Financial Target Pressure on Hospital Staff and its Effects on Healthcare Quality Performance: A Systematic Literature Review

Parhlad Singh Ahluwalia, Department of Healthcare and Pharmaceutical Management, School of Management and Business Studies, Jamia Hamdard, New Delhi, India

Abstract

Background: Hospitals worldwide operate within environments of intensifying financial constraint, driven by cost-containment imperatives, value-based purchasing mandates, and reimbursement reforms. Financial target pressure—defined as the imposition of budgetary goals, performance-linked payment schemes, and efficiency benchmarks upon clinical staff—has become ubiquitous in modern healthcare systems. While financial discipline is necessary for institutional sustainability, mounting evidence suggests that excessive financial pressure on hospital staff engenders significant consequences for healthcare quality, patient safety, and workforce well-being. This systematic literature review synthesises evidence examining the relationship between financial target pressure on hospital staff and its effects on qualitative healthcare performance.

Methods: A systematic search was conducted across PubMed/MEDLINE, EMBASE, Scopus, Web of Science, CINAHL, and the Cochrane Library covering the period from January 2010 to December 2024. Search terms included combinations of: financial pressure, hospital staff, healthcare quality, patient safety, burnout, staffing ratios, pay-for-performance, cost-containment, and nurse/physician workload. Studies were included if they reported empirical or review evidence on the effects of financial targets or fiscal pressure on staff behaviour, clinical quality indicators, or patient outcomes in acute hospital settings. A total of 67 peer-reviewed studies met the inclusion criteria after PRISMA-guided screening. Thematic synthesis was employed to organise findings into conceptual categories.

Results: Four principal thematic domains emerged: (1) Staffing reductions and patient outcomes: financial-driven staffing cuts are associated with increased patient mortality, higher adverse event rates, and longer hospital stays; (2) Staff burnout and moral distress: financial pressure amplifies workload demands, elevates burnout prevalence (estimated at 30–70% among physicians and nurses), and generates moral distress when clinicians cannot deliver care aligned with professional standards; (3) Pay-for-performance schemes: while incentive-based payment models can yield modest improvements in measurable process indicators, their effects on holistic care quality are mixed, and they risk introducing perverse incentives including gaming and neglect of non-incentivised domains; (4) Organisational mediators: leadership quality, institutional culture, and resource allocation strategies moderate the relationship between financial pressure and clinical outcomes.

Conclusion: Financial target pressure on hospital staff exerts a complex, predominantly adverse influence on healthcare quality performance. Sustainable quality improvement requires moving beyond fiscal austerity toward integrated workforce investment strategies, balanced performance measurement frameworks, and leadership cultures that prioritise both financial accountability and clinical excellence. Future research should focus on longitudinal, multi-country comparative studies to establish causal pathways.

Keywords: *financial pressure, hospital staff, healthcare quality, patient safety, burnout, pay-for-performance, staffing ratios, cost-containment, systematic review*

1. Introduction

The global landscape of healthcare finance has undergone profound transformation over the past three decades. Health systems in high-income countries face mounting pressure to contain costs while simultaneously improving the quality and safety of clinical services. These twin imperatives—fiscal prudence and clinical excellence—are often presented in policy discourse as complementary, yet empirical evidence reveals that their relationship is considerably more complex and frequently contradictory (Hussey et al., 2013; Busse et al., 2019).

Financial target pressure in hospital settings refers to the systematic imposition of quantitative fiscal objectives upon clinical and managerial staff. This encompasses a spectrum of mechanisms: budget caps limiting departmental expenditure, staffing ratio mandates driven by cost reduction, performance-linked remuneration models (commonly termed pay-for-performance or value-based purchasing), efficiency targets tied to hospital reimbursement, and penalties for exceeding defined cost thresholds (Milstein & Schreyoegg, 2016; Aryankhesal, 2023). These instruments have been widely adopted by health ministries, hospital systems, and insurance payers as tools to enhance value in healthcare delivery.

However, a growing body of literature raises serious concerns about the unintended consequences of financially driven performance management. Hospital staff—including physicians, nurses, allied health professionals, and administrative personnel—are increasingly subjected to pressures that may conflict with their professional duty to provide high-quality, patient-centred care (Dall'Ora et al., 2021; Hall et al., 2016). When financial targets become the dominant metric of institutional success, clinical imperatives may be subordinated to economic considerations, with potentially deleterious effects on patient outcomes and workforce well-being.

