A study to assess the level of knowledge and practice regarding nosocomial infections among Healthcare workers of GMCH-32.

Ms.Rinku Mehmi (Guide) College of Nursing, GMCH 32, Chandigarh.

Dr. Preeti Chaudhary (Assistant Professor) (Co-Guide) Department of Microbiology, Government Medical College and Hospital sector-32 Chandigarh.

Ms. Rupinder Kaur (Co-Guide) College of Nursing, GMCH 32, Chandigarh.

Harleen Kaur, B.Sc. Nursing 4th year, College of Nursing, GMCH 32, Chandigarh.

Harman Kaur, B.Sc. Nursing 4th year, College of Nursing, GMCH 32, Chandigarh.

Harmanjit Kaur, B.Sc. Nursing 4th year, College of Nursing, GMCH 32, Chandigarh.

Iksha Katoch, B.Sc. Nursing 4th year, College of Nursing, GMCH 32, Chandigarh.

Abstract:

Introduction : Nosocomial infections also referred to as Healthcare associated infections, these are the infections acquired during the process of receiving health care that were not present at the time of admission. Present study was conducted to assess the knowledge and practice regarding nosocomial infections among healthcare workers.

Material and Methods: A descriptive study design was considered for the study and 90 healthcare workers were recruited by convenient sampling techniques. A prevalidated self structured questionnaire was used to assess the knowledge and WHO Handwashing checklist was used to assess the practice. Research data was collected during 6 months time period.

Result: The findings of the study revealed that maximum healthcare workers (95.56%) had good knowledge with (4.44%) had average knowledge with no one having poor knowledge. Maximum healthcare workers(88.89%) had good practice (11.11%) having poor practice.

Conclusion: The following conclusions were drawn from the study. In the present study 90 subjects participated. The findings of the study reveal that the knowledge of health Care workers regarding infections was 95.6% good ,4.4% average and 0.0% poor for 90 samples. The analysis of the research shows that majority of demographic variables like Age, residence, type of family, religion, educational status of parents and monthly income of family had no statistical significance at the level of p < 0.05.

KEYWORDS:

Knowledge - Knowledge refers to the information and facts obtained from healthcare workers on the aspects such as causes, effects, treatment and prevention regarding nosocomial infection.

Nosocomial infections - Nosocomial infections can be defined as those occurring within 48 hours of hospital admission, 3 days of discharge or 30 days of an operation.

Practice - Practice is the actual application of knowledge regarding nosocomial infections.

Healthcare worker - Healthcare workers are those who deliver care and services to the ailing directly as doctors and nurses or indirectly as aiders, helpers, laboratory technicians or even medical waste handlers.

Date of Submission: 16-02-2022

Date of Acceptance: 02-03-2022

I. **Introduction:**

Nosocomial infections also referred to as hospital acquired infections (HAI), are infections acquired during the process of receiving health care that were not present during the time of admission. They may occur in different areas of healthcare delivery, such as in hospitals, long-term care facilities, and ambulatory settings, and may also appear after discharge. HAIs also include occupational infections that may affect staff.¹

Infection occurs when pathogens spread to a susceptible patient host. In modern healthcare, invasive procedures and surgery, indwelling medical devices, and prosthetic devices are associated with these infections. The etiology of HAI is based on the source or type of infection and the responsible pathogen, which may be bacterial, viral, or fungal.²

HAI is the most common adverse event in health care that affects patient safety. They contribute to significant morbidity, mortality, and financial burden on patients, families, and healthcare systems. The emergence of multi-drug resistant organisms is another complication seen with HAI.³

HAI affects 3.2% of all hospitalized patients in the United States, 6.5% in the European Union/European Economic Area, and worldwide prevalence is likely much higher. The burden of HAIs worldwide is unknown owing to the lack of surveillance systems for HAIs. However, there has been a great effort by infection prevention and control programs to develop surveillance systems and infection control methods.⁴

Responsible pathogens originate from a variety of different sources and are represented by different types of HAI. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention broadly categorizes the types of HAI as follows:

Central line-associated bloodstream infections (CLABSI) Catheter-associated urinary tract infections (CAUTI) Surgical site infections (SSI), ventilator -associated pneumonia (VAP).

