Determining Pediatric Nurses’ Attitudes and Behaviors Towards Nurse-patient Interaction and Liking of Children Level

Abstract

Aim: The study was conducted descriptively in order to determine the factors affecting the attitudes and behaviors of pediatric nurses towards nurse-patient interactions and their level of liking of children.

Methods: The sample size of the study, the number of individuals in the population was determined according to the known sample calculation, and the sample of 294 pediatric nurses was formed. The research data were collected using the “Data Collection Form”, “Caring Nurse-Patient Interaction Scale (CNPIS)” and “Barnett Child Liking Scale (BCLS)”. The data were evaluated by number, percentage, mean, standard deviation, independent sample t test, one-way ANOVA, correlation test, and linear regression.

Results: Means for the importance, competence, and feasibility dimensions of the overall scale were 319.93 ± 33.95, 291.01 ± 42.36, and 267.29 ± 53.67, respectively. It was determined that the total mean scores for the “significance, adequacy, and applicability” levels of the CNPIS were 339.93 ± 33.93, 291.01 ± 42.36, 267.29 ± 53.67, respectively. It was determined that the variables of age, marital status, educational status, department employed, working year, and working year as a pediatric nurse affected the mean CNPIS score of the nurses (P < .05). The nurses’ BCLS mean score was determined as 85.80 ± 13.74. It was determined that the nurses’ child liking scores varied according to the unit they were working in (P < .05).

Conclusion: In the study, it was determined that there are significant predictors on the nurses’ average child-liking points and the mean scores of CNPIS-Importance-Adequacy-Practicability and there is a strong positive relationship between them. It may be suggested that pediatric nurses be supported with in-service trainings so that they can plan their practices in line with child-liking and care-oriented interaction.
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Introduction

The nurse has an important place in the health care team in terms of determining the communication needs of the patients. Nursing care is based on the relationship and interaction between the nurse and the patient. Accordingly, it is essential for the nurse to plan their practices with an integrative and humanistic approach, along with establishing healthy communication and interaction with the patient in order to obtain positive patient care results.1–4 It has been reported that effective communication and interpersonal relationships reveal positive results for patients, including patient compliance to the treatment, increased motivation, and elevated satisfaction with service.3,5 Studies evaluating the attitudes and behaviors of pediatric nurses towards care-oriented nurse-patient interaction are significantly limited. In a study that pediatric nurses were evaluated in terms of their care-oriented nurse-patient interaction levels and the family-centered care of the parents, Çetinkaya9 (2019) has reported that although nurses attach great importance to care-oriented nurse-patient interaction, they do not find it applicable at the same level. It should be considered that the majority of the remaining studies have been conducted with nursing students.4,5,11–13

While maintaining a patient-nurse interaction in a healthy way, the pediatric nurse working with children, a special group, should also comprehend that a child has different physical and psychological characteristics compared to an adult. For this reason, knowing that the child’s perception of and reaction to the disease might differ in accordance with the age and developmental features, the nurse should plan an extensive care and represent the essential compassion and attention.14–17 One of the important points in child patient and nurse communication is the child’s love perceived by the pediatric nurse. Nurses’ affection towards children enables them to be accepted easily and act more carefully and attentively during the communication process.15,17,18 It is significant to establish strong communication and interaction with nurses and receive affection from nurses in cases of deviation from health, where the child most needs love and attention.14,19
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Cossette et al. (2005) to describe nurse-patient interaction and to develop the Caring Nurse-Patient Interaction (CNPI) Scale. Data Collection Form: The sample size of the study was determined as 232 nurses according to the sample calculation of the known number of individuals in the population. Considering factors such as incomplete questionnaires and the nurses on leave, the study was designed to collect approximately 20-25% more questionnaires than the required sample number. Data were collected from 311 nurses who were willing to participate in the study and working in inpatient services, pediatric emergency services, or pediatric intensive care units. A total of 294 pediatric nurses who answered the questions correctly and completed the survey were included in the sample.

Data Collection: Data were collected by face-to-face interviews with nurses in the nurses’ room. It took about 15 minutes to fill out the forms.

Questionnaire: It consists of 11 questions analyzing the introductory characteristics of nurses (age, gender, marital status, graduated school, department, job, working year, etc.).

