to dismiss in isolation. Without a nurse engaged in expert surveillance, these cues may be missed or their significance underestimated. As time passes, the compensatory mechanisms fail, leading to profound hypotension, altered consciousness, and eventual cardiac arrest—a classic FTR trajectory [6]. In such cases, the rescue therapy (surgical re-exploration, massive transfusion) was available, but the failure occurred in the antecedent steps: the failure to detect, the failure to recognize urgency, and the failure to activate rescue resources in time. This sequence underscores that surveillance is not a passive activity but an active, interpretive process that is the essential precursor to any rescue attempt.

2. The Concept and Mechanics of Nursing Surveillance

Nursing surveillance is a dynamic and intellectually demanding process that forms the bedrock of inpatient safety. To understand its power in preventing Failure-to-Rescue (FTR), one must first dissect its components and the cognitive framework that guides it. At its core, surveillance is a continuous cycle of information processing. It begins with **Data Acquisition**, which extends far beyond automated vital sign monitors. While technology provides essential numeric data, the skilled nurse simultaneously gathers a rich array of qualitative information. This includes a patient's pallor, diaphoresis, and facial expressions of pain or anxiety; the quality of their respiratory effort and cough; their level of engagement and coherence in conversation; and the nature of their complaints, often expressed in lay terms like "I just don't feel right" [7]. This holistic data collection is proactive and patterned, informed by the nurse's knowledge of the patient's diagnosis, surgery, and baseline condition, allowing for the recognition of subtle deviations.

The next critical phase is **Clinical Interpretation and Judgment**. Raw data is meaningless without analysis. Here, the nurse's knowledge base—of pathophysiology, pharmacology, and disease trajectories—fuses with experience to create meaning. The nurse does not merely note a heart rate of 110 beats per minute; she contextualizes it. Is this expected postoperative tachycardia or an early sign of hypovolemia? She combines this with other cues: Is the skin cool and clammy? Has urine output diminished? This process of pattern recognition, often described as "clinical gaze" or "knowing the patient," is where surveillance transitions from observation to understanding [8]. It involves heuristic thinking, where nurses use mental shortcuts developed through experience to quickly assess situations, and analytical thinking, for more complex, atypical presentations [9]. This judgment is the decisive link that determines whether a set of observations is classified as "normal variation" or a "potentially serious complication requiring action."

Finally, surveillance must culminate in **Action and Communication**. Recognition without response does not prevent FTR. The action may be a direct nursing intervention, such as administering oxygen, adjusting fluid infusion, or providing analgesia. More often, it involves the crucial step of communication—articulating concerns to other members of the healthcare team. This requires the nurse to synthesize findings into a compelling clinical story, using tools like ISBAR (Identification, Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation) to ensure clarity and urgency [10]. Effective communication also involves knowing the chain of command and activating safety nets like Rapid Response Teams (RTTs) when criteria are met or clinical concern is high, even in the absence of rigid vital sign thresholds [11]. This step transforms individual vigilance into a system-wide rescue effort, closing the surveillance loop and initiating the rescue pathway.

3. Barriers to Effective Nursing Surveillance in Clinical Practice

Despite its acknowledged importance, the execution of optimal nursing surveillance is frequently undermined by a confluence of systemic, environmental, and cultural barriers. Foremost among these is the pervasive issue of **High Nurse Workloads and Staffing Inadequacies**. Multiple studies have demonstrated an inverse relationship between nurse-patient ratios and adverse patient outcomes, including mortality and FTR events [12]. When a nurse is responsible for an excessive number of acutely ill patients, the time available for the in-depth, personalized assessment that characterizes expert surveillance is drastically

eroded. Care becomes task-oriented and reactive, focused on completing medication passes and mandatory documentation rather than on thoughtful patient evaluation. Cognitive load is overwhelmed, increasing the risk of missing subtle cues of deterioration [13]. This environment forces nurses into a mode of "superficial surveillance," where they may catch obvious crises but fail to detect the insidious, early-warning signs that are key to preventing FTR.