The consequences of such tensions have been documented across multiple healthcare systems. In the United Kingdom, National Health Service (NHS) austerity measures implemented since 2010 have been associated with increased hospital mortality and deteriorating staff morale (Anandaciva et al., 2018). In the United States, financial pressures linked to value-based purchasing programmes have generated a complex landscape of outcomes, with some quality indicators improving while others reveal evidence of gaming, displacement, or neglect (Norton et al., 2022). In low- and middle-income country contexts, performance-based financing schemes in sub-Saharan Africa have yielded mixed results, suggesting that financial incentives operate differently depending on contextual factors including pre-existing resource levels and governance capacity (Gautier et al., 2021).

Despite the breadth of empirical activity in this domain, the literature remains fragmented across disciplines including health economics, organisational behaviour, nursing science, and medical sociology. Systematic synthesis of this evidence is therefore essential to provide an integrated account

of the mechanisms through which financial target pressure affects healthcare quality, and to identify the conditions under which such effects are most harmful or potentially ameliorated.

This systematic literature review addresses the following research questions: (1) What forms of financial target pressure are applied to hospital staff, and through what mechanisms do they influence clinical behaviour? (2) What is the evidence for effects of financial pressure on measurable healthcare quality indicators, including patient safety, clinical outcomes, and patient experience? (3) How does financial pressure affect hospital staff well-being, and what are the downstream consequences for care quality? (4) What organisational, structural, and systemic factors mediate or moderate the relationship between financial pressure and healthcare quality performance?

2. Theoretical Background and Conceptual Framework

To contextualise the findings of this review, it is important to establish the theoretical underpinnings of the relationship between financial pressure, staff behaviour, and clinical quality. Three principal theoretical frameworks inform this synthesis.

2.1 The Quality-Cost Trade-off Hypothesis

The classical economics of healthcare posits that quality and cost are frequently in tension: reducing expenditure risks compromising the inputs (staffing, equipment, time per patient) necessary for high-quality care delivery. This trade-off hypothesis has been extensively interrogated in the health services research literature. Hussey et al. (2013), in a systematic review published in the Annals of Internal Medicine, found that the relationship between healthcare quality and cost was inconsistent across studies, with some demonstrating a positive association, others a negative one, and many showing no significant correlation. More recent scoping reviews have similarly found that the evidence does not support a simple, universal trade-off, and that context—particularly the presence of managerial capacity and organisational culture—is a critical determinant (Krachler & Greer, 2015; Pirani et al., 2023).

Critically, however, even where financial pressure does not reduce overall quality scores, it may redistribute the burden of quality unevenly, privileging easily measured outcomes over complex or relationship-based dimensions of care that are harder to quantify. This selective degradation of care quality is particularly relevant when assessing the effects of pay-for-performance schemes that reward compliance with narrow process indicators.

2.2 Job Demands-Resources Theory

The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model, developed by Bakker and Demerouti (2007), provides a robust theoretical lens for understanding how financial pressure translates into staff burnout and, ultimately, clinical underperformance. The model posits that workplace well-being is determined by the balance between job demands (physical, psychological, or organisational effort required) and job

resources (aspects of the work environment that reduce demands and facilitate goal achievement). When demands chronically exceed resources—as is characteristic of financially pressured hospital environments—burnout, disengagement, and error-prone practice are predictable outcomes (Dall'Ora et al., 2020). Financial target pressure increases job demands by intensifying workload, reducing time per patient, and introducing administrative accountability burdens, while simultaneously eroding resources by cutting staff, training, and support services.

2.3 Institutional Logic and Professional Identity

A third perspective draws on the sociology of professions, particularly Friedland and Alford's (1991) concept of institutional logics. Hospital organisations are sites of contending logics: the market logic of financial efficiency, the bureaucratic logic of regulatory compliance, and the professional logic of clinical excellence oriented toward patient welfare. When financial target pressure becomes institutionally dominant, it may crowd out professional logics, creating what nurses and physicians describe as "moral distress"—the experience of knowing the ethically correct action but being constrained from performing it by institutional factors (Jameton, 1984; Epstein & Hamric, 2009). Moral distress, in turn, is associated with reduced care quality, staff attrition, and declining professional commitment (Fumis et al., 2017).

3. Methods

3.1 Study Design

This review was conducted in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (Page et al., 2021). The review was designed as a systematic literature review with thematic synthesis, appropriate for integrating findings from heterogeneous study designs addressing a complex multidimensional research question. Due to the diversity of outcome measures and methodological approaches across included studies, meta-analytic pooling of effect sizes was not feasible; thematic synthesis was therefore adopted as the primary analytical strategy (Thomas & Harden, 2008).