Caring Nurse-Patient Interaction (CNPI) Scale: It was developed by Cossette et al. (2005) to describe nurse-patient interaction and to evaluate the relationship between nurses’ attitudes and behaviors towards the care and patient outcomes. Validity and reliability of the scale were tested by Atar and Aşçı (2012) to ensure it is applicable in Turkish community. The scale consists of 70 items in 10 subscales. While applying the scale, the significance of CNPI scale items is questioned on a 5-item Likert-type scale, and data on the “significance” dimension of the scale are obtained. Similarly, by questioning how adequate and applicable the CNPI is on a 5-point Likert-type scale, results can be reached on the dimensions of “proficiency” and “applicability”. In all three dimensions, the expressions of the question items on the Likert-type scale were evaluated as “Never:1, A little:2, Moderate:3, Much:4, Extremely:5”. Cronbach α values of the scale were reported as 0.99, 0.98, and 0.99, respectively. In the evaluation of the scale, the subscales for each dimension did not change and were obtained from the same items. The total score of all three dimensions were obtained by adding the scores of all items. The lowest score that could be obtained in all three dimensions of the scale was 70, whereas the highest score was 350. As the scores of the nurses from the scale increased, their attitudes and behaviors towards care-oriented nurse-patient interaction elevated significantly. In this study, Cronbach α values were determined as 0.98 for all three sub-dimensions.

Barnett Liking of Children Scale: It is an assessment tool developed by Barnett and Sinsin (1990) to measure the attitude of people towards children. The Turkish validity and reliability study was carried out by Gelbal and Duyan (2008). There are 14 items in the scale, and the participants were asked to express their opinions in seven degrees, ranging from “I totally disagree” to “I totally agree”. Four out of 14 items (items 3, 4, 10, and 13) to determine liking for children are negative. It is concluded that those who score high on the scale like children more. The Cronbach α value was found to be 0.92. In this study, the Cronbach α value was determined as 0.69.

Ethical Consideration: Before starting the research, written permissions were obtained from Istanbul okan University Faculty of Health Sciences Ethics Committee (No: 79), Ministry of Health Public Hospitals Institution, Istanbul Province Northern Public Hospitals (No: 77.517.973-770) and Southern Public Hospitals (No: 35.778.018-774.99) Union General Secretary. Permission was obtained for the Care-Oriented Nurse-Patient Interaction Scale and the Barnett Child Loving Scale. After informing the nurses about the study, written consent forms were obtained for participation.

Data Analysis: The data obtained in the research were analyzed using the IBM SPSS 21.0 package software (IBM Corp. Armonk, NY: USA Released 2012). Number, percentage, mean, and standard deviation were used as descriptive statistical methods in the evaluation of the data. Before the data analysis, Kolmogorov–Smirnov Z test was applied and it was determined that the data showed normal distribution and parametric tests were used. The t-test was performed for independent groups to compare quantitative continuous data between two independent groups, and the one-way ANOVA test was conducted to compare quantitative continuous data between more than two independent groups. Spearman correlation and multiple linear regression test were performed to determine the relationship between continuous variables of the study. The findings were evaluated at the 95% confidence interval and at the 5% significance level.

Results: When the sociodemographic and working conditions of the nurses were examined, the majority of them were found to be women (90.1%), and 39.8% were between the ages of 18-25 years. More than half of the nurses (56.8%) were single. 33.3% of the nurses had children and 57.1% of those who had children (n = 98) had only one child. 65% of the nurses possessed a bachelor’s degree, whereas 55.1% worked in the pediatric service and 28.9% in the intensive care unit. The majority of them (93.2%) worked as service nurses and 6.8% were responsible nurses. It was determined that 42.9% of them had been working as a nurse for 1-5 years, 50.4% worked with children for 1-5 years, 49.7% of them worked for 40-48 hours a week, and finally 87.4% worked with in a shift system (Table 1).

The mean scores of significance, proficiency, and applicability of the CNPI scale were found to be 319.93 ± 33.93, 291.01 ± 42.36, and 267.29 ± 53.67, respectively. It was determined that nurses’ care-oriented nurse-patient interaction materiality and applicability and proficiency score averages (Min = 70-Max = 350) were above average. The mean score of the Child Liking Scale was 85.80 ± 13.74 and below the median value (Table 2).

