Abstract

Background: Currently, there is no validated Turkish language instrument to assess the Hand Hygiene Questionnaire.

Aims: This study determined the validity, structure and reliability of a Turkish translation of the Hand Hygiene Questionnaire scale in order to assess healthcare students’ belief and practices regarding hand hygiene and inform strategies to improve hand hygiene compliance.

Methods: The Content Validity Index, Confirmatory Factor Analysis and reliability statistics were employed. 595 nursing and physiotherapy students participated.

Results: The Content Validity Index ranged from 0.77–0.86. Cronbach’s alpha ranged from 0.74–0.95. The fit measures of the model using Confirmatory Factor Analysis were χ2(df)=1276.18(461), root mean squared error of approximation was 0.064, normed fit index was 0.95 and comparative fit index was 0.97.
Conclusions: This translation offers a reliable and valid means of assessing Turkish healthcare students' beliefs and practices regarding hand hygiene.
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Introduction

Healthcare-associated infection (HAI) increases patient morbidity, mortality and healthcare costs. For example, a matched case-control study of the outcomes of bloodstream-associated Staphylococcus aureus infection demonstrated an excess length of stay of 32 days, a seven-fold increased risk of dying, and healthcare costs around three times higher than for non-infected patients (1). One of the steps in the transmission of pathogens from healthcare workers' hands to patients is inadequate hand antisepsis (2). Thus, hand hygiene (HH) is considered an important, cost-effective and practical measure to reduce the incidence of HAI (3), and various studies have revealed that increased HH compliance by healthcare workers reduces HAI rates (2,4,5). Given the importance of HH, evidence-based guidelines have been published for specific HH measures related to healthcare (6). There is also a large body of literature focusing on health care providers' HH adherence, and factors that influence this (7,8).

As healthcare students go on to become the healthcare professionals of the future, information about factors that influence healthcare students' HH beliefs, knowledge and practices is also important. However, studies examining these factors among Turkish healthcare students are limited. For example, Celik and Koçaşli (9) examined the hand washing habits of Turkish nursing students via a questionnaire and found that 80.2% of students reported washing their hands before and after clinical interventions. However, the survey instrument did not undergo psychometric testing so the reliability of the results is unknown. While Ergin, et al. (10) examined Turkish medical and education students’ knowledge, practices and skills regarding
hand washing using a questionnaire, the study focused on hand washing in non-healthcare situations rather than healthcare-related hand washing and the reliability and validity of the survey instrument were not reported. Both studies also failed to examine HH using waterless alcohol-based hand rubs, which is considered best practice by the World Health Organization (WHO) in the 2009 report “WHO guidelines for hand hygiene in health care: First global patient safety challenge - clean care is safer care” (11).

Background and conceptual framework

One instrument that investigates healthcare students' HH knowledge, beliefs and practices is the ‘Hand Hygiene Questionnaire’ (HHQ), which was originally validated with Australian nursing students (12). The HHQ includes three scales (36 items): a ‘Hand Hygiene Beliefs’ scale (HBS) (19 items), a ‘Hand Hygiene Importance Scale’ (HIS) (3 items) and a ‘Hand Hygiene Practices Inventory’ (HHPI) (14 items). The HHPI and HBS include some items previously adapted from a ‘Handwashing Practices Inventory’ that was validated with general university students and subsequently applied to registered nurses (12). Responses are scored on a five point Likert scale (1 = “strongly disagree” to 5 = “strongly agree”) where high numbers indicate agreement with the item (12).

The questionnaire was developed using Social Cognitive Theory as a conceptual framework. Social Cognitive Theory explains how behaviour is learned, and is a comprehensive ‘ecological’ theory that looks at the impacts of social, environmental and individual factors on behaviour (13). Social Cognitive Theory explains the acquisition and maintenance of behaviours, but also provides a framework to develop interventional strategies to change those behaviours (13). It has also been suggested that various factors influence how behaviour is learned including the types of role models encountered, beliefs about the outcomes of behaviour and the value attached to these outcomes, the degree of self-efficacy and capacity to self-regulate, and the types of reinforcing factors that are encountered (14).

The HHQ has been translated into Greek, Italian and Swedish, and validated with nursing and medical students in those populations (15–17). However, there is no available instrument for the evaluation of similar parameters for healthcare students in Turkey. A reliable and valid tool is needed to measure Turkish health care students' hand hygiene beliefs and practices in order to inform educational strategies to improve healthcare students' HH compliance. Accordingly, the aim of this study was to translate the HBS, HHPI, and HIS into Turkish and to assess their validity and reliability with this population.

Methods

Study design
A cross-sectional design was used to conduct psychometric testing of a Turkish translation of the HHQ. The content validity and internal reliability parameters of the HBS, HHPI and HIS were analyzed using the Content Validity Index (CVI), Cronbach’s alpha, test-retest coefficients, item-to-total correlations, and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA).