3.2 Eligibility Criteria

Inclusion criteria were defined using the PICO framework. Population: hospital staff (physicians, nurses, allied health professionals, and hospital managers) in acute care settings. Intervention/Exposure: financial target pressure, including budgetary constraints, pay-for-performance schemes, staffing efficiency mandates, and cost-containment policies. Comparator: absence of, or lower levels of, financial pressure, or pre-intervention baseline conditions. Outcomes: healthcare quality indicators including clinical process measures, patient safety events (medical errors, adverse events, hospital-acquired infections, falls), patient mortality, length of hospital stay, patient satisfaction, and

staff-reported care quality. Additionally, studies examining intermediate outcomes (staff burnout, moral distress, intent to leave, workload perceptions) as mediators of the main effect were included.

Studies were excluded if they: (1) focused exclusively on primary care or long-term care without acute hospital components; (2) examined financial pressure on patients rather than staff; (3) reported only cost or efficiency outcomes without any quality or safety measures; (4) were published in languages other than English without available English-language translations; or (5) were published prior to January 2010, to ensure contemporaneous relevance.

3.3 Search Strategy

Systematic searches were conducted in PubMed/MEDLINE, EMBASE, Scopus, Web of Science, CINAHL, and the Cochrane Library. The search combined subject headings (MeSH terms where applicable) and free-text keywords. Key search clusters included: (i) financial pressure terms—"financial pressure," "financial target," "budget constraint," "cost-containment," "pay-for-performance," "value-based purchasing," "performance-based financing," "financial incentive"; (ii) hospital staff terms—"hospital staff," "nurse," "physician," "clinician," "healthcare worker," "medical staff"; and (iii) quality/outcome terms—"healthcare quality," "patient safety," "medical error," "adverse event," "patient outcome," "burnout," "moral distress," "staffing ratio." Boolean operators (AND, OR) were used to combine clusters. Reference lists of included studies and recent systematic reviews in the field were additionally searched by hand.

3.4 Study Selection and Data Extraction

Two independent reviewers screened titles and abstracts, followed by full-text review of potentially eligible records. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion and, where necessary, consultation with a third reviewer. A structured data extraction form recorded: author(s), year, country, study design, setting, type of financial pressure examined, staff group studied, quality/safety outcome measures, and key findings. Study quality was assessed using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) for mixed-method studies, the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale for observational studies, and the AMSTAR-2 checklist for systematic reviews.

3.5 Synthesis Approach

Thematic synthesis proceeded in three stages following Thomas and Harden (2008): (1) line-by-line coding of findings from included studies; (2) development of descriptive themes capturing patterns across studies; and (3) generation of analytical themes representing interpretive insights that extend beyond primary study findings. The GRADE framework was applied to assess the certainty of evidence for each thematic domain.

4. Results

4.1 Study Selection

The initial database search retrieved 8,741 records. Following removal of duplicates (n = 1,892), 6,849 records were screened at the title and abstract stage. Of these, 6,512 were excluded as irrelevant. Full texts were retrieved for 337 articles, of which 67 met all inclusion criteria and were included in the final synthesis. Excluded full-text articles failed inclusion criteria on grounds of: incorrect population (n = 94), insufficient outcome data (n = 82), focus on cost without quality outcomes (n = 57), or pre-2010 publication date (n = 37).

Included studies comprised 28 observational studies (cross-sectional and longitudinal), 18 systematic reviews or meta-analyses, 12 qualitative studies, and 9 mixed-methods investigations. Studies were conducted predominantly in the United States (n = 29), United Kingdom (n = 14), European Union member states (n = 11), Australia (n = 6), and other high-income countries (n = 7). A small number of studies (n = 5) addressed low- and middle-income country contexts, primarily through performance-based financing evaluation in sub-Saharan Africa.

4.2 Theme 1: Financial-Driven Staffing Reductions and Patient Outcomes

The most extensively documented mechanism through which financial pressure affects healthcare quality is the reduction of clinical staffing levels as a cost-containment strategy. The evidence base here is substantial and broadly consistent.

A landmark study by Aiken et al. (2014), encompassing 422 hospitals across nine European countries and involving 422,730 patients and 26,516 nurses, established that each additional patient added to a nurse's workload was associated with a 7% increase in the odds of a patient dying within 30 days of hospital admission, and a 23% increase in the odds of nurse burnout. This dose-response relationship between nurse-to-patient ratios and mortality has been replicated across multiple healthcare system contexts. A more recent cross-sectional analysis of 87 Illinois acute care hospitals found that each additional patient in a nurse's workload was associated with a 16% increase in 30-day mortality odds and a 5% increase in length of stay (Aiken et al., 2021). The same study projected that standardising nurse-to-patient ratios at 4:1 would have prevented over 1,595 deaths and generated $117 million in savings within a single year through avoided readmissions and shorter stays.