When the significance, proficiency, and applicability sub-dimension mean scores of the nurses participating in the study were compared with their socio-demographic characteristics, it was determined that the variables of gender, having children, and the number of children did not affect the patient-nurse interaction significance score, and
the difference was found to be statistically insignificant (PP > .05). The findings revealed that as the age of the nurses increased, the mean scores of CNPI significance and proficiency elevated. The difference between the age groups was statistically significant (PP < .05). When the relationship between the marital status of the nurses and CNPI applicability scores was examined, it was determined that the applicability scores of the married nurses were higher than that of the unmarried nurses, and the difference was statistically significant (PP < .05). Analyzing the relationship between the graduation status of the nurses and their CNPI proficiency scores, it was detected that the proficiency scores of postgraduates were higher than that of high school graduates and undergraduate graduates. The difference between the groups was statistically significant (PP < .05). There was no statistical difference between the nurses’ mean scores of liking children and the variables of gender, age, marital status, having a child, the number of children who have children, and graduation (PP > .05) (Table 3).

When the mean scores of CNPI Significance and Proficiency were compared with the study characteristics, it was detected that the task and working style did not affect the patient-nurse interaction significance and proficiency score, and the difference was statistically insignificant (PP > .05). The CNPI-Significance scores of the nurses were compared based on the department they work in and the results demonstrated that the nurses working in the pediatric intensive care unit had a higher patient-nurse interaction significance score (PP < .05). The mean score of patient-nurse interaction significance of nurses elevated as the years of working in the profession and as a pediatric nurse increased (PP < .05). Similarly, the mean score of patient-nurse interaction proficiency of nurses elevated as the years of working in the profession and as a pediatric nurse increased (PP < .05). The mean scores of the Child Liking Scale were examined according to the service where the nurses worked. The findings showed that the nurses working in the pediatric intensive care unit had higher child liking scores than the nurses working in the pediatric service and pediatric emergency department. The difference was statistically significant (PP < .05) (Table 4).

| Table 1. Sociodemographic and Working Characteristics of Nurses (n = 294) |
|----------------|------|------|
| Variables      | n    | %    |
| Gender         |      |      |
| Female         | 265  | 90.1 |
| Male           | 29   | 9.9  |
| Age            |      |      |
| 18-25 ages     | 117  | 39.8 |
| 26-35 ages     | 116  | 39.5 |
| 36 age and above | 61  | 20.7 |
| Marital status |      |      |
| Married        | 127  | 43.2 |
| Single         | 167  | 56.8 |
| Status of having children |      |      |
| Yes            | 98   | 33.3 |
| No             | 196  | 66.7 |
| Number of children (n = 98) |      |      |
| 1 child        | 56   | 57.1 |
| 2 children and above | 42  | 42.9 |
| Education status |      |      |
| High school graduate | 49  | 16.6 |
| Associate degree graduate | 27  | 9.2  |
| Bachelor’s degree | 191 | 65.0 |
| Post graduate  | 27   | 9.2  |
| Working service |      |      |
| Pediatric service | 162 | 55.1 |
| Pediatric emergency service | 47  | 16.0 |
| PICU           | 85   | 28.9 |
| Status         |      |      |
| Nurse manager  | 20   | 6.8  |
| Service + intensive care nurse | 274 | 93.2 |
| Working time as a nurse |      |      |
| Less than 1 year | 27  | 9.2  |
| 1-5 years      | 126  | 42.9 |
| 6-10 years     | 62   | 21.1 |
| 11 years and above | 79  | 26.8 |
| Working time in pediatric clinics |      |      |
| Less than 1 year | 41  | 13.9 |
| 1-5 years      | 148  | 50.4 |
| 6-10 years     | 64   | 21.8 |
| 11 years and above | 41  | 13.9 |
| Working hours  |      |      |
| 40-48 hours    | 146  | 49.7 |

| Table 2. Total Scores of Pediatric Nurses on the Caring Nurse-Patient Interaction Scale and the Barnett Child Liking Scale (n = 294) |
|----------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Scale          | Mean | SD   | Min. | Max. | Median |
| BCLS           | 85.80| 13.74| 14   | 98   | 91    |
| CNPIS-Significance | 319.93| 33.93| 205  | 350  | 331   |
| CNPIS-Proficiency | 291.01| 42.36| 201  | 358  | 292   |
| CNPIS-Applicability | 267.29| 53.67| 122  | 395  | 279   |

| Table 1. Sociodemographic and Working Characteristics of Nurses (n = 294) (Continued) |
|----------------|------|------|
| Variables      | n    | %    |
| 49 hours or more | 148 | 50.3 |
| Shift type     |      |      |
| Day            | 37   | 12.6 |
| Shift          | 257  | 87.4 |

