

International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health

43(6): 1-11, 2022; Article no.IJTDH.85492 ISSN: 2278–1005, NLM ID: 101632866

Assessment of Knowledge, Attitude and Practices of Hand Hygiene among Medical and Nursing Students

Ifeoluwa Silvanus Abiodun ^{a*}, Esther Olufunke Monday ^a, Chizoba Jessica Aneke ^a, Rukayat Akinola-Oloyede ^a, Olawale Omotayo Olatunji ^a and Abiola Abigael Oyindamola ^a

^a All Saints University School of Medicine, Roseau, Dominica.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/IJTDH/2022/v43i630594

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/85492

Original Research Article

Received 24 January 2022 Accepted 01 April 2022 Published 09 April 2022

ABSTRACT

Aims: This study aims to determine and compare the levels of handwashing knowledge, attitude and practice among medical and nursing students of All Saints University School of Medicine, Dominica.

Study Design: This was a quantitative, cross-sectional study.

Place and Duration of Study: All Saints University School of Medicine, Dominica between May and August, 2021.

Methodology: A total of 73 students (26 MD students, 18 Clinical students, 22 Nursing students and 7 Pre-med students) of All Saints University Dominica participated in the study, after their informed consent was obtained. The study data was collected from registered medical and nursing students of All Saints University, Dominica. This involved the use of a self-designed, structured questionnaire that was electronically distributed to students and analyzed electronically using SPSS version 21.

Results: Though all participants admitted having heard of hand hygiene practices, all nursing students (100%) affirmed having sufficient knowledge about hand hygiene while 28.6% of the premed students participating did not feel they had sufficient knowledge (P<0.05). Also, a large percentage of the respondents that were nursing students (90.9) claimed to have had a formal training in hand hygiene. This was closely followed by clinical students (72.2%) while MD and premed students only had 38.5% and 28.6% respectively. **Conclusion:** Although there seem to be a high level of awareness of hand hygiene among the participants, certain gaps in knowledge still exist which may be due to lack of proper training. There seem to be a better level of practice of hand hygiene among the nursing students and those in clinicals, compared to other medical students which draws the need to re-introduce formal training on hand hygiene into medical schools especially from early years of training.

Keywords: Knowledge; attitude; practices; hand washing; hand hygiene practices; medical students; nursing students; Dominica.

1. INTRODUCTION

Globally, hand hygiene remains the single, cheapest and practical public health measure associated with the prevention of transmission of microorganisms and health-care infectious diseases, while drastically reducing the spread of antimicrobial resistance [1-3]. In spite of the simplicity of this procedure, compliance has been poor among healthcare providers [1,4] and medical students [5]. According to the World Health Organization, washing hands with soap and water could reduce diarrhea-related deaths by half [6].

The World Health Organization introduced the 'My five moments for hand hygiene' programme to help improve compliance with hand hygiene [7]. "This five moments include the moment before touching a patient, before performing aseptic and clean procedures, after being at risk of exposure to body fluids, after touching a patient and after touching а patients surroundings [8,9]. This approach has significantly improved the understanding and practice of hand hygiene among healthcare practitioners" [1].

The practice of hand hygiene includes cleansing of the hands by rubbing both hands together using an alcohol-based hand sanitizer or washing both hands with soap and water to prevent microbial growth [10]. In spite of the simplicity of this procedure, compliance has been poor and a faulty behavioural development during medical training has been identified as a central cause [11,12].

Furthermore, the findings of previous studies on compliance with hand hygiene demonstrate that medical students may have unsatisfactory levels of knowledge and practices of hygienic practices. In a study conducted among medical students in Dominica, it was demonstrated that only 44.12% of medical students wash their hands before eating, 3.53% after working on a cadaver, 55.29% after working in the laboratory, 68.24% after defecation and 62.94% after urination [13].

In a study conducted by Al Kadi and Salati [8], only 29% of the medical students were able to identify all indications for hand hygiene in the questionnaire, with a 17% compliance during OSCE sessions. In her study, Graf et al. [14] demonstrated that only 33% of students could identify indications of hand hygiene. A study conducted by feather demonstrated only 8.5% of medical students washed their hands after patient contact during their final MBBS OSCE. figure increased although this to 18.3% after handwashing signs were displayed [12].