Systematic evidence further indicates that financially driven skill mix changes—substituting registered nurses with lower-qualified healthcare assistants to reduce labour costs—are associated with elevated rates of hospital-acquired infections, patient falls, medication errors, and pressure injuries (Griffiths et al., 2016; Blume et al., 2021). The risk of death in intensive care units increases by a factor of 3.5 when patient-to-nurse ratios exceed evidence-based thresholds, according to multicentre longitudinal studies conducted in French university hospitals (Vincent et al., 2018). A 2023 umbrella

review of 15 previous systematic reviews confirmed that nurse staffing is robustly associated with a range of nurse-sensitive patient outcomes across international settings, with the evidence quality rated as moderate to high for mortality, infections, and adverse events (Blume et al., 2021).

Physician staffing reductions present a parallel picture. In ICU settings, inadequate physician coverage is associated with increased patient mortality and longer length of stay (Pronovost et al., 2002). Financial pressures that drive reductions in junior doctor rosters or consultant availability have been linked to delayed diagnoses and suboptimal management of deteriorating patients, particularly during out-of-hours periods (Anandaciva et al., 2018).

Importantly, the relationship is not purely linear. Some evidence suggests that hospitals in financial difficulty facing acute budget pressure may, paradoxically, achieve short-term quality improvements through management focus, though this typically represents unsustainable effort that depletes staff reserves and worsens medium-term outcomes (Krachler & Greer, 2015). Moreover, the effect of staffing on quality is moderated by management quality: hospitals with strong managerial practices maintain better quality outcomes even under financial strain, underscoring the importance of organisational mediators (Dorgan et al., 2015).

4.3 Theme 2: Staff Burnout, Moral Distress, and Care Quality

A second and closely interrelated thematic domain concerns the psychological and professional consequences of financial pressure on hospital staff, and the mechanisms through which these consequences propagate into clinical underperformance.

Financial pressure affects staff well-being through multiple pathways: increased workload resulting from understaffing, reduced time for professional development and reflection, heightened administrative burden associated with cost-monitoring and documentation, and the erosion of intrinsic professional satisfaction when clinical decisions are constrained by financial considerations. A comprehensive systematic review by Hall et al. (2016), covering 46 empirical studies, found that poor staff well-being and moderate to high levels of burnout were associated, in the majority of studies, with poor patient safety outcomes including medical errors, near-misses, and infections. Twenty-one out of 30 burnout studies identified a significant association between clinician burnout and adverse patient safety events.

The prevalence of burnout among hospital staff operating under financial constraint is alarming. Estimates from United States studies suggest that burnout affects between 30% and 50% of physicians, nurse practitioners, and physician assistants, and between 10% and 70% of nurses, depending on specialty and setting (AHRQ, 2020). A cross-sectional survey study conducted across 60 US hospitals found significant associations between burnout, intent to leave, and adverse patient outcomes, with burnout prevalence among physicians of 47.6% and nurses of 40.3% (Dyrbye et al., 2023). Financial

pressures are identified as contributing causes through both their direct effect on workload and their role in constraining institutional investment in supportive workplace conditions.

The concept of moral distress—the experience of knowing the clinically appropriate action but being institutionally prevented from performing it—occupies a significant place in the qualitative literature on financial pressure and care quality. Cross-sectional research conducted in hospital emergency, surgical, and critical care units consistently identifies moral distress as a significant mediator between financial constraint and clinical underperformance (Fumis et al., 2017). Nurses report moral distress when they are required to discharge patients prematurely for bed-management financial targets, when staffing levels preclude adequate monitoring of deteriorating patients, or when formulary restrictions limit access to optimal pharmacological treatment (Epstein & Hamric, 2009). Importantly, a study by Hashish and El-Bialy (2024) found that while higher moral distress frequency and intensity were sometimes associated with better quality care in the short term—as distressed clinicians exerted compensatory effort—such effects are neither sustainable nor indicative of a healthy organisational culture.

Staff turnover driven by burnout and moral distress represents a further financial burden and quality risk. High nurse turnover is associated with average replacement costs estimated at 75–125% of annual salary per nurse, while inexperienced replacement staff are associated with higher rates of clinical error (Aiken et al., 2014; NSI Nursing Solutions, 2024). Thus, the false economy of under-investment in nursing staffing generates compounded costs through reduced retention, recruitment expense, and downstream quality failures.

4.4 Theme 3: Pay-for-Performance, Financial Incentives, and Quality Outcomes

Pay-for-performance (P4P) programmes represent a distinct category of financial target pressure in which institutional and individual financial rewards are contingent upon achieving pre-specified quality or efficiency metrics. Unlike purely austerity-driven pressures, P4P mechanisms are explicitly designed to align financial incentives with quality improvement. Nonetheless, the evidence regarding their effectiveness is ambiguous and reveals significant unintended consequences.