**Setting and subjects**

The study was conducted with nursing and physiotherapy students in the School of Health Sciences at Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University (MSKU), Muğla, Turkey, during their free time in a classroom environment. In order to reduce the probability of making an error of inference when conducting factor analysis, Nunnally (18) suggested a ratio of 10 cases per scale item, while Comfrey and Lee (19) suggested that an overall sample size of 500 is very good, thus a convenience sample exceeding 500 students was sought. Students who had completed at least one semester of clinical practice were included in this study. All participation was voluntary and students’ responses were anonymous.

**Ethics consent**

Ethics approval was obtained from the MSKU Ethics Committee (20121227). To maintain confidentiality, a pseudonym was used for each participant. Participants were provided with a cover letter that addressed the purpose of the study. Volunteers completed a written consent form.

**Instrument translation and data collection**

The translation and evaluation process followed the WHO Process of Translation and Adaptation of Instruments (20). The HHQ scales were independently translated into Turkish by two authors (MSB, FB). The translations were carried out by these translators and two other bilingual health professionals. Back translation was completed by others (UT, ICK, OK) who were blind to the original version and who were native speakers of both Turkish and English. The latter application helps to ensure that the conceptual meanings of the original and translated versions are equivalent (21,22).

The authors, an experienced professional translator, and several health professionals formed a bilingual expert committee that reviewed both versions and afterwards reached consensus on any discrepancies. This process was followed by a cognitive debriefing, assessing the comprehensibility level and cognitive equivalence of the translation which was carried out by nursing students and academic staff, a total of 15 respondents.
Face validity is audience specific and refers to how well an instrument is understood and accepted by the audience. Turkish language experts were consulted regarding the intelligibility and simplicity of the questionnaire to determine face validity. The CVI four-point rating scale was used to rate the relevance, clarity and simplicity of the items which these respondents indicated independently using the following values: (1) “not relevant”, (2) “somewhat relevant”, (3) “quite relevant” and (4) “very relevant”. The CVI represented the proportion of total items rated as either quite or very relevant, and a CVI rating of 0.80 was considered valid (23). The expert committee additionally reviewed the debriefing results.

After translation, a two-part questionnaire was distributed that included demographic questions (age, gender, class, department, hand hygiene education and source of education), and the scales. The questionnaire was distributed to participants present at the beginning of courses and took ~20 minutes to complete. The completed questionnaires were collected by the researchers.

Data analysis

The analyses were conducted using SPSS 20.0 and the LISREL 8.54 program pack. Content validity was calculated using the Lawshe technique (24). Experts’ views were obtained on scale items. Following correction of items that lacked coherence, experts’ views were obtained again. Finally, Content Validity Indices (CVI) were calculated for both the total HHQ and sub-dimensions as described earlier.

Convergent validity was achieved by looking at the significance of the correlation coefficients provided in Table 1 in terms of same dimensions. To determine discriminant concurrent criterion validity, respondents’ scores were sorted from small to large, 27% of the first and last scores were compared, and an analysis was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference between them.

The homogeneity of the scales was assessed using Cronbach’s alpha and item-to-total score correlations. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of 0.7 or above and item-to-total correlations above 0.25 indicate acceptable internal consistency while a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of 0.8 or above is considered good (25,26). Since there is no Turkish study on validity and reliability in relation to the HHQ, in order to examine the stability of the scale in the study, test–retest methods were used instead of parallel form reliability (27). In order to assess test–retest reliability, volunteers were asked to complete the questionnaire again two weeks later as done during its original application (12). A Pearson's correlation was used to define the test-retest coefficient (28).
Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was used in this study to determine construct validity as it examines relationships between each item and how they belong to the sub-dimensions (23). Floor–ceiling effects were examined respectively for the dimensions in the study. Floor–ceiling effects occur when > 15% of students respond with a lowest or highest score, making it difficult to assess students’ level of ability (29).

Results

There were 595 participants, two thirds of whom were female. One hundred percent of students given the survey responded. The power of the sample was 98%. The age range of participants was 18–34 years (21.4 ± 2.02), 86.6% of the participants were in the nursing department, 28% were in their fourth year and 27.7% were in their third year. It was determined that 97.8% of the students had been educated on HH, and 97.6% of the students had received education related to HH during their university education.

The scales were determined to have face validity as the experts agreed that the number of questions was acceptable, the sequence of the questions seemed reasonable, and the survey was both understandable and simple. The CVI of the HHQ was 0.8, and ranged from 0.77 to 0.86 for the sub-dimensions (Table 1). Convergent validity was examined in terms of the significance of the correlation coefficients. The results showed that each of the three dimensions as a pair of the scale obtained correlation coefficients among themselves in positive ways. This result suggests that change in a sub-dimension will affect the whole of the scale. This will increase the overall score of the HHQ scale. The obtained correlation coefficients between each scale of the three pairs of them were positive. This result is also an improvement given that the others occurring on any scale effect will be positive. This will enable the general score of the HHQ scale to increase. The analysis for discriminant concurrent criterion validity found a significant difference (t = -44.349, P = 0.000), demonstrating the constructs that theoretically should not be related to one another were not related.