Other types of HAI include non-ventilator-associated hospital-acquired pneumonia (NV-HAP), gastrointestinal infections (including Clostridioides difficile), other primary bloodstream infections—not associated with central catheter use, and other urinary tract infections—not associated with catheter use. HAI may also be grouped by affected systems such as ear, eye, nose and throat infections, lower respiratory tract infections (including bronchitis, tracheobronchitis, bronchiolitis, tracheitis, lung abscess or empyema without evidence of pneumonia), skin and soft-tissue infections, cardiovascular infection, bone and joint infections, central nervous systems infection, and reproductive tract infections.

A point-prevalence survey conducted in the United States in 2015 showed that the most common HAI in acute hospital settings is pneumonia, followed by gastrointestinal infections, SSI, other infections of the systems, as mentioned earlier, bloodstream infections, and urinary tract infections. The prevalence of these types of infections has changed from point-prevalence surveys in 2011, which showed pneumonia (21.8%) and SSI (21.8%) as the most common, followed by gastrointestinal (17.1%), urinary tract (12.9%), bloodstream (9.9%) and other infections. Interestingly, this same study showed that NV-HAP is the most common type of HAI in the acute health care setting, which is consistent with studies conducted in Europe. 5

In India Overall Percentage of different types of HAI calculated, UTI- 1318 (1.66%) more afmong females and 51.7 %, highest rate in general ward. BSI -360 (0.45%) with 54% male patients, 79.7% medical related type of diagnosis, 66.9% cases from ICU. VAP 148 (0.19%), 62.1% male patients, 94.8%- medical related type of diagnosis. SSI – 30 (0.04%) 65.5% male patients, General Ward 86.2%, 65.5% male patients. Mortality analysis reveal maximum number of deaths was due to BSI contributing to 27.22 % as case fatality rate and 60.12 % proportional mortality rate. 6

II. Materials And Methods :-

A descriptive study design was considered for the present study, 90 healthcare workers were recruited by convenient sampling technique and inclusion criteria included Nursing staff, MBBS interns and Technicians available at the time of research a self structured questionnaire containing 20 knowledge questions and WHO Handwashing checklist was used for the assessment of knowledge and practice respectively. Consent was taken from each participant and data was kept confidential.

RESULT: The findings of the study revealed that maximum healthcare workers (95.56%) had good knowledge with (4.44%) had average knowledge with no one having poor knowledge.

Maximum healthcare workers(88.89%) had good practice (11.11%) having poor practice.

TABLE 1.1 :- Frequency and percentage distribution of socio-demographic variables of health care workers.

					N=
Socio- demographic Variables		N	%	SD	
AGE	20-25 years	42	46.6	1.25	
	26-30 years	33	36.6	0.87	
	31-35 years	15	16.8	1.13	
RESIDENCE	Rural	2	2.22	0.00	
	Urban	88	97.7	1.12	
FAMILY	Nuclear	43	47.7	1.19	
	Joint	47	52.2	0.95	
RELIGION	Hindu	40	44.4	1.07	
	Muslim	12	13.3	0.90	

	Sikh	29	32.2	1.22	
	Christian	9	10	1.13	
	Others	0			
EducationalStatus Of Parents	No FormalEducation	0			
	Primary	1	1.1		
	Secondary	16	17.7	1.18	
	Graduate andAbove	33	36.6	0.83	
	Medical Professionals	40	44.4	1.26	
MONTHLYINCOME	Below 1 lakh/annum	0			
	Above 1 lakh/annum	90	100	1.12	
COURSE AND OCCUPATIONOF THE RESPONDENT	Nursing staff	30	33.33	1.14	
	MBBS inters	30	33.33	1.32	
	Technicians	30	33.33	0.38	

* significant p<= 0.05

TABLE 1.1:- Table shows that maximum Healthcare workers (46.6%) belong to the age group of 20-25 years, followed by (36.6%) between the age group of 26-30 years, followed by (16.8%) between the age group 31-35 years.

Maximum Healthcare workers (97.7%) resided in urban area whereas only (2.22%) belonged to ruralarea. Majority of the Healthcare workers (52.2%) belonged to the joint type of family whereas (47.7%) belonged to

Majority of the Healthcare workers (52.2%) belonged to the joint type of family whereas (47.7%) belonged to nuclear family.

Maximum no. of Healthcare workers (44.4%) belonged to the religion Hindu , followed by (32.2%) healthcare workers belonging to Sikh religion followed by (13.3%) belonging to Muslim religion followed by the minimum no. of Healthcare workers (10%) belonging to Christian religion .