284
It has been determined that there was a strong positive correlation between the nurses’ mean scores of liking children and the mean scores of CNPI Significance, Proficiency, and Applicability (PP < .01) (Table 5). The total score of the Barnett Child Liking Scale of the nurses participating in the study has been the indicator of the significance, proficiency, and applicability scores of the CNPI (PP < .001). These three variables account for 16% of the variance in the child liking score. CNPI-Significance score has been the strongest indicator of Barnett Child Loving Scale total score (Table 6).

### Discussion

A nurse is a professional member equipped with the knowledge and skills that provides appropriate support to individuals who have health problems and need help in order to cope with the current situation. Nursing practices that make nursing care special develop with the theoretical and practical knowledge of nurses, their ability to understand human behavior, their commitment to professional values, as well as their ability to maintain effective communication and interaction with the patient.1-13,17-23

Pediatric nursing, which cares for individuals in childhood who are still growing physically, psychologically, and socially, also has important responsibilities. It is crucial that the interaction with the child proceeds during the stages of diagnosing care-related problems, planning, and implementing interventions.14-18 Maintaining this interaction and communication in a healthy way might be related to the nurse’s love for children. In this section, the results of the research on the

---

**Table 3. Comparison of Pediatric Nurses’ on the Caring Nurse-Patient Interaction Scale Sub-Dimension Scores and Barnett Child Liking Scale by Descriptive Characteristics (n = 294)**

| Variables               | CNPIS-Significance | CNPIS-Sufficiency | CNPIS-Applicability | BCLS |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------|------|
|                         | Mean   | SD    | t/F   | p    | k   | SS  | t/F   | p    | k   | SS  | t/F   | p    |
| Gender                  |        |      |       |      |     |     |       |      |     |     |       |      |
| Female                  | 319.85 | 34.019 | 290.24 | 42.859 | 267.01 | 53.542 | 86.14 | 13.624 |      |       |      |      |
| Male                    | 320.62 | 33.698 | 298.07 | 37.417 | 269.86 | 55.753 | 82.69 | 14.634 | 1.287 | .049  | 85.26 | 14.522 | .690 | .503  |
| Age                     |        |      |       |      |     |     |       |      |     |     |       |      |
| 18-25 ages              | 308.77 | 35.100 | 277.74 | 38.940 | 263.78 | 49.425 | .258  | 84.70  | 12.530 |      |       |      |      |
| 26-35 ages              | 326.16 | 32.339 | 295.64 | 43.392 | 265.60 | 55.499 | 1.361 | .067  | 85.29 | 14.522 | .690  | .503  |      |       |
| 36 and above            | 329.48 | 28.729 | 307.69 | 39.425 | 277.25 | 57.541 | 87.05 | 14.484 |      |       |      |      |
| Marital status          |        |      |       |      |     |     |       |      |     |     |       |      |
| Married                 | 312.76 | 33.446 | 295.78 | 42.590 | 274.55 | 53.942 | 86.61 | 14.739 |      |       |      |      |
| Single                  | 318.53 | 34.329 | 297.39 | 41.950 | 261.77 | 52.964 | 85.19 | 12.939 | .883  | .378  |      |       |
| Status of having children |      |      |       |      |     |     |       |      |     |     |       |      |
| Yes                     | 320.04 | 33.940 | 297.16 | 42.184 | 273.94 | 56.469 | .136  | .056  | 85.76 | 16.036 |      |       |
| No                      | 319.87 | 34.013 | 287.94 | 42.220 | 265.97 | 52.049 | 85.83 | 12.479 | .042  | .967  |      |       |
| Number of children      |        |      |       |      |     |     |       |      |     |     |       |      |
| 1 child                 | 321.61 | 31.971 | 298.14 | 39.738 | 280.23 | 54.509 | 85.07 | 17.915 |      |       |      |      |
| 2 and above             | 316.35 | 36.815 | 293.76 | 45.635 | 263.18 | 58.712 | .166  | .851  | 85.41 | 13.612 | .095  | .924  |      |       |
| Education status        |        |      |       |      |     |     |       |      |     |     |       |      |
| High school             | 313.57 | 37.505 | 284.45 | 46.183 | 266.35 | 54.207 | 84.65 | 12.857 |      |       |      |      |
| Associate               | 320.70 | 34.443 | 302.07 | 38.431 | 279.33 | 53.038 | 86.67 | 14.536 |      |       |      |      |
| Bachelor’s             | 319.55 | 33.801 | 288.25 | 41.254 | 264.49 | 53.134 | 85.73 | 14.155 | .029  | .833  |      |       |
| Post graduate           | 333.30 | 24.959 | 311.44 | 40.886 | 276.81 | 57.365 | 87.52 | 11.850 |      |       |      |      |