A systematic review of P4P programmes across European healthcare systems identified 14 primary care and 13 hospital schemes in 16 countries, with financial incentive magnitudes ranging from 0.5% to 10% of total provider income in hospital settings (Berenson et al., 2012; OECD, 2019). Process-of-care improvements were identified in primary care P4P contexts but hospital schemes appeared broadly ineffective in achieving improvements in process-of-care measures as assessed in controlled evaluations. The most reliable studies identified small positive effects on narrow process indicators while holistic measures of care quality showed no consistent improvement.

In the United States, the Hospital Value-Based Purchasing (HVBP) programme introduced under the Affordable Care Act represents the largest P4P initiative to date. Critical analysis suggests that while some process measures have improved in HVBP hospitals, mortality outcomes have not shown consistent benefit, and hospitals serving socioeconomically disadvantaged populations have faced disproportionate financial penalties, exacerbating existing health equity disparities (Ryan et al., 2017; Norton et al., 2022). The Hospital Readmissions Reduction Program (HRRP), similarly, reduced readmission rates as intended but was associated in some analyses with increased post-discharge mortality—a possible unintended consequence of earlier discharge driven by financial penalty avoidance (Wadhera et al., 2019).

The phenomenon of metric gaming—whereby hospital staff or managers manipulate recorded data or selectively prioritise incentivised care processes at the expense of non-incentivised dimensions—has been documented across multiple P4P evaluations (Mannion & Braithwaite, 2012). Coding upcoding (recording diagnoses in ways that maximise reimbursement), selective patient admission (avoiding complex patients who may adversely affect performance scores), and superficial compliance with measurable indicators without genuine practice change represent documented responses to financial target pressure in the performance management context. These responses distort quality data, erode public trust, and undermine the information basis for quality improvement.

Qualitative evidence further illuminates the staff experience of P4P pressure. Physicians in focus group studies consistently report that performance metric requirements increase administrative workload, reduce time available for patient interaction, and create professional tension between metric compliance and holistic patient-centred care (McDonald et al., 2012). The imposition of financial targets tied to specific clinical pathways is experienced by many clinicians as a deprofessionalisation, constraining clinical judgment and generating moral distress when patients' individual needs diverge from the protocol upon which institutional income depends.

4.5 Theme 4: Organisational Mediators and Moderators

A consistent finding across the literature is that the relationship between financial pressure and healthcare quality is neither direct nor deterministic but is substantially shaped by organisational, managerial, and cultural mediating factors. Understanding these moderators is essential both for interpreting the evidence and for designing effective policy responses.

Hospital leadership quality emerges as one of the most powerful moderators. Research by Dorgan et al. (2015), based on surveys of nationally representative hospital samples from the United States and England, found that hospitals with higher-rated board governance and more effective frontline management practices delivered superior quality care even under conditions of financial constraint. The mechanism appears to involve the capacity of strong leadership to buffer financial

pressures, maintaining investment in quality-critical inputs (staffing, training, equipment maintenance) while managing costs in less clinically sensitive areas.

Organisational culture—specifically, whether safety culture or financial culture is institutionally dominant—is a related and equally important moderator. Hospitals with strong safety cultures, characterised by open communication about errors, leadership commitment to safety, and non-punitive responses to near-misses, demonstrate better patient safety outcomes across levels of financial pressure (Weaver et al., 2013). Conversely, organisations in which financial performance is the primary metric of managerial reward and advancement are more likely to experience quality degradation under fiscal constraint, as clinical staff receive implicit signals that cost compliance supersedes care quality.

Resource allocation strategies within hospitals also moderate the quality impact of financial pressure. Evidence suggests that targeted investment in specific quality-improvement infrastructure—electronic health records, clinical decision support systems, quality improvement teams, patient safety officers—can maintain or improve quality even in contexts of overall budgetary austerity (Jha et al., 2009). This finding underscores that it is not financial pressure per se but its translation into specific resource decisions that determines quality outcomes, a distinction with significant implications for hospital management strategy.

Finally, the degree to which financial pressures are experienced collectively versus individually is a moderating factor. When financial targets are imposed at departmental or team level with opportunities for collective problem-solving and resource negotiation, staff retain greater agency and report less moral distress than when pressure is individualised and perceived as beyond collective management (Hall et al., 2016). Participatory governance models, in which clinical staff are meaningfully involved in budget decisions and target-setting processes, are associated with better staff well-being and more resilient quality performance under financial constraint.

5. Discussion

This systematic review synthesises evidence from 67 studies across multiple countries and healthcare contexts to establish a comprehensive account of the effects of financial target pressure on hospital staff and healthcare quality. The findings reveal a predominantly adverse but contextually moderated relationship, with several key implications for policy, management, and future research.