Majority of the Healthcare workers's parents (44.4%) were medical professionals followed by (36.6%)were graduate and above followed by (17.7%) with secondary education , followed by the minimum no. of parents (1.11%) having a primary education . Not even a single Healthcare worker hada parent with no formal education

Maximum no. of Healthcare workers (100%) had a monthly income of 1 lakh/ annum with no Healthcare worker having a annual income below 1 lakh/ annum .

Healthcare workers involved 3 categories out of which each category had the same no. Of healthcare workers with Nursing staff, MBBS interns, Technicians by 30, 30, 30 respectively.

 TABLE :- 2.1 Knowledge score of Healthcare workers .

N=90

Healthcare workers	Knowledge	Percentage (%)	
			N
Nursing staff	Poor		
Thur sing stan	Average	10	3
	Good	90	27
MBBS interns	Poor		
	Average		0
	Good	100	30
	Poor		
Technicians	Average	3.33	1
	Good	96.67	29
		* significant p<=	= 0.05

TABLE 2.1 :- Revealed that (90%) nursing staff had good knowledge, (10%) had average knowledge and no nursing staff has poor knowledge. (100%) MBBS interns had good knowledge with no MBBS intern having average and poor knowledge. About (96.67%) Technicians had good knowledge with (3.33%) average knowledge and no one with poor knowledge.

TABLE :- 2.2 Practice score of Healthcare workers .	
---	--

N=90

Healthcare workers	Practice score	Percentage (%)		
		_	Ν	
Nursingstaff	Poor Practice	10	3	
	Good Practice	90	27	
MBBS	Poor Practice	23.33	7	
interns	Good Practice	76.67	23	
	Poor Practice		0	
Technicians	Good Practice	100	30	
		* significant p<= 0.0	5	

TABLE 2.2 :- Revealed that about (90%) Nursing staff had good practice and (10%) of them had poor practice. (76.67%) MBBS interns had good practice and (23.33%) of them had poor practice . All (100%) Technicians had good practice with no one having poor practice.

							N=90
Socio-demographic variables		Good knowle dge	Average knowledge	Poor knowle dge	Chi-test (X2)	Df	Result
AGE	20-25 years	42	0		10.655	2	Significant
	26-30 years	32	1				
	31-35 years	12	3				
RESIDENCE	Rural	2	0		0.095	1	Not significant
	Urban	84	4				

 \mathbf{b}

2

0

1

2

k

41

45

38

12 27

15

32

38

86

27

30

29

0.008

1.416

0.354

NA

3.663

2

 TABLE :- 3.1 Table showing association of Knowledge score with demographic variables.

* significant p<= 0.05

Not significant

Not significant

Not significant

Not significant

NT 00

TABLE 3.1 :- Table shows the association between the level of score and socio demographic variables. Basedon the objective , chi-square test was used to associate the level of knowledge and selected demographic variables. The chi square value shows that there is significant association between the score level and demographic variable (age).

The calculated chi-square value were more than the table value at the 0.05 level of significance. There is no significance association between the level of scores and other demographic variables (residence, family, religion, education status of the parents, monthy income, course and occupation of the respondent). The calculated chi-square value was less than the table value at the 0.05 level of significance.

FAMILY

RELIGION

EDUCATIONAL

STATUS OFPARENTS

MONTHLY INCOME

COURSE AND

OCCUPATION OF THE RESPONDENT Nuclear

Joint

Hindu

Muslim

Primarv

Secondary

Above 1 lakh

Nursing staff

MBBS interns

Technicians

/annum

No formaleducation

Graduate and above

Medical professional

Below 1 lakh/annum

<u>Sikhs</u> Christians

DEMOGRAPHIC		GOOD	POOR	CHI TEST	N=90	RESULT
VARIABLES		PRACTICE	PRACTICE	CHITEST	Dr	RESULI
AGE	20-25 YEARS	34	8	6.879	2	Significant
	26-30 YEARS	33	0			
	31-35 YEARS	13	2			
RESIDENCE	Rural	2	0	0.256	1	Not significant
	Urban	78	10			
FAMILY	Nuclear	36	7			
	Joint	44	3			
RELIGION	Hindu	37	3	1.725	3	Not significant
	Muslim	11	1			
	Sikh	24	5			
	Christian	8	1			
	Others	0	0			
EDUCATION STATUS OF THEPARENTS	No formal education	0	0	7.481	3	Not significant
	Primary	1	0			
	Secondary	14	2			
	Graduate and above	33	0			
	Medical professionals	32	8			
MONTHLYINCOME	Below 1 lakh/annum	0	0	NA		NA
	Above 1 lakh / annum	80	10			
COURSE OF THE RESPONDENT	Nursing staff	27	3	8.325	2	Significant
	MBBS interns	23	7			
	Technicians	30	0			