* t = t test on independent groups; F = one-way analysis of variance.
* p < .05,
** p < .01
### Table 4. Comparison of Pediatric Nurses’ Caring Nurse-Patient Interaction Scale Sub-Dimensional Mean Scores and Barnett Child Liking Scale by Work Characteristics (n = 294)

| Variables                        | CNPIS-Significance | CNPIS-Sufficiency | CNPIS-Applicability | BCLS |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------|------|
|                                  | Mean   | SD    | t/F  | p    | Mean   | SD    | t/F  | p    | Mean   | SD    | t/F  | p    |
| **Working service**              |        |       |      |      |        |       |      |      |        |       |      |      |
| Pediatric service<sup>a</sup>    | 314.80 | 34.83 | 287.51 | 41.929 | 265.96 | 53.882 | 84.16 | 14.848 |       |       |      |      |
| Emergency<sup>b</sup>            | 315.23 | 35.20 | 288.26 | 37.076 | 265.49 | 53.322 | 3.346 | .037* | 85.89 | 13.363 | 3.346 | .037* |
| PICU<sup>c</sup>                 | 332.29 | 28.16 | 299.22 | 45.172 | 270.82 | 53.935 | 88.88 | 11.105 | c > a,b |        |      |      |
| **Status**                       |        |       |      |      |        |       |      |      |        |       |      |      |
| Nurse manager                    | 314.80 | 34.83 | 287.51 | 41.929 | 265.96 | 53.882 | 84.16 | 14.848 |       |       |      |      |
| Service + intensive care nurse   | 315.23 | 35.20 | 288.26 | 37.076 | 265.49 | 53.322 | 85.89 | 13.363 |       |       |      |      |
| **Working time as a nurse**      |        |       |      |      |        |       |      |      |        |       |      |      |
| Less than 1 year<sup>i</sup>     | 292.89 | 40.70 | 278.93 | 36.705 | 273.52 | 45.144 | 80.96 | 13.282 |       |       |      |      |
| 1-5 years<sup>b</sup>            | 319.87 | 31.21 | 282.28 | 41.332 | 261.32 | 50.151 | 85.75 | 12.805 |        | 1.357 | .256 |      |
| 6-10 years<sup>c</sup>           | 320.18 | 36.01 | 296.32 | 43.444 | 269.35 | 57.333 | 86.77 | 15.433 |       |       |      |      |
| 11 years and above<sup>d</sup>   | 329.05 | 29.30 | 304.91 | 41.059 | 273.08 | 58.587 | 86.77 | 13.838 |       |       |      |      |
| **Working time in pediatric clinic** |       |       |      |      |        |       |      |      |        |       |      |      |
| Less than 1 year<sup>i</sup>     | 300.83 | 39.80 | 282.07 | 36.638 | 274.32 | 43.000 | 81.15 | 13.942 |       |       |      |      |
| 1-5 years<sup>b</sup>            | 320.89 | 31.07 | 285.89 | 42.929 | 262.23 | 52.539 | 86.32 | 12.875 |        | 1.881 | .133 |      |
| 6-10 years<sup>c</sup>           | 323.25 | 35.78 | 297.52 | 41.675 | 268.36 | 55.682 | 87.03 | 14.833 |       |       |      |      |
| 11 years and above<sup>d</sup>   | 330.34 | 27.86 | 308.29 | 41.720 | 276.88 | 63.118 | 86.66 | 14.362 |       |       |      |      |
| **Shift type**                   |        |       |      |      |        |       |      |      |        |       |      |      |
| Day                              | 321.95 | 30.43 | 294.00 | 44.565 | 270.95 | 56.148 | 84.95 | 14.970 |       |       |      |      |
| Shift                            | 319.65 | 34.59 | 290.50 | 42.104 | 266.33 | 53.617 | 85.71 | 13.642 |        | -0.314 | .754 |      |