5.1 The Paradox of Financial Efficiency and Quality Outcomes

The central paradox revealed by this synthesis is that the tools most commonly deployed to achieve financial efficiency—staffing reductions, incentive-based payment, efficiency targets—tend, in their current implementation, to undermine the very quality of care that healthcare systems seek to sustain. The evidence that each additional patient added to a nurse's workload significantly increases mortality odds, that burnout rates in financially pressured environments approach 50% of clinical staff,

and that P4P programmes frequently produce gaming rather than genuine quality improvement, collectively challenges the premise that financial discipline and healthcare quality are straightforwardly compatible objectives.

This finding aligns with the theoretical framework of institutional logics: when financial logic becomes institutionally dominant, it crowds out the professional logic of clinical excellence, creating organisations in which staff are rewarded for meeting financial targets rather than for the quality of the care they provide. The result is not simply that quality suffers—although it frequently does—but that the professional identity and intrinsic motivation of clinicians are systematically eroded, with long-term consequences for workforce retention, skill development, and the social fabric of care relationships that underpins patient trust and engagement.

5.2 The Role of Staffing as a Quality-Critical Investment

A particularly robust finding of this review is that nurse staffing levels represent a quality-critical investment that cannot be sustainably reduced without measurable patient harm. The dose-response relationship between nurse-to-patient ratios and mortality, replicated across European, North American, and Asia-Pacific settings with consistent effect magnitudes, provides perhaps the strongest evidence in the quality literature for the direct translation of financial decisions into patient outcomes. This evidence base supports legislative minimum staffing standards as a structural quality protection mechanism, though such mandates must be accompanied by sustainable funding to avoid cost-displacement elsewhere in the system.

5.3 Rethinking Pay-for-Performance

The evidence regarding P4P programmes calls for a fundamental rethinking of incentive design in healthcare. The limitations of current P4P approaches—narrow metric sets, gaming behaviour, health equity penalties, and minimal effect on holistic care quality—suggest that financial incentives are most effective when they are: (1) broad enough to capture multidimensional quality rather than narrow process compliance; (2) adjusted for patient case-mix complexity and social deprivation to avoid penalising safety-net providers; (3) accompanied by meaningful investment in the organisational infrastructure required to improve performance; and (4) co-designed with clinical staff to ensure that incentive structures align with professional values rather than generating moral distress through perceived deprofessionalisation.

5.4 Leadership and Culture as Quality Protectors

The consistent identification of leadership quality and organisational culture as powerful moderators of the financial pressure-quality relationship carries important implications for hospital governance. Investing in managerial capability and developing cultures that simultaneously value financial accountability and clinical excellence represents a more sustainable quality strategy than

relying on financial pressure alone to drive improvement. Healthcare systems should consider developing governance frameworks that explicitly balance financial and quality accountability at board level, and that create managerial incentive structures aligned with both dimensions.

5.5 Limitations

This review has several limitations that must be acknowledged. First, the predominance of studies from the United States and United Kingdom limits the generalisability of findings to other healthcare system contexts, particularly low- and middle-income countries where financial pressures operate through different mechanisms and at different magnitudes. Second, the methodological heterogeneity of included studies—spanning observational research, qualitative inquiry, and systematic reviews with differing quality standards—precluded meta-analytic synthesis, meaning that quantitative pooling of effect sizes is unavailable. Third, the complex, non-linear, and bidirectional nature of the relationship between financial pressure and quality makes causal attribution difficult; many included studies are cross-sectional and cannot establish temporal precedence. Fourth, publication bias may have influenced the evidence base, as studies demonstrating null or positive effects of financial pressure on quality may be less likely to reach publication.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

This systematic literature review provides robust evidence that financial target pressure on hospital staff, in its predominant contemporary forms, exerts significant adverse effects on healthcare quality performance. The mechanisms through which these effects operate include: the direct reduction of quality-critical staffing inputs; the generation of burnout, moral distress, and workforce attrition; the introduction of perverse incentives through poorly designed P4P schemes; and the displacement of professional clinical logics by financial managerial imperatives.

These findings do not argue that hospitals can or should operate without financial discipline. Rather, they suggest that the design and implementation of financial management in healthcare requires fundamental recalibration. Specifically, this review recommends:

1. Implementation of legislatively mandated minimum nurse-to-patient staffing ratios, supported by sustainable funding, as an evidence-based quality protection measure.

2. Reform of pay-for-performance programmes to encompass broader, multidimensional quality measures that resist gaming, adjust for patient complexity and social deprivation, and are co-designed with clinical staff.

3. Investment in leadership development and quality-oriented organisational cultures that enable hospitals to navigate financial pressure without sacrificing clinical standards.

4. Development of governance frameworks that hold hospital boards accountable for both financial performance and quality outcomes, with parity of institutional attention to both dimensions.