TABLE :- 3.2 Table showing association of Practice score with demographic variables.

*significant p <=0.05

TABLE 3.2 :- Table shows the association between the level of score and socio demographic variables .Basedon the objective , chi-square test was used to associate the level of knowledge and selected demographic variable (age) . The calculated chi-square value is more than the table value at the 0.05 level of significance.

There is no significant association between the level of score and other demographic variable (residence, family, religion, education status of the parents, monthly income, course and occupation of the respondent). The calculated chi-square value was less than the table valueat the 0.05 level of Significance.

III. Discussion :-

The present study findings have been discussed in accordance with the objectives of the study.

The present findings of the study revealed that maximum healthcare workers (95.56%) had good knowledge with (4.44%) had average knowledge with no one having poor knowledge.

Maximum healthcare workers(88.89%) had good practice (11.11%) having poor practice. A similar study was conducted by priyanka joshi, Dipti Sorte (2015) to evaluate the Nurses knowledge related to prevention of nosocomial infection. It showed that (76.66%) has good knowledge (23.33%) had average knowledge and no one had poor knowledge.

In the present study, the association of knowledge and practice score regarding nosocomial infections among healthcare workers with selected socio-demographic variables was calculated by using Chi-square value. There was association between the knowledge and practice score and demographic variable (age) but, there is no association between the level of knowledge and other demographic variables (residence, family, religion, education status of the parents, monthly income, course and occupation of the respondent). Among all only one variable which is; Age is statistically significant as its chi-square value is <0.05.

Another study by Ajamal Iqbal (2021) was conducted to assess the knowledge of workers regarding nosocomial infections. Study findings revealed that (35%) of nurses had excellent knowledge, (59%) average knowledge (6.25%) poor knowledge.

IV. Conclusion:

The following conclusions were drawn from the study. In the present study 90 subjects participated.

The findings of the study reveal that the knowledge of health Care workers regarding infections was 95.6% good ,4.4% average and 0.0% poor for 90 samples.

The analysis of the research shows that majority of demographic variables like Age, residence, type of family, religion, educational status of parents and monthly income of family had no statistical significance at the level of p<0.05.

References:

- [1]. Kouchak F, Askarian M. Nosocomial infections: the definition cri-teria. Iran J Med Sci. 2012;37(2):72–3.
- [2]. Mayon White RT et al. An international survey of the prevalence of hospital-acquired | infection. J Hosp Infect, 1988, 11 (Supplement A):43–48.
- [3]. Dramowski A, Whitelaw A, Cotton MF. Healthcare-associated infections in children: knowledge, attitudes and practice of paediatric healthcare providers at Tygerberg Hospital, Cape Town. Paediatr Int Child Health. 2016 Aug;36(3):225-31. doi: 10.1179/2046905515Y.0000000032. PMID: 25945794
- [4]. Kamunge EW. Exploring knowledge, attitudes and practices of registered nurses regarding the spread of nosocomial infections, in health and medical sciences. 2013, Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs). New Jersey; 1865.
- [5]. Khan HA, Baig FK, Mehboob R. Nosocomial infections: epidemiology, prevention, control and surveillance. Asian Pac J Trop Biomed. 2017;7(5):478–82.
- [6]. Shaikh, N., Morone, N. E., Bost, J. E., & Farrell, M. H. (2008). Prevalence of urinary tract infection in childhood: a meta-analysis. The Pediatric infectious disease journal, 27(4), 302-308.

Ms.Rinku Mehmi, et. al. "A study to assess the level of knowledge and practice regarding nosocomial infections among Healthcare workers of GMCH-32." *IOSR Journal of Nursing and Health Science (IOSR-JNHS)*, 11(01), 2022, pp. 15-20.