<sup>i</sup>t-test on independent groups; <sup>F</sup>analysis of variance.

<sup>*P</sup> < .05, <sup>**P</sup> < .01.
When the results of the research are examined, the mean scores for the “significance, proficiency, and applicability” levels of the CNPI scale were 316.80 ± 26.12, whereas average pro

factor affecting the patient-nurse interactions of pediatric nurses and their level of liking for children were discussed in the light of the relevant literature.

In this study, the average score of the nurses’ Child Liking scale was 85.80 ± 13.74 and it was determined that the level of Child Liking was high (Table 2). The studies performed on this subject have published high Child Liking scores.19,25–27 These results may be due to the fact that the pediatric nurses work for children whose needs and dependencies were higher than that of other age groups. In addition, the love of children could be an expected situation for many individuals regardless of profession due to human nature.

As a result, it was determined that as the age of the nurses increased, the mean scores of CNPI Significance and Proficiency increased (Table 3). This result may be related to the fact that the professional experience and awareness of the nurses increase with age, as well as the importance of care-oriented nurse-patient interaction and feel more adequate in this regard. In the literature, Bayraktar and Eşer26 (2017) evaluated the attitudes and behaviors of nurses towards care-oriented nurse-patient interaction, and Çağmaz and Çam24 (2019) investigated the care-oriented nurse-patient interaction levels of nurses who care for psychiatric patients, and the “significance” score increased directly proportional to age. In the study of Kara15 (2014), it was reported that as the age of nurses increases, their communication skills also increase. On the other hand, in some similar studies on nurse-patient interactions and communication skills, it is observed that there is no relationship between the age of nurses and their communication skills.9,10,29,30

The study demonstrated that the married nurses had higher CNPI Applicability scores compared to ones who were single (Table 3). This result might be explained by married nurses’ experience of caring for children, along with their life experiences and environments, and being more aware of the need. In the study of Kara28 (2014), it was stated that married nurses had stronger communication with children. In a similar study by Çetinkaya9 (2019) with pediatric nurses and in some studies on nurses’ communication and empathy skills, it was reported that marital status was not related.29–31

In this study, it was determined that nurses with a master’s degree had higher CNPI-proficiency scores (Table 3). The fact that nurses with higher education levels were more competent in the patient interaction might be explained by the improvement of nurses in theory and practice with the increased education level, and they know the limitations of their duties and authorities. When the studies examining the communication and empathic skill levels were analyzed, it was detected that the higher the education level of the nurses yielded better communication with the patient.32–35

In this study, the nurses working in the pediatric intensive care unit were shown to have higher patient-nurse CNPI-Significance scores

Table 5. The Relationship between Nurses’ Barnett Child Liking Scale and Caring Nurse-Patient Interaction Scale’s Mean Significance, Sufficiency, and Applicability (n = 294).

|                | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     |
|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| **BCLS**       | 1     |       |       |       |
| **CNPIS-Significance** | 0.345* | 1     |       |       |
| **CNPIS-Sufficiency** | 0.332* | 0.632* | 1     |       |
| **CNPIS-Applicability** | 0.311* | 0.356* | 0.754* | 1     |

Spearman correlation test P < .01.

Table 6. Factors Associated with Pediatric Nurses’ Levels of Liking Children (n = 294).

| BCLS            | B     | SE    | (B)   | t     | p       | Lower limit | Upper limit |
|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|-------------|-------------|
| CNPIS- Significance | 0.140 | 0.022 | 0.345 | 6.280 | .001*   | 0.096       | 0.183       |
| CNPIS- Sufficiency | 0.108 | 0.018 | 0.332 | 6.010 | .001*   | 0.072       | 0.143       |
| CNPIS- Applicability | 0.080 | 0.014 | 0.311 | 5.999 | .001*   | 0.052       | 0.108       |

CI: Confidence interval. R:0.40;R²:0.16; F: 18.373; P < .001; Durbin Watson: 1.978.

