PHS Scientific House

International Journal of Pharma Research and Health Sciences

Available online at www.pharmahealthsciences.net



Original Article

Assessment of the Knowledge, Attitude and Practices Regarding Hand Hygiene amongst the Healthcare Workers in a Tertiary Health Care Centre

Ansari SK¹, Gupta P^{1,*}, Jais M¹, Nangia S², Gogoi S¹, Satia S¹, Raza MW³

¹ Department of Microbiology, Lady Hardinge Medical College &Associated Hospitals, India.

² Department of Paediatrics, Lady Hardinge Medical College &Associated Hospitals, India.

3 Department of Radiotherapy, AIIMS, New Delhi, India

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 10 Jun 2015 Accepted: 28 Jun 2015 Introduction: Hand hygiene is an important strategy to prevent health care-associated infections (HAI) and limits the transmission of microorganisms. Poor hand hygiene practices are a major threat and pose a huge risk to the health of the patients. Objective: We compared the level of knowledge attitude and practice regarding hand hygiene among doctors and nurses. Results: Training sessions were conducted for 100 healthcare workers (56 doctors and 44 nurses) and their assessment for knowledge, attitude and practice was done throughpretest andposttest questionnaire. There was a significant improvement in the KAP score for both doctors and nurses after the training sessions. Doctors have better knowledge of hand hygiene. Although nursing staff have relatively less knowledge about the hand hygiene, but a good percentage of this category has a positive attitude and follows the correct practicing habits. WHO recommends alcohol based hand rub (ABHR) for hand antisepsis as it is fast acting and has broad spectrum antimicrobial activity. In our study, most of the doctors still believe that soap and water is the best way of hand hygiene. Nurses were found to be more aware about ABHR as best method. Discussion & Conclusion: Overall, level of awareness regarding the importance of hand hygiene and WHOs five moments of hand hygiene is low in both doctors and nurses and there is a need of regular training sessions and monitoring of hand hygiene compliance under strict supervision. Keywords: Hand hygiene, Healthcare associated infections, Knowledge, Attitude, Practices

ABSTRACT

Corresponding author * Dr Poonam Gupta, Department of Microbiology, Lady Hardinge Medical College, New Delhi 110001, India. Email: drpoonamgupta@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Implementation and adherence to hand hygiene practices in a healthcare facility can prevent health care-associated infections (HAI) and limit the transmission of microorganisms, including multidrug resistant pathogens. It is a required practice for all health care providers and is recommended in all P Gupta et al.

national and international infection control guidelines and is a basic expectation of patients and their families. Hand hygiene is one of the five key initiatives set out by the World Alliance for Global Patient Safety Challenges¹.

Over the years, there has been massive advancement in the health care system but it is strange that health-care settings, which restore and maintain health, also threaten patient's health. One major hazard arises from poor hand hygiene practices, which poses a huge risk not only to the health of the patients but also to the health care professionals ².

The total number of hand exposures in a hospital may range from several tens to thousands per day. With each hand-to-surface exposure a two directional exchange of microorganisms occurs between hands and the touched object and the transient hand-carried flora is thus continuously changing. Most of the healthcare workers hand flora gradually gets replaced by pathogenic microorganisms, which can spread throughout a health care environment in a short span of time.

Hand hygiene in the health care setting has been encouraged for generations and is recommended as the single most important procedure for preventing the transmission of infection.

2. MATERIAL & METHODS

Our hospital is a 1247 bedded tertiary care hospital in Delhi providing out-patient, in-patient and intensive care services. We have a dedicated infection control team including five infection control nurses to assess and record the current infection control practices, fill existing gaps through training and continuous review of procedures to address new issues.

Training sessions were conducted for all Health care workers in different categories including doctors and nurses by the Microbiology departments. A predesigned questionnaire was given to all. These sessions Volume 3 (3), 2015, Page-720-726

were completed over a period of three months (January 2015- March 2015). First, a pretest questionnaire was given to all participants to evaluate their base line knowledge about hand hygiene practices. The first presentation focussed on the Overview and WHO guidelines for Hand Hygiene: Techniques. The second presentation focused on the Monitoring of hand hygiene and Innovations. The Implementation of Action Plan for Hand Hygiene improvement was discussed in the third presentation which was followed by a discussion on Hand Hygiene practices in India. In the group activity, demonstration of Glogerm, smart app, preparation of in house Hand rub and various types of Hand Hygiene products and dispensers were shown.