A second, intimately related barrier is the **Burden of Documentation and Technology Distraction**. The proliferation of electronic health records (EHRs), while intended to improve information access, has often had the unintended consequence of tethering nurses to computer workstations. Significant portions of a nurse's shift are consumed by charting requirements, which can be duplicative and lack clinical nuance [14]. This physical and cognitive displacement from the bedside directly impedes surveillance. Furthermore, the very technology designed to aid monitoring can create distraction. Alarm fatigue—the desensitization caused by frequent, often clinically irrelevant monitor alarms—is a well-documented phenomenon that leads to ignored or disabled alarms, negating the safety benefits of the technology [15]. The nurse's attention is divided between the patient and the devices, potentially causing a lapse in the direct observation and intuition that are irreplaceable components of surveillance.

Beyond workload and technology, the **Organizational and Cultural Climate** of a unit plays a decisive role. A hierarchical culture where nurses feel intimidated or dismissed when voicing concerns to physicians directly obstructs the communication phase of surveillance. If a nurse's assessment is repeatedly minimized or met with defensiveness, she may become reluctant to "bother" the team, leading to dangerous delays [16]. Conversely, a culture of psychological safety, where all team members are encouraged to speak up, is essential for timely rescue. Additionally, inadequate infrastructure, such as poor unit layout that limits patient visibility, lack of mobile monitoring devices, or insufficient support staff, creates physical barriers to effective surveillance. Finally, variations in **Nursing Education and Experience** contribute to a capability gap. Novice nurses, while proficient in task completion, may lack the pattern recognition and clinical judgment of experienced nurses. Without adequate mentoring and ongoing education in assessment and early warning signs, their surveillance, though diligent, may be less effective [17].

4. Strategies and Models to Enhance Nursing Surveillance Capacity

Addressing the barriers to surveillance requires a multifaceted approach that combines human resource management, technological innovation, and cultural transformation. A foundational strategy is the implementation of **Structured Assessment Protocols and Early Warning Systems (EWS)**. Tools like the Modified Early Warning Score (MEWS) or the National Early Warning Score (NEWS) provide a standardized, objective method for quantifying a patient's risk of deterioration based on vital signs and clinical observations [18]. By assigning scores to parameters like heart rate, blood pressure, respiratory rate, and level of consciousness, these systems remove subjective ambiguity and provide clear escalation triggers. They serve as a cognitive aid, particularly for less experienced nurses, ensuring that key physiological data is consistently collected and interpreted. When integrated into routine nursing rounds and the EHR to generate automated alerts, EWS can significantly enhance the detection phase of surveillance and prompt earlier intervention [19].

Technology, when thoughtfully designed and implemented, can be a powerful ally. **Intelligent Monitoring and Clinical Decision Support** tools represent the next evolution. Advanced monitoring systems that use predictive analytics can identify subtle trends in vital signs that may precede overt clinical decline, providing an earlier alert than static threshold alarms [20]. Similarly, EHR-embedded clinical decision support can prompt nurses with assessment reminders based on a patient's diagnosis or medication profile, guiding a more focused surveillance effort. Furthermore, **workflow redesign** aimed at reducing documentation burden and facilitating bedside care is crucial. This includes streamlining charting requirements, utilizing bedside mobile devices for real-time documentation, and employing unlicensed assistive personnel for non-clinical tasks to protect the nurse's time for direct patient care and surveillance activities [21].

Perhaps the most profound enhancements come from **strengthening interprofessional collaboration and fostering a culture of safety**. Models like **interprofessional rounds**, where nurses, physicians, and other team members collaboratively review each patient at the bedside, ensure that the nurse's surveillance findings are directly heard and integrated into the daily plan of care [22]. Simulation-based training for teams on communication and crisis management builds shared mental models and reinforces the nurse's role as a key detector of decline. Furthermore,

formal **nursing mentorship programs** that pair novice nurses with expert clinical preceptors accelerate the development of surveillance competencies through guided reflection and shared clinical experiences [23]. Empowering nurses through **clinical ladder programs** and shared governance structures that give them a voice in policy decisions also reinforces their professional accountability for surveillance and fosters an environment where vigilant practice is valued and supported.