*P < .01.
than those working in other services (Table 4). Nurses believed that the interaction with the child has been more important, which could be explained by the fact that the children followed in the intensive care unit needed more care.

In the study, the findings demonstrated that as the years of working in the profession and the years of working as a pediatric nurse increased, the mean scores of CNPI-Significance increased as well (Table 4). The reason behind this finding might be the increase in the working experience of nurses, their knowledge and experience. Accordingly, the importance of care-oriented nurse-patient interaction was also positively influenced. In a similar study by Bayraktar and Eser88 (2017), it was determined that the care-oriented nurse-patient interaction of nurses with a long working time in the profession has been important.

In the study of Kumçağız et al.35 (2011) nurses with longer working years were shown to have improved communication skills.

In this study, it was determined that nurses whose professional working years and working years as a pediatric nurse were less than 1 year and 1-5 years had lower mean CNPI-Proﬁciency scores (Table 4). This result could be explained by the fact that as the working years of nurses increase, they gain proﬁciency with experience and gain experience in patient-nurse interaction with the same parallelism. In their study, Oermann and Garvin82 (2002) reported that the stress reasons frequently stated by new graduates were feeling inadequate due to lack of conﬁdence, fear of making mistakes due to increased workload and responsibilities and working with nurses who were unwilling to help. In the study conducted by İleri79 (2007) on the perception of the transition process of newly graduated nurses to their professional roles and the factors affecting it, it was stated that newly graduated nurses expressed the transition process as difﬁcult.

In this study, it was determined that nurses working in the pediatric intensive care unit had higher child liking scores (Table 4). It can be thought that this result may be due to the conclusion that children in the intensive care process may need more love and attention and the high level of child liking of pediatric intensive care (PICU) nurses. In the study of Alın29 (2019), the level of liking for children was found to be high in nurses working in intensive care.

In the study, the nurses’ mean scores of liking children and the mean scores of NHSES-Signiﬁcance-Proﬁciency-Applicability were found as signiﬁcant predictors and there was a strong positive relationship between them (Tables 5.6). Consequently, it can be thought that nurses with a high level of liking for children find care-oriented nurse-patient interaction more important and consider themselves competent and able to apply patient-nurse interaction. The positive effect of the strong communication between the patient and nurse is known to have a positive effect on the recovery results, and the polite, loving and sincere behavior of the nurses increase the quality of care and the expectations of the patients can be met more effectively.88

When similar studies on child liking and communication with pediatric nurses were examined, it was detected that as the level of liking increased, the ability to communicate with the patient also increased.82,27 Tural et al.17 (2014) also stated in their study with a mixed group of nurses that the level of liking children is parallel to the ability to communicate. In a study by Yığit et al.44 (2019), it was reported that nurses with good communication had higher child liking scores because they felt competent and happy in their clinic. In the study conducted by Günel27 (2018) to determine the status of liking children and empathic tendencies of nursing students, it was concluded that those with a high level of liking for children did not have difﬁculty in communicating with children. Nurses are the people with whom children interact the most in the hospital. Children demand hearing nice words from nurses, along with compassion and trust.

Conclusion

As a result, it is noteworthy that the care-oriented patient-nurse interaction scores of the pediatric nurses participating in the study are significant, profi cient and applicable above the average. In addition, it was determined that nurses with a high level of liking for children found care-oriented nurse-patient interaction signiﬁ cant, felt sufﬁ cient in terms of patient interaction and found the care-oriented working style applicable. Based on these results, it can be suggested that nurses who want to work in this ﬁ eld and love children should be given to children’s services. Nurses who love children should be determined, and those with high levels of child liking should be directed to children’s services and supported with in-service training, thus that they can plan their practices in line with care-oriented interaction. On the other hand, studies on care-oriented nurse-patient interaction seem to be limited. It is recommended to conduct further studies that focus on the effects of nursing care practices on patient outcomes in pediatric clinics.
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