After the presentation a posttest evaluation was conducted in questionnaire format. This questionnaire consisted of twenty questions of one mark each. Questionnaire was assessed in three parts depicting response to Knowledge, Attitude and Practices (Table 2, 3 and 4). Questionnaire for doctors and nurses were similar. KAP score assessment was done which is shown in table 1. On the basis of their performance, each participant was given a KAP score. A KAP score of 1-9 was considered poor, 10-14 as fair; 15-18 as good and above 18 as excellent. On the basis of these scores, all the participants were graded as Excellent, good, satisfactory and unsatisfactory.

Statistical testing was conducted with the statistical package for the social sciencesystem version SPSS 16.0 (Chicago, IL, USA) and Microsoft Word and Excel were used for generation of tables and graphs. Categorical variables were analyzed using either the chi square test or Fisher's exact test. For all statistical tests, p value less than 0.05 was taken to indicate a significant difference.

3. RESULTS

P Gupta et al.

Training sessions were conducted for 100 healthcare workers (56 doctors and 44 nurses) and their assessment for knowledge, attitude and practice was done throughpretest andposttest questionnaire. KAP Score was calculated which is shown in table 1.

Table 1: Assessment of KAP scores among doctors and nurses.

KAP score(0-	Pre	test	Posttest) Doctors(n=56) Nurses(n=44)				
20)	Doctors(n=56)	Nurses(n=44)					
Excellent	0(0)	0(0)	2(3.5)	0(0)			
Good	4(7.1)	1(2.2)	26(46.4)	20(45.5)			
Satisfactory	10(17.8)	14(31.8)	15(26.7)	16(36.4)			
Unsatisfactory	42(75)	20(45.4)	13(23.2)	8(18.2)			

(Figures in parenthesis shows percentage)

There was a significant improvement in the KAP score for both doctors and nurses.

Table 2 shows response to knowledge based questions among healthcare workers. Knowledge about World Hand Hygiene Day, Electronic monitoring system was significantly higher among doctors in pre test evaluation. Similarly, nurses were more aware about hand hygiene methods best at killing bacteria, global hand washing day and WHO 5 moments of hand hygiene.

S. No.	Question	Response	Pretes	st (%)	р	Postte	st (%)	р
			Doctors	Nurse	s	Doctors	Nurse	5
1	World Hand	5 th May	71.4	27.3	0.001	85.7	81.8	0.727
	Hygiene Day	15th October	14.3	36.4		7.1	18.2	
		1 st May	14.3	18.2		7.1	0	
		1 st December	0	18.2		0	0	
2	Which hand hygiene	Plain soap and water	78.6	36.4	0.001	35.7	27.3	0.791
	method is	Antimicrobial	7.1	9.1		0	9.1	
	best at killing bacteria	soap and water						
		Alcohol	14.3	54.5		64.3	63.6	
		based hand						
		rub (ABHR)						
		None	0	0		0	0	
3	All of the	Ethanol 70%	42.9	18.2	0.112	7.1	9.1	0.049
	following are required to	Isopropyl alcohol 99%	7.1	27.3		78.6	54.5	
	prepare hand	Ethanol 80%	0	0		0	0	
	rub	Isopropyl alcohol 70%	50	54.5		14.3	36.4	
4	Which of the	Moment 1 &	42.9	63.6	0.025	14.3	45.5	0.007
	following	2						
	U	Moment 2 &	28.6	27.3		78.6	45.5	
	not captured	3						
	by electronic monitoring	Moment 1&	21.4	0		7.1	0	