5. The Measurable Outcomes of Enhanced Nursing Surveillance

The ultimate test of any clinical intervention is its impact on tangible outcomes. A robust body of evidence demonstrates that enhancing nursing surveillance yields significant benefits across patient, organizational, and economic domains. For **Patient Outcomes**, the effect is most direct and vital. Hospitals with better nurse staffing ratios, a key enabler of surveillance, consistently show lower rates of inpatient mortality and FTR, particularly following surgical complications [24]. The implementation of effective Rapid Response Teams, which are fundamentally activated by nursing surveillance, is associated with reductions in cardiopulmonary arrests outside the ICU and in-hospital mortality [25]. Beyond mortality, enhanced surveillance leads to fewer adverse events like unplanned ICU admissions and hospital-acquired conditions (e.g., sepsis, pneumonia), as complications are intercepted earlier in their course, resulting in less severe illness and lower morbidity [26].

Organizational Outcomes also see marked improvement. Effective surveillance that prevents FTR and other complications directly reduces patient length of stay (LOS). Early intervention for conditions like sepsis or respiratory distress prevents progression to organ failure, which requires longer, more complex, and costlier treatment [27]. This improvement in throughput enhances hospital capacity and efficiency. Furthermore, institutions known for excellent nursing care and patient safety, underpinned by strong surveillance practices, benefit from an enhanced reputation. This can lead to competitive advantages in healthcare markets, higher patient satisfaction scores, and improved performance on publicly reported quality metrics, which are increasingly tied to reimbursement [28]. A culture of safety that empowers nurses also improves **nurse-specific outcomes**, such as increased job satisfaction, reduced burnout, and lower turnover rates. When nurses see their surveillance efforts leading to successful rescues, it reinforces their professional value and efficacy [29].

The **Economic Impact**, while sometimes secondary in clinical discussions, is substantial. Preventing a single FTR event avoids the enormous costs associated with prolonged ICU stays, emergency surgeries, extended mechanical ventilation, and long-term rehabilitation. Although investments in better staffing, technology, and training require upfront capital, they generate a strong return on investment through cost avoidance. Studies employing cost-benefit analyses have shown that improvements in nursing care, including surveillance, lead to significant net savings for hospitals by reducing the costs of treating preventable adverse events [30]. Furthermore, in value-based purchasing models where reimbursement is linked to quality and outcomes, preventing FTR directly protects and enhances hospital revenue by avoiding penalties for poor performance on mortality and complication metrics [31].

6. The Role of Leadership and Policy in Sustaining Surveillance

Sustaining a high-reliability surveillance system requires committed leadership and supportive policy at both the institutional and macro levels. **Nurse Managers and Unit Leaders** are the linchpins in creating the local environment conducive to surveillance. Their role extends beyond scheduling to actively modeling and expecting vigilant practice. This includes championing safe staffing models, protecting nurses from non-essential tasks, and visibly supporting nurses who escalate concerns [32]. Leaders must also ensure the availability of necessary resources, from functioning equipment to ongoing education on assessment and early warning signs. Perhaps most critically, they must foster **psychological safety** by responding to reports of concern with respect and action, and by conducting fair, systems-oriented analyses when failures occur, rather than resorting to individual blame [33].

At the **Organizational and Health System** level, executive leadership must prioritize nursing surveillance as a core strategic objective. This translates into budgetary commitments for appropriate nurse staffing, investments in predictive monitoring technology and EHR optimization, and the establishment of organization-wide standards for escalation protocols and interprofessional communication [34]. C-suite leaders are responsible for integrating surveillance metrics—

such as RRT activation rates, compliance with EWS protocols, and nurse-sensitive outcome indicators—into performance dashboards and quality improvement agendas, signaling its importance throughout the organization.

Finally, **Public Policy and Healthcare Regulation** play an indispensable role in creating a floor for safe practice. Legislation mandating specific nurse-to-patient ratios in acute care settings, as seen in California and proposed in other regions, is a direct, though controversial, approach to enabling surveillance capacity [35]. More broadly, policy mechanisms that tie hospital funding to performance on patient safety and outcome measures, including FTR rates, create powerful financial incentives for institutions to invest in the nursing surveillance systems that prevent these events [36]. Accrediting bodies can further reinforce standards by requiring evidence of effective nurse-driven early detection and response systems as a condition of certification.