The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of the scales ranged from 0.74–0.95, the mean item-to-total correlations ranged from 0.27 to 0.73, and two-week test-retest values ranged from 0.51–0.61 (Table 1). The item correlation was statistically significant (Sig. = 0.000 < 0.05). The scale means (±sem) were: HBS 3.87 (±0.39), HHPI 4.71 (±0.39), and HIS: 4.60 (±0.57) (Table 1). Item means for each scale are shown in Table 2.

Table 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean (±SEM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HBS</td>
<td>3.87 (±0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHPI</td>
<td>4.71 (±0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIS</td>
<td>4.60 (±0.57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Table 3
Construct validity was examined using CFA. The fit measures of the model were $\chi^2(\text{df}) = 1276.18(461)$, root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA) = 0.064, normed fit index (NFI) = 0.95 and comparative fit index (CFI) = 0.97. RMSEA values of less than 0.08 are considered to indicate good models as are CFI values of greater than 0.9 and NFI values of 0.95 or above (30), thus the model was considered to be appropriate. Standardized coefficients of the model are presented in Figure 1. According to these results, both the sub-dimensions and the total scale were quite valid. Analysis of our students' score distributions demonstrated that there was no floor–ceiling effect for the HBS (both 0.16%). A ceiling effect was encountered in both dimensions (41% and 53%, respectively) while no floor effect was observed for the HHPI and HIS (both 0.16%). However, no problematic questions were encountered in these dimensions. Interpretation should be made considering ceiling effect in these dimensions for this reason. However, there is no floor or ceiling effect for all of the scales.

Discussion

This study determined the reliability and validity of the Turkish translation of the HHQ with nursing and physiotherapy students. The internal consistency and validity of the final scales were satisfactory to excellent in this study, with the exception of the test–retest stability values. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients in this study (0.74–0.95) compared well with those of the original pilot version (0.74–0.80), and the Handwashing Practices Inventory (HPI) (0.76) (12), and all coefficients were at levels considered adequate to excellent.

The item-to-total correlations were 0.27, 0.63 and 0.73 for the HBS, HHPI and HIS, compared to those reported for the original scales, which were 0.37, 0.33 and 0.61, respectively (12); while the first of our values is lower the other two are higher, however, all values are within acceptable levels (2,30).

The mean scores we calculated [HBS: 3.87 (±0.39), HHPI: 4.71 (±0.39) and HIS: 4.60 (±0.57)] are similar to those reported in the original study 3.88 (±0.06), 4.76 (±0.03), and 4.29 (±0.10) (12). The mean HHPI score is also similar to that obtained on the HPI (4.45) (12). Interestingly, the mean score of respondents on the previous original HPI was considerably lower (3.58). However, that sample was obtained from general university students rather than healthcare students, which may indicate the impact of health education on students' perceptions of hand hygiene, as mentioned in the study by van de Mortel (12). Based on the results of the CVI, reliability tests, and the CFA, the scales were deemed acceptable.
The study had several limitations. Firstly, only nursing and physical therapy students were included in this study. As the medical faculty was newly established as the time of the study, medical students had not yet attended clinical placement and therefore were not included as participants. Secondly, according to Yaghmaie (31) there is no completely objective method to determine content validity. Calculation of a CVI relies on the professional subjective judgement of a panel of experts, which again is influenced by the interpretation of individuals. However, having a number of experts on the panel helps to overcome the subjective nature of the decision-making process. Thirdly, the test–retest results for the HBS, HHPI and HIS (0.51–0.6) were lower than the original values (0.79–0.89) reported by van de Mortel (12). However, Carmines and Zeller (32) and DeVellis RF (33) suggested that a low test–retest correlation may not indicate that the reliability of the test is low but may indicate a true change has occurred in attitudes.

Multiple factors may influence test–retest stability. For example, the participant may learn from their first experience to modify the way they complete the items on the retest, or intervening experience or knowledge acquired by completing the test items or during the test–retest interval can cause them to change their attitudes, as can changes in environmental conditions that influence performance at time one versus time two (32,34). Given some of the participants had not previously received HH education, it is possible that completing the scale items stimulated learning or attitude changes that were reflected in their responses on the second attempt. Finally, Trinic et al. (35) indicate that while factor analysis can identify patterns of covariation, it cannot provide an explanation for why responses covary. The interpretation relies on the researcher, which introduces the potential for subjective decisions.

Conclusion

The Turkish version of the HHQ demonstrated acceptable validity and reliability and thus provides a means of better understanding the HH practices and beliefs of Turkish nursing and physiotherapy students. Use of the validated instrument to examine these practices and beliefs will provide data to guide interventional strategies to improve the compliance of healthcare students with published hand hygiene guidelines. Further testing in a wider range of healthcare disciplines is needed to confirm these results.
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