			Volu	me 3 (3), 201	5, Pag	ge-720	-726
	system?	Moment 3 & 4	7.1	9.1		0	9.1	
5	following is	Measurement of product	7.1	0	0.053	0	0	0.001
	considered as Gold standard for	usage Direct Observation	42.9	27.3		92.9	45.5	
	determining	of HCW's						
	Hand Hygiene	Observation by patient	7.1	18.2		0	18.2	
	Compliance?	• •	42.9	54.5		7.1	36.4	
6	All are the disadvantages	Time consuming	7.1	18.2	0.205	7.1	9.1	0.006
	of direct observation	Provide low hand hygiene	28.6	9.1		14.3	0	
	method for monitoring	opportunity Expensive	21.4	9.1		14.3	0	
	for hand	Avoid	42.9	63.6		64.3	90.9	
	hygiene complex except	Hawthrone effect						
7	Global hand	5 th May	85.7	36.4	0.001	50	27.3	0.007
	washing day	15th October	14.3	45.5		50	63.6	
		1 st May	0	18.2		0	9.1	
		1st December	0	0		0	0	
8	All are part of the WHO 5 Moments	Before touching a patient	0	18.2	0.001	0	0	0.02
	except	After body fluid exposure risk	7.1	27.3		7.1	18.2	
		After touching a	0	9.1		0	9.1	
		patient Before touching patient files	35.7	36.4		78.6	63.6	
		After touching patient surroundings	57.1	9.1		14.3	9.1	

During post test evaluation, level of knowledge significantly increased in both doctors and nurses about preparation of hand rub, electronic monitoring system, gold standard method for hand hygiene compliance and disadvantages of direct observation method for monitoring.

Table 3 shows results of attitude based questions which were five in number. During pretest evaluation most of the doctors were aware about the most important reason for HCW to practice good hand hygiene. 100% doctors answered correctly that after coming in contact with a patient on isolation, visitors are encouraged to perform hand hygiene upon leaving the patient's room. P Gupta et al.

Post education responses significantly improved in

both doctors and nurses.

Table 3: Response to Attitude based questions

S. No.	-	Response			р	Posttest		р
190.			(%) Doctors	Nure		(%) Doctors	Nurco	-
			Doctors	es		Doctors	s	
1	In a facility	Introducing	0		0.299	0	18.2	0.718
	where hand	-						
	hygiene	Improvement						
	Improvemen	activity						
	t	Base line	92.9	27.3		50	27.3	
	programme	evaluation						
	has to be	Facility	0	36.4		42.9	45.5	
	initiated	preparedness						
		Developing a	7.1	9.1		7.1	9.1	
	-	plan for next						
2	is:	5 year	0	0.1	0.001	0	0.1	0.050
2	What is the		0	9.1	0.001	0	9.1	0.056
	single most							
	important reason for	soiling from hands						
	healthcare	To prevent	0	9.1		7.1	18.2	
	workers to	transfer of	0	7.1		7.1	10.2	
		bacteria from						
	*	the home to						
	hygiene?							
		To prevent	0	18.2		7.1	0	
		transfer of						
		bacteria from						
		the hospital						
		to the home						
		To prevent	100	63.6		85.7	72.7	
		infections						
		that patients						
		acquire in						
		the hospital.						
3	Hand	1 month	42.9	54.5	0.186	28.6	36.4	0.261
	hygiene	3 months	57.1	0		71.4	36.4	
	compliance	6 months	0	27.3		0	18.2	
	monitoring	12 months	0	18.2		0	9.1	
	in high risk							
	areas should							
	be done at							
	least once in							
4	How much	15 minutes	7.1	0	0.515		0	0.029
	time would		21.4	18.2		21.4	9.1	
		1 hour	57.1	72.7		64.3	81.8	
	nurse save	2.5 hours	8	9.1		7.1	0	
	during an							
	eight hour							
	shift by							
	using an							
	alcohol-							
	based hand							
	rub instead							
	of soap and							
5	water After	Woor alarra	0	0	0.001	0	Δ	0 001
5		Wear gloves	0	0	0.001	0	0	0.001
	-	before eating						
		or handling food						
	a patient on isolation,	Leave the	0	27.2		0	180	
	visitors are	facility to	0	27.3		0	18.2	
	encouraged	-						
	encouraged	prevent						

		Volume 3 (3), 2015, Page-720-726					
to	contaminatio n of others. Perform	100	72.7	100	81.8		
	hand hygiene upon leaving the patient's room.	100	12.1	100	01.0		
	Use an empty room to talk with family members.	0	0	0	0		
	members.						