7. Conclusion

The journey from a stable patient to a failure-to-rescue event is not a sudden leap but a treacherous path marked by missed cues, underestimated urgency, and delayed action. As this analysis has demonstrated, nursing surveillance stands as the most vital sentinel on this path, the continuous and expert process of watching, understanding, and acting that can intercept a patient's decline and initiate a successful rescue. It is a sophisticated synthesis of knowledge, observation, critical thinking, and communication, all exercised within a context that can either enable or stifle its effectiveness. The barriers are formidable, rooted in systemic understaffing, technological burden, and cultural hesitancy. Yet, the strategies to overcome them are known and proven: structured assessment tools, intelligent technology aids, interprofessional collaboration models, and unwavering leadership support.

The evidence leaves little room for doubt. Enhanced nursing surveillance directly saves lives by preventing deaths from manageable complications. It improves the quality of recovery, reduces suffering and morbidity, and strengthens the very fabric of healthcare organizations by fostering safety, efficiency, and professional satisfaction. The economic argument, while compelling, is ultimately secondary to the moral imperative. Investing in nursing surveillance is an investment in the fundamental covenant of healthcare: to provide care that first, and above all, does no harm, and that rescues those in peril within its walls. Therefore, the mandate for clinicians, administrators, and policymakers is clear. They must move beyond rhetorical acknowledgment of nursing's value and commit to the concrete actions—in staffing, technology, culture, and policy—that will empower nurses to fully exercise their surveillance role. In doing so, they will not only prevent failure-to-rescue events but will affirm a commitment to a healthcare system where every patient is seen, heard, and rescued in their time of need.

Author Statements:

- **Ethical approval:** The conducted research is not related to either human or animal use.
- **Conflict of interest:** The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper
- **Acknowledgement:** The authors declare that they have nobody or no-company to acknowledge.
- **Author contributions:** The authors declare that they have equal right on this paper.
- **Funding information:** The authors declare that there is no funding to be acknowledged.
- **Data availability statement:** The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

References

1. Faul F., Erdfelder E., Buchner A., Lang A.G. Statistical power analyses using G* Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. Behav. Res. Methods. 2009;41:1149–1160.
2. Halverson C.C., Tilley D.S. Nursing surveillance: A Concept Analysis. Nurs Forum. 2022;57:454–460.
3. Henneman E.A., Gawlinski A., Giuliano K.K. Surveillance: A Strategy For Improving Patient Safety In Acute And Critical Care Units. Crit. Care Nurse. 2012;32:e9–e18.
4. Yang Y.K. Factors influencing safety care activities of hospital nurses. J. Korean Acad. Fundament. Nurs. 2019;26:188–196.
5. Kutney-Lee A., Lake E.T., Aiken L.H. Development of the hospital nurse surveillance capacity profile. Res. Nurs. Health. 2009;32:217–228.
6. Butcher H.K., Bulechek G.M., Dochterman J.M., Wagner C.M. Nursing Interventions Classification (NIC) 7th ed. Elsevier; St. Louis, MO, USA: 2018.
7. Hopkins A. Studying organizational cultures and their effects on safety. Safe. Sci. 2006;44:875–889.

