

## Session 5.6 Research Track

### Abstract Title:

Content Validity of Nursing Language Exemplified Using ENP-NANDA Mapping

### Presenters:

Pia Wieteck  
Holger Mosebach  
Simon Berger, RN

### Intended Audiences:

Educators, Clinicians, Informaticists

### Areas of Focus:

Classification Development, Informatics, Research, Use in Practice, Use in Education, Linking or Integrating Nursing Language

### Research Format:

For Research Reports

**PURPOSE.** The cross mapping of the standardized nursing languages European Nursing care Pathways (ENP ) and NANDA is carried out to find out if the terms used in ENP for describing nursing diagnoses are meaningfully structured and linked. The cross mapping of ENP-NANDA is to compare and assess the nursing contextual statements of ENP nursing diagnoses with those of NANDA nursing diagnoses. NANDA nursing diagnoses are suited for content validity, firstly due to their structure and precombinatory approach, and secondly because numerous NANDA validation studies have been carried out and published, assuring quality of the NANDA taxonomy.

**METHODS:** The focus of the evaluation of the ENP-NANDA cross mapping is the comparison of the expressiveness, completeness and clarity of ENP nursing diagnoses with NANDA nursing diagnoses. This study aims to answer the following questions:

F1 Can the content (professional nursing statements) of NANDA nursing diagnoses be mapped using ENP nursing diagnoses?

F2 Which nursing diagnoses cannot be covered with ENP?

F3 Which of ENP's nursing diagnoses have no equivalent in NANDA?

F4 How do ENP nursing diagnoses represent NANDA nursing diagnoses statements?

**METHODS:** The cross mapping of ENP Version 2.2\_1 (2006) with the German language version of NANDA ADDIN EN.CITE Georg, 2005, 1326, 974 "Edited Book" 28, Georg, Jürgen, NANDA Pflegediagnosen Definition und Klassifikation 2005-2006, 1. Auflage, Aktuelle und potenzielle Gesundheitsprobleme erkennen, benennen, behandeln, 172 Pflegediagnosen, Definitionen, Kennzeichen, Einflussfaktoren, Risikofaktoren, Taxonomie II, 2005, Hans Huber Verlag, 3-456-83322-9, F/875 (Georg, 2005) is carried out by an ENP expert. It is a non-experimental, descriptive, comparative, cross-sectional study. These mappings carried out by the ENP expert are evaluated by four designated NANDA experts and/or experts in the field of nursing diagnosis. The aim of the study is to judge whether ENP possesses a similar contextual expressiveness to NANDA.

The quality of the mappings is demonstrated:

- a) using bidirectional mapping for the complete mapping procedure and,
- b) using agreement measures for the evaluation.

**FINDINGS:** The results of the ENP and NANDA mappings are presented in three parts. First, the results of the ENPàNANDA mappings, then the NANDA &ENP mappings are presented and discussed. Next, the results of interrater reliability of the experts' ratings are presented and subsequently discussed.

**DISCUSSION:** The results of the study show, that both systems are not complete. Nineteen per cent of the ENP nursing diagnoses cannot be illustrated by NANDA and for 10% of the NANDA nursing diagnoses there is no match found in the ENP nursing diagnoses. Primarily, three main reasons could be found which made the mapping proceedings difficult: the overlapping problem of the NANDA nursing diagnoses; the formulation of symptoms as nursing diagnoses by NANDA; and the different emphasis of both systems (ENP and NANDA) in the formulation of one nursing diagnosis. ENP's nursing diagnoses are more specifically formulated (73%) than the NANDA nursing diagnoses as regards comprehension.

**CONCLUSION:** The results will be critically reflected and the question pursued: which type of nursing diagnoses will nurses in practice require for process documentation and the evaluation of process data?

**Citations:**

- Bakken Henry, S., & Mead, C. N. (1997). Review. Nursing Classification Systems: Necessary but not Sufficient for Representing "What Nurses Do" for Inclusion in Computer-based Patient Record Systems. *Journal of American Medical Informatics Association*, 4(3), 222-232.
- Bakken, S., Cashen, M. S., Mendonca, E. A., O'Brien, A., & Zieniewicz, J. (2000). Representing nursing activities within a concept-oriented terminological system: evaluation of a type definition. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 7(1), 81-90 (47 ref).
- Capuano, T. A., Hitchings, K. S., & Johnson, S. (1990). Respiratory Nursing Diagnoses: Practicing Nurses' Selection of Defining Characteristics. *Nursing Diagnosis*, 1(4), 169-174.
- Franklin, R. C. G., Jacobs, J. P., Tchervenkov, C. I., & Béland, M. J. (2002). Bidirectional crossmap of the Short Lists of the European Paediatric Cardiac Code and the International Congenital Heart Surgery Nomenclature and Database Project; Elektronische Ressource: <http://www.ipccc.net/Publications/Article%20-%20Bidirectional%20crossmap...2002%20-%20vol%2012.pdf> Download 5.12.005. *Cardiol Young*, 12(Suppl. 2), 18-22.
- Georg, J. (Ed.). (2005). *NANDA Pflegediagnosen Definition und Klassifikation 2005-2006* (1. Auflage ed.). Bern: Hans Huber Verlag.
- Hardiker, N. R., & Rector, A. L. (1998). Modeling nursing terminology using the GRAIL representation language. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 5(1), 120-128 (135 ref).
- Landis, J. R.; G. G. Koch (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data In: *Biometrics Jg.* 33, 1977, p. 159-174.
- Mayer, H., Nonn, C., Osterbrink, J., & Evers, G. C. M. (2004). Qualitätskriterien von Assessmentinstrumenten - Cohen's Kappa als Maß der Interrater-Reliabilität (Teil 1). *Pflege* 17(1), 36-46.
- Müller Staub, M. (2004). Pflegeklassifikationen im Vergleich. Teil 1. *PR-Internet*, 6(5), 296-312.
- Wieteck, P., & Opel, B. (2006). Planen, Formulieren, Dokumentieren. *Pflegediagnosen für die Altenpflege auf Grundlage der standardisierten Pflegefachsprache ENP*. Bad Emstal: RECOM.
- Zielstorff, R. D., Tronni, C., Basque, J., Griffin, L. R., & Welebob, E. M. (1998). Mapping Nursing Diagnosis Nomenclature for Coordinated Care. *Image - the Journal for nursing scholarship*, 30(4), 369-373.