Table 4 depicts responses to practice based questions. Nurses were more aware about practical questions like which method is recommended in case of soiled hands, best method for hand hygiene, time duration when washing hands with soap and water.

Table 4: Response to practice based questions

S. No.	Question	Response	Pretest		р	Posttest		р
			Doctors	Nurses		Doctors]	Nurse	s
1	All of the	Donning	42.9	36.4	0.299	28.6	27.3	0.00
	following	gloves on wet						
	leads to	hand						
	skin	Use of hot	0	0		0	0	
	irritation	water for hand						
	except	wash						
		Patting skin	57.1	0		71.4	27.3	
		with clean						
		towel after						
		hand wash						
		Washing hand	0	63.6		0	45.5	
		regularly						
		before or after						
		hand rub						
2	Irritant	Iodophores	35.7	27.3	0.001			0.06
	contact	Chlorhexidine	7.1	9.1		7.1	9.1	
	dermatitis	Chlroxylenol	0	9.1		0	9.1	
	is seen	Alcohol based	92.9	54.5		42.9	54.5	
	most	product						
	commonly							
2	in	C1.1 . 1 . 1.	0	0	0.100	0	0	0.00
3		Chlorhexidine	0	0	0.186	0	0	0.09
	soiled hand		0	0		14.2	0	
	which one	ABHR	0	0		14.3	0	
	is preferred	Soap and water	7.1	72.7		57.1	63.6	
		Both b and c	92.9	27.3		28.6	36.4	
4	Best	Soap and	92.9 100		0.515			0.00
4	method for	· ·	100	21.5	0.515	50	10.2	0.00
	hand	Alcohol based	0	72.7		50	81.8	
	hygiene	hand rub	0	12.1		50	01.0	
	nygiciic	Antimicrobial	0	0		0	0	
		soap	0	Ū		0	0	
		Plain water	0	0		0	0	
5	How long	5 seconds	7.1	0	0.001		0	0.57
-	U	10-20 seconds	14.3	Ő		7.1	0	
	2	20-30 seconds	57.1	27.3		14.3	27.3	
	2	40-60 seconds.		72.7		71.4	72.7	
	together for							
	when							
	washing							