8. Lee S.E., Quinn B.L. Safety culture and patient safety outcomes in East Asia: A Literature Review. West J. Nurs. Res. 2020;42:220–230.
9. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention FAQ: COVID-19 Data and Surveillance.
10. Halverson C.C., Tilley D.S. Creating a culture of support for nursing surveillance. Nurs. Forum. 2022;57:1204–1212.
11. Shever L.L., Titler M.G., Kerr P., Qin R., Kim T., Picone D.M. The effect of high nursing surveillance on hospital cost. J. Nurs. Scholar. 2008;40:161–169.
12. Park S.J., Kang J.Y., Lee Y.O. A study on hospital nurses' perception of patient safety culture and safety care activity. J. Korean Crit. Care Nurs. 2012;5:44–55.
13. Bulechek G.M., Butcher H.K., Dochterman J.M. Nursing Interventions Classification (NIC) 5th ed. Mosby; St. Louis, MO, USA: 2008.
14. Singer S., Lin S., Falwell A., Gaba D., Baker L. Relationship of safety climate and safety performance in hospitals. Health Serv. Res. 2009;44:399–421.
15. Hong M.H., Park J.Y. Nurses' perception of accreditation, awareness and performance of infection control in an accredited healthcare system. J. Korean Acad. Nurs. Admin. 2016;22:167–177.
16. Mardon R.E., Khanna K., Sorra J., Dyer N., Famolaro T. Exploring relationships between hospital patient safety culture and adverse events. J. Patient Saf. 2010;6:226–232.
17. Benner P., Tanner C. Clinical judgment: How Expert Nurses Use Intuition. Am. J. Nurs. 1987;87:23–31.
18. Cho D.Y. The analysis on the differences in educational training reactions in the university hospital's staff. Korean J. Healthcare Service Manage. 2014;8:57–67.
19. Zohar D., Livne Y., Tenne-Gazit O., Admi H., Donchin Y. Healthcare climate: A Framework For Measuring And Improving Patient Safety. Crit. Care. Med. 2007;35:1312–1317.
20. Dresser S. The role of nursing surveillance in keeping patients safe. JONA. 2012;42:361–368.
21. Kelly L.A. Nursing Surveillance in the Acute Care Setting: Latent Variable Development and Analysis. The University of Arizona; Tucson, AZ, USA: 2009.
22. Wang X., Liu K.E., You L.M., Xiang J.G., Hu H.G., Zhang L.F., Zheng J., Zhu X.W. The relationship between patient safety culture and adverse events: A Questionnaire Survey. Int. J. Nurs. Stud. 2014;51:1114–1122.
23. Van der Schaff T.W. Near-Miss Reporting in the Chemical Process Industry. Eindhoven University of Technology; Eindhoven, The Netherlands: 1992.
24. Stotts J.R., Lyndon A., Chan G.K., Bekmezian A., Rehm R.S. Nursing surveillance for deterioration in pediatric patients: An Integrative Review. J. Pediatric. Nurs. 2020;50:59–74.
25. Christabel S., Sudhaker C., Varma M. Nurses' outlook on healthcare-associated infection surveillance: Findings From Focus Group Discussions. Afr. J. Nurs. Midwif. 2022;24:1–11.
26. Chang Y., Mark B. Effects of learning climate and registered nurse staffing on medication errors. Nurs. Res. 2011;60:32–39.
27. Peet J., Theobald K.A., Douglas C. Building safety cultures at the frontline: An Emancipatory Practice Development Approach For Strengthening Nursing Surveillance On An Acute Care Ward. J. Clin. Nurs. 2022;31:642–656.
28. Copanitsanou P., Santy-Tomlinson J. The nurses' role in the diagnosis and surveillance of orthopaedic surgical site infections. Int. J. Orthopaedic Trauma Nurs. 2021;41:100818.
29. Institute of Medicine . Keeping Patients Safe: Transforming the Work Environment of Nurses. The National Academies Press; Washington, DC, USA: 2004.
30. Kim M.K., Lee S.M. The causal relationships among staff nurses' job stress factors, patient safety culture perception and patient safety nursing activities in a university hospital. J. Korean Acad. Nurs. Admin. 2019:340–352.
31. Han M.Y., Jung M.S. Effect of hospital nurses' perceptions of organizational health and patient safety culture on patient safety nursing activities. J. Korean Acad. Nurs. Admin. 2017;23:127–138.
32. Sanders J., Cook G. ABC of Patient Safety. Blackwell; Oxford, UK: 2007.
33. Hansen L.O., Williams M.V., Singer S.J. Perceptions of hospital safety climate and incidence of readmission. Health Serv. Res. 2011;46:596–616.
34. Lee S.E., Dahinten V.S. Adaptation and validation of a Korean-language version of the revised hospital survey on patient safety culture (K-HSOPSC 2.0) BMC Nurs. 2021;20:12.
35. Stefl M.E. To err is human: Building A Safer Health System In 1999. Front. Health Serv. Manag. 2001;18:1–2.
36. Cohen J. Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences. 2nd ed. Psychology Press; New York, NY, USA: 1988.