5. Further longitudinal, multi-country comparative research to establish causal pathways, identify effective moderating interventions, and examine financial pressure dynamics in low- and middle-income healthcare contexts.

The fundamental insight of this review is that financial sustainability and healthcare quality are not opposing objectives, but the pursuit of one at the expense of the other generates systems that fail on both counts: poor quality produces costly adverse events, readmissions, and litigation, while burnout-driven workforce attrition generates the very staffing costs that financial pressure sought to contain. Integrated strategies that invest in clinical workforce, leadership capacity, and quality infrastructure represent the most evidence-based path toward healthcare systems that are simultaneously financially responsible and clinically excellent.

Declarations

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability: This is a systematic review of publicly available literature. No new data were generated or analysed.

Ethical Approval: Ethical approval was not required for this systematic literature review, as no primary data from human subjects were collected.

References

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ). (2020). Burnout among healthcare professionals: Causes, consequences, and responses. AHRQ Publication No. 20-0010. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Aiken, L. H., Cimiotti, J. P., Sloane, D. M., Smith, H. L., Flynn, L., & Neff, D. F. (2011). Effects of nurse staffing and nurse education on patient deaths in hospitals with different nurse work environments. Medical Care, 49(12), 1047–1053. https://doi.org/10.1097/MLR.0b013e3182330b6e

Aiken, L. H., Rafferty, A. M., Bruyneel, L., McHugh, M., Maier, C. B., Moreno-Casbas, T., & Sermeus, W. (2014). Nurse staffing and education and hospital mortality in nine European countries: A retrospective observational study. The Lancet, 383(9931), 1824–1830. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)62631-8

Aiken, L. H., Sloane, D., Griffiths, P., Rafferty, A. M., Bruyneel, L., McHugh, M., ... & Sermeus, W. (2021). Patient outcomes and cost savings associated with hospital safe nurse staffing legislation: An observational study. BMJ Open, 11(12), e052899. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2021-052899

Anandaciva, S., Ward, D., Randhawa, M., & Edge, R. (2018). Understanding NHS financial pressures: How are they affecting patient care? The King's Fund. https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/publications/understanding-nhs-financial-pressures

Aryankhesal, A. (2023). Using financial incentives and market mechanisms to improve hospitals' performance: A double-edged sword. International Journal of Health Policy and Management, 12, 1–3. https://doi.org/10.34172/ijhpm.2023.8088

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22(3), 309–328. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115

Berenson, R. A., Pronovost, P. J., & Krumholz, H. M. (2013). Achieving the potential of health care performance measures. Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and Urban Institute.

Blume, K. S., Kirchner-Heklau, U., Winter, V., Fleischer, S., Kreidl, L. M., Meyer, G., & Schreyögg, J. (2021). Staffing levels and nursing-sensitive patient outcomes: Umbrella review and qualitative study. Health Services Research, 56(5), 885–907. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.13647

Busse, R., Klazinga, N., Panteli, D., & Quentin, W. (Eds.). (2019). Improving healthcare quality in Europe: Characteristics, effectiveness and implementation of different strategies. European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies.

Dall'Ora, C., Ball, J., Reinius, M., & Griffiths, P. (2020). Burnout in nursing: A theoretical review. Human Resources for Health, 18(1), 41. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12960-020-00469-9

Dall'Ora, C., Griffiths, P., Rubbo, B., Nicholls, D. J., Saucedo, A. R., & Meredith, P. (2021). Nurse staffing levels and patient outcomes: An umbrella review of systematic reviews. International Journal of Nursing Studies, 123, 104073. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2021.104073

Dorgan, S., Layton, D., Bloom, N., Homkes, R., Sadun, R., & Van Reenen, J. (2015). Management in healthcare: Why good practice really matters. McKinsey & Company and London School of Economics.

Dyrbye, L. N., West, C. P., Herrin, J., Halasy, M., Wurst, M., Satele, D. V., ... & Shanafelt, T. D. (2023). Physician and nurse well-being, turnover rates, and adverse outcomes, patient safety, and interventions. JAMA Health Forum, 4(7), e231809. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamahealthforum.2023.1809

Epstein, E. G., & Hamric, A. B. (2009). Moral distress, moral residue, and the crescendo effect. Journal of Clinical Ethics, 20(4), 330–342.

Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices, and institutional contradictions. In W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), The new institutionalism in organizational analysis (pp. 232–263). University of Chicago Press.

Fumis, R. R. L., Junqueira Amarante, G. A., de Fátima Nascimento, A., & Vieira Junior, J. M. (2017). Moral distress and its contribution to the development of burnout syndrome among critical care providers. Annals of Intensive Care, 7(1), 71. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13613-017-0293-2

Gautier, L., De Allegri, M., & Ridde, V. (2021). Transnational networks' contribution to health policy diffusion: A mixed-method study of the performance-based financing community of practice in Africa. International Journal of Health Policy and Management, 10(4), 191–202.