ungloved with soap and hands water. come in Use an 28.6 0 14.3 0 contact alcohol-based with the hand cleaner. drainage Rinse them 28.6 63.6 21.4 54.5 from the and use the patient's alcohol-based wound. To hand cleaner. clean your Wipe them 0 0 0 0	ΡC	Gupta et al							
6YourWash them42.936.40.02264.345.50.0unglovedwith soap andwater.0 </td <td></td> <td>with soap</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		with soap							
ungloved with soap and hands water. come in Use an 28.6 0 14.3 0 contact alcohol-based with the hand cleaner. 0 0 14.5 14.5 drainage Rinse them 28.6 63.6 21.4 54.5 54.5 from the and use the patient's alcohol-based 0 0 0 0 wound. To hand cleaner. 0 0 0 0		and water?							
handswater.come inUse an28.6014.30contactalcohol-basedwith thehand cleaner.drainageRinse them28.663.621.454.5from theand use thepatient'salcohol-basedwound. Tohand cleaner.clean yourWipe them000	6	Your	Wash them	42.9	36.4	0.022	64.3	45.5	0.01
come inUse an28.6014.30contactalcohol-basedwith thehand cleaner.drainageRinse them28.663.621.454.5from theand use thepatient'salcohol-basedwound. Tohand cleaner.clean yourWipe them000		ungloved	with soap and						
contactalcohol-basedwith thehand cleaner.drainageRinse them28.663.621.454.5from theand use thepatient'salcohol-basedwound. Tohand cleaner.clean yourWipe them00000		hands	water.						
with the hand cleaner.drainageRinse them and use the patient's alcohol-based wound. To hand cleaner. clean your21.4 S4.554.5from the and use the and use the patient's alcohol-based wound. To based o0		come in	Use an	28.6	0		14.3	0	
drainageRinse them28.663.621.454.5from theand use thepatient'salcohol-basedwound. Tohand cleaner.clean yourWipe them000		contact	alcohol-based						
from the and use the patient's alcohol-based wound. To hand cleaner. clean your Wipe them 0 0 0 0		with the	hand cleaner.						
patient's alcohol-based wound. To hand cleaner. clean your Wipe them 0 0 0 0		drainage	Rinse them	28.6	63.6		21.4	54.5	
wound. To hand cleaner. clean your Wipe them 0 0 0 0		from the	and use the						
clean your Wipe them 0 0 0 0		patient's	alcohol-based						
		wound. To	hand cleaner.						
1 1 14		clean your	Wipe them	0	0		0	0	
hands you with a paper		hands you	with a paper						
should towel.		should	towel.						
7 How long 5 seconds 0 9.1 0.252 0 9.1 0.41	7	How long	5 seconds	0	9.1	0.252	0	9.1	0.413
should you 10-20 seconds 57.1 54.5 71.4 63.6		should you	10-20 seconds	57.1	54.5		71.4	63.6	
use 20-30 seconds 42.9 36.4 28.6 27.3		use	20-30 seconds	42.9	36.4		28.6	27.3	
ABHR? 40-60 seconds. 0 0 0 0		ABHR?	40-60 seconds.	0	0		0	0	

4. DISCUSSION

The participants involved in this study were assessed for knowledge, attitude and practice of hand hygiene. Interestingly, this study revealed that the awareness and proper practice of hand hygiene was not satisfactory in the pretest evaluation. There was significant difference in the pretest and posttest responses. Posttest evaluation after the educational training program, both the groups showed significant improvement.

The comparison of Knowledge, with Attitude and practice of groups showed that the people with higher education, as doctors have better knowledge of hand hygiene. This can be attributed to their accountability, commitment in patient and ward management. Although nursing staff have relatively less knowledge about the hand hygiene, but a good percentage of this category has a positive attitude and follows the correct practicing habits. Nurses had greater practical skills regarding hand hygiene. Their response to practice based questions were better than doctors. Similar findings have been reported in other studies ^{3, 4}.

Average KAP score for both doctors and nurses was between 10 and 15. In a study done in India in an ICU of a multispeciality hospital showed higher level of awareness (90%) about hand hygiene ⁵. Ariyaratre reported that 72% unhygienic hands of HCW were main route of transmission of infection ⁶ whereas a study done in Cairo in Elgalia Government hospital showed good level of knowledge in 73% of HCWs⁷.

Doctors had better level of knowledge as compared to nurses. Nurses had a positive attitude towards Hand hygiene. Many studies have shown similar findings ⁽⁸⁾. A study done in Cairo, 96% nurses showed positive attitude ⁹ and in Italy were 86% HCP in ICU showed positive attitude.

WHO recommends ABHR for hand antisepsis as it is fast acting and has broad spectrum antimicrobial activity. In our study, most of the doctors still believe that soap and water is the best way of Hand hygiene. Nurses were found to be more aware about ABHR as best method. This could be because of low level of awareness and lack of availability of ABHR. Similar finding is seen in many studies ^{10, 11, 12, 13}. Study conducted in Emergency unit of Royal Infirmary in UK in which the nurses had a better Hand hygiene practice than doctors ¹⁴ whereas UPTH study says that doctors have better hand hygiene practice than nurses ¹⁰.

5. CONCLUSION

In the present study, we have observed that level of awareness regarding the importance of hand hygiene and WHOs five moments of hand hygiene is low in both doctors and nurses. A single training session is not sufficient for effective and complete practice of hand hygiene. There is a need for refresher training programs at regular time interval to repeatedly train and re-train all the staff with special importance to the new comers. All the newcomers including doctors, nursing staff and students must be trained on joining. There is also a need for orientation programs for the newcomers to understand the significance of hand hygiene. It is better to include hand hygiene practices in the academic curriculum of medical and nursing students. Clean hands are the single most important factor in preventing the spread of pathogens and

Volume 3 (3), 2015, Page-720-726

P Gupta et al.

antibiotic resistance in healthcare settings. Hand hygiene reduces the incidence of healthcare associated infections.

