INPLASY PROTOCOL

Corresponding author:
Floro Cubelo

floro.cubelo@oamk.fi

Author Affiliation:
University of Eastern Finland.

Workplace Integration Strategies for Internationally Educated Nurses (IENs): Mixed-Method Systematic Review

Cubelo, F[1]; Turunen, H[2]; Jokiniemi, K[3], Parviainen, A[4].

Review question / Objective: a. Population: Internationally Educated Nurses (IENs) are those who have received their initial education and registration from their home countries and have migrated abroad to work as Registered Nurses); b. Intervention: Integration into a new workplace abroad; c. Comparison intervention: Impact of integration intervention; d. Outcome measures: Impact of Integration Intervention on work satisfaction and professional competencies in nursing.
· Review Question: Does IEN who receive integration intervention have better work satisfaction and professional competencies compared to those who did not receive any integration program/intervention into a new workplace healthcare environment?
· Objective: To explore and summarize the current evidence-based integration strategies as a guide to creating effective integration policies for IENs.

INTRODUCTION

Review question / Objective: a. Population: Internationally Educated Nurses (IENs) are those who have received their initial education and registration from their home countries and have migrated abroad to work as Registered Nurses); b. Intervention: Integration into a new workplace abroad; c. Comparison intervention: Impact of integration intervention; d. Outcome measures: Impact of Integration Intervention on work

satisfaction and professional competencies in nursing.

• **Review Question:** Does IEN who receive integration intervention have better work satisfaction and professional competencies compared to those who did not receive any integration program/intervention into a new workplace healthcare environment?

• **Objective:** To explore and summarize the current evidence-based integration strategies as a guide to creating effective integration policies for IENs.

Rationale: Lack of scientific knowledge/ knowledge gap regarding the impact of the integration policies and standard operating procedures to support the professional needs of internationally educated nurses.

Condition being studied: a. Inclusion Criteria: Peer-reviewed articles including Qualitative, Quantitative, Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs), and Mixed-Method Studies; b. Exclusion Criteria: Literature reviews, books, editorials, opinions.

METHODS

Search strategy: Based on the recommendations of the university's information specialist, there will be two search strategies used to come up with broader results. Filter: English, 2012-2022, 10 years.
CINAHL (EBSCO)
• TITLE-ABS-KEY ("foreign nurs*" OR "immigra* nurs*" OR "international nurs*") AND TITLE-ABS-KEY ("job satisfaction" OR "work satisfaction")
• TITLE-ABS-KEY ("foreign nurs*" OR "immigra* nurs*" OR "international nurs*")
• AND TITLE-ABS-KEY (competenc*)
Scopus & PubMed
("foreign nurs*" OR "immigra* nurs*" OR "international nurs*") AND ("job satisfaction" OR "work satisfaction") AND competenc*

Participant or population: Internationally Educated Nurses (IENs).

Intervention: Integration into a new workplace abroad.

Comparator: Internationally Educated Nurses (IENs) who did not receive integration intervention.

Study designs to be included: Qualitative, Quantitative, Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs), and Mixed-Method Studies.

Eligibility criteria: The IEN's observed in the chosen articles may be of any age, gender, ethnicity, nationality, geographical location, or social background. IENs are those who have received their initial registration from their.

Information sources: Scientific databases (CINAHL, Scopus, PubMed).

Main outcome(s): Scientific knowledge to be used in identifying the impact of existing policies and strategies in integrating Internationally Educated Nurses (IENs).

Data management: Chosen articles for the mixed-method systematic review will be stored in a password-protected cloud-based online storage solution (One Drive) and into the Covidence systematic reviews management system to which the research team has access.

Quality assessment / Risk of bias analysis: The selected articles retrieved will be independently reviewed by two independent researchers using the Mixed-Methods Appraisal Tool. This tool is intended to assess quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-methods studies included in systematic mixed-methods reviews. The tool defines a series of criteria and screening questions to generate an overall quality score, with a specific focus on mixed-methods studies (Hong et. al 2018.) Conflicts with the decision will be discussed thoroughly by the two researchers to come up with a resolution. This takes place virtually using the Covidence systematic reviews management system.

Strategy of data synthesis: The findings will be categorised according to similarities. The similarities will be discussed, and themes and subthemes will be identified

based on the findings by two independent researchers virtually using the Covidence systematic reviews management system.

Subgroup analysis: This review will not include any analysis of subgroups or subsets.

Sensitivity analysis: This is not applicable to this research study.

Language restriction: English.

Country(ies) involved: Finnish, University of Eastern Finland.

Keywords: IENs; Migration Strategies; Migration Policies; Integration.

Contributions of each author:
Author 1 - Floro Cubelo - Primary Investigator.
Email: floro.cubelo@oamk.fi
Author 2 - Anndra Dumo Parviainen - Researcher.
Email: anndra.parviainen@uef.fi
Author 3 - Hannele Turunen - Main Supervisor. The author will read, provide feedback and approve the final manuscript.
Email: hannele.turunen@uef.fi
Author 4 - Krista Jokiniemi - Second Supervisor. The author will read, provide feedback and approve the final manuscript.
Email: krista.jokiniemi@uef.fi

References: Hong, Q. N., Fàbregues, S., Bartlett, G., Boardman, F., Cargo, M., Dagenais, P., Pluye, P. (2018). The Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018 for information professionals and researchers. Education for information, 34(4), 285-291. https://doi.org/10.3233/EFI-180221