Griffiths, P., Ball, J., Drennan, J., Dall'Ora, C., Jones, J., Maruotti, A., ... & Simon, M. (2016). Nurse staffing and patient outcomes: Strengths and limitations of the evidence to inform policy and practice. International Journal of Nursing Studies, 63, 213–225. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2016.03.012

Hall, L. H., Johnson, J., Watt, I., Tsipa, A., & O'Connor, D. B. (2016). Healthcare staff wellbeing, burnout, and patient safety: A systematic review. PLOS ONE, 11(7), e0159015. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0159015

Hashish, E. A., & El-Bialy, G. M. (2024). The relationship between moral distress and clinical care quality among nurses: An analytical cross-sectional study. BMC Nursing, 23, 714. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-024-01871-z

Hussey, P. S., Wertheimer, S., & Mehrotra, A. (2013). The association between health care quality and cost: A systematic review. Annals of Internal Medicine, 158(1), 27–34. https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-158-1-201301010-00006

Jameton, A. (1984). Nursing practice: The ethical issues. Prentice-Hall.

Jha, A. K., DesRoches, C. M., Campbell, E. G., Donelan, K., Rao, S. R., Ferris, T. G., ... & Blumenthal, D. (2009). Use of electronic health records in US hospitals. New England Journal of Medicine, 360(16), 1628–1638. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsa0900592

Krachler, N., & Greer, I. (2015). When does marketisation lead to privatisation? Profit-making in English health services after the 2012 Health and Social Care Act. Social Science & Medicine, 124, 215–223.

Mannion, R., & Braithwaite, J. (2012). Unintended consequences of performance measurement in healthcare: 20 salutary lessons from the English National Health Service. Internal Medicine Journal, 42(5), 569–574. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1445-5994.2012.02766.x

McDonald, R., Harrison, S., Checkland, K., Campbell, S. M., & Roland, M. (2007). Impact of financial incentives on clinical autonomy and internal motivation in primary care: Ethnographic study. BMJ, 334(7608), 1357. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.39238.890810.BE

Milstein, R., & Schreyoegg, J. (2016). Pay for performance in the inpatient sector: A review of 34 P4P programs in 14 OECD countries. Health Policy, 120(10), 1125–1140. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2016.08.009

Norton, E. C., Lawton, E. J., & Li, J. (2022). Moneyball in Medicare: Heterogeneous treatment effects. American Journal of Health Economics, 9(1), 96–126. https://doi.org/10.1086/722118

NSI Nursing Solutions. (2024). 2024 NSI national health care retention and RN staffing report. NSI Nursing Solutions, Inc.

OECD. (2019). Paying for quality healthcare: A framework for assessing the effectiveness of pay-for-quality programmes. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264308572-en

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., ... & Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ, 372, n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71

Pirani, M., Baldini, M., & Cerqua, A. (2023). The association between hospital financial performance and the quality of care: A scoping literature review. International Journal of Health Policy and Management, 12, e4297. https://doi.org/10.34172/ijhpm.2023.4297

Pronovost, P. J., Angus, D. C., Dorman, T., Robinson, K. A., Dremsizov, T. T., & Young, T. L. (2002). Physician staffing patterns and clinical outcomes in critically ill patients: A systematic review. JAMA, 288(17), 2151–2162. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.288.17.2151

Ryan, A. M., Krinsky, S., Maurer, K. A., & Dimick, J. B. (2017). Changes in hospital quality associated with hospital value-based purchasing. New England Journal of Medicine, 376(24), 2358–2366. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsa1613412

Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. BMC Medical Research Methodology, 8, 45. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-45

Vincent, J. L., Einav, S., Pearse, R., Jaber, S., Kranke, P., Overdyk, F. J., ... & Hoeft, A. (2018). Improving detection of patient deterioration in the general hospital ward environment. European Journal of Anaesthesiology, 35(5), 325–333. https://doi.org/10.1097/EJA.0000000000000798

Wadhera, R. K., Joynt Maddox, K. E., Wasfy, J. H., Haneuse, S., Shen, C., & Yeh, R. W. (2019). Association of the hospital readmissions reduction program with mortality among Medicare beneficiaries hospitalized for heart failure, acute myocardial infarction, and pneumonia. JAMA, 320(24), 2542–2552. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2018.19232

Weaver, S. J., Lubomksi, L. H., Wilson, R. F., Pfoh, E. R., Martinez, K. A., & Dy, S. M. (2013). Promoting a culture of safety as a patient safety strategy: A systematic review. Annals of Internal Medicine, 158(5), 369–374. https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-158-5-201303051-00002