This is a questionnaire based study and one major limitation is that we have not calculated the actual hand hygiene compliance rate. In general adherence of HCW regarding hand hygiene procedures is poor. Studies show overall adherence rates which averaged about 40%. Very few Indian data is available on the hand hygiene compliance. Eighty five percent of HAI are due to poor hand hygiene practices. Therefore, there is a need to raise the awareness about hand hygiene practices among HCWs. We recommend monitoring of hand hygiene compliance under strict supervision and regular surveillance should be done in day-to-day hospital activities.

6. REFERENCES

- Mazi W, Senok AC, Al-Kahldy S, Abdullah D. Implementation of the world health organization hand hygiene improvement strategy in critical care units. Antimicrobial Resistance and Infection Control. 2013; 2:15
- WHO Guidelines on Hand Hygiene in Health Care. Available at: www.who.int/gpsc/5may/.../who_guidelineshandhygiene_summary.
- JB Suchitra, N Lakshmi Devi. Impact of education on knowledge, attitudes and practices Among various categories of health care workers on Nosocomial infections. Indian Journal of Medical Microbiology.2007; 25 (3):181-7
- Maheshwari V, Kaore NCM, Ramnani VK, Gupta SK, Borle A, Kaushal R. A Study to Assess Knowledge and Attitude Regarding Hand Hygiene amongst Residents and Nursing Staff in a Tertiary Health Care Setting of Bhopal City. Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research. 2014 ;8(8): DC04-DC07

- Raman S, Meenakshi S, Vipin K. Hand washing compliance among healthcare staff in intensive care unit of a Multispecialty hospital of north India. J Hosp Administration 2012; 1(2):27-33.
- Ariyaratne MHJD, Gunasekara TDCP, Weerasekara MM, J Kottahachchi J, Kudavidanage BP, Fernando SSN. Knowledge, attitudes and practices of hand hygiene among final year medical and nursing students at the University of Sri Jayewardenepura. Sri lankan Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2013; 3(1):15-25.
- AbdElaziz KM, Bakr IM. Assessment of knowledge attitude and practice of hand-washing among healthcare workers in Ain Shams University Hospital Cairo. The Egyptian Journal of Community Medicine 2008; 26:50-54.
- Nobile C, Diac E, Mantuori P, Villari P. Healthcare personnel and hand washing. Decontamination in intensive care units: knowledge, attitude and behavior in Italy. J Hosp Infect 2002; 51(3):226-232.
- Rumgay S, Macdonald S, Robertson CE. Hand washing pattern and infection control in the accident/emergency department. Arch Emerg Med 1984; 1(3):157-159.
- Balafama A, Opara P. Hand-washing practices amongst health workers in a teaching hospital. Am J Infect Dis 2011; 7(1): 8-15.
- AnarghV,Singh MH, Kulkarni A, Kotwal A, Mahen A. Hand hygiene practices among health care workers (HCWs) in a tertiary care facility in Pune. Medical journal armed forces India .2013;69: 54 -56
- 12. Shinde MB, Mohite VR. A Study to Assess Knowledge, Attitude and Practices of Five Moments of Hand Hygiene among Nursing Staff and Students at a Tertiary Care Hospital at Karad. IJSR. 2014; 3(2):34-39

HanumantappaR,HiremathSG,SirajMA,Raghunath P. Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice of Hand Hygiene among Medical and Nursing Students at a Tertiary Health Care Centre in Raichur, India. ISRN Preventive MedicineVolume 2014; 608927: 4

 Rumgay S, Macdonald S, Robertson CE. Hand washing pattern and infection control in the accident/emergency department. Arch Emerg Med 1984; 1(3):157-159.

Conflict of Interest: None Source of Funding: Nil