1.1 Justification

There is a paucity of information regarding the knowledge, attitude and practices of handwashing among Caribbean medical especially medical and students. nursing student's knowledge of the most important safety precaution measure. The observance of hygiene by students hand medical is hypothesized as being poor, yet the knowledge and practice of hand hygiene among medical students is a reflection of the future healthcare as well as a reflection of the general populace at large. Thus, the need for a study like this that aims in the long run to design appropriate strategies that promote hand hygiene has become expedient.

1.2 Null Hypothesis

Medical students do not know about or practice hand hygiene regularly.

1.3 Alternative Hypothesis

Medical students know and practice hand hygiene regularly.

1.4 Aims and Objectives

These research project has have been created and adapted by student researchers at All Saints University. We evaluated the knowledge and practice of hand hygiene among students of All Saints University.

1.5 Aim

• To evaluate the knowledge, attitude and practice of hand hygiene among medical and nursing students

1.6 Objectives

- 1. To access knowledge, attitude and practices of handwashing compliance among medical students
- 2. To promote hand washing compliance among medical students
- 3. To suggest appropriate strategies that promote hand hygiene
- 4. To compare levels of knowledge, attitudes and practices of hand hygiene between students of different stages and fields of clinical training as well as across gender

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Design: This was a quantitative, cross-sectional study.

Study Area: All Saints University School of Medicine, Roseau, Commonwealth of Dominica.

Study Participants: All medical and nursing students enrolled to a full-time programme to study at the All-Saints University School of Medicine, Commonwealth of Dominica were recruited into the study. Recruitment was dependent on approval of the University's ethical committee as well as following obtained informed consent from the study participants. As a result of education and immigration, this population is made up of nationals from different countries.

2.1 Inclusion Criteria

- All medical students who voluntarily gave their consent to participate in the study by giving their oral and written informed consent
- Persons within the age ranges of 15 60 years old

2.2 Exclusion Criteria

• Individuals who were unwilling or incapable of giving their informed consent for data collection.

2.3 Data Collection Procedure

During the study procedure, informed consent was obtained from each subject. Data collection involved the use of structured questionnaire that contained items on their demographic characteristics; age, dietary habits, sanitary and hygienic habits etc. Questionnaires were distributed to all participants who voluntarily consented to participate in the study after being fully informed.

2.4 Data Management and Analysis

The data was generated via guestionnaires electronically. The data was coded and transferred to Microsoft Excel, and then transferred to Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21 for analysis. Descriptive statistical methods were used to calculate percentages for each of the responses given. Pearson Chi-square test was used to compare the percentages of the correct responses between the medical and nursing students and determine the statistical significance. P-value less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

3. RESULTS

Tables 1 and 2 is a comparison of the knowledge on hand hygiene based on WHO guidelines among the four groups of students who took part in this study. In Table 1, it is shown that all the participants had heard of hand hygiene practices. A satisfactory percentage across the groups admitted having heard about it from school (clinical - 61.1%, MD - 57.7%, Nursing - 68.2%, pre-med - 71.4%) and social media (clinical -16.7%, MD – 19.2%, Nursing – 18.2%, pre-med - 14.3%). Only 1 (4.5%) of the nursing students claimed to have heard about hand hygiene from all the options provided. This outcome was statistically significant (P = 0.000). In the same vein, although more than half of all the groups claimed to always have the notice boards remind them of hand hygiene, this act was most common among the nursing students with 72.7% of the group participating in the study indicating that option.

At the same time, all the nursing students (100%) claimed to have sufficient knowledge about hand hygiene while 28.6% of the pre-med students participating in this study did not feel they had sufficient knowledge. This comparison was statistically significant (P = 0.000). Also, a large

percentage of the respondents that were nursing students (90.9%) claimed to have had a formal training in hand hygiene. This was closely followed by students in clinicals (72.2%) while MD and pre-med students only had 38.5% and 28.6% respectively. This comparison was also statistically significant (P = 0.000). About alcohol based rubbing, only among the nursing students was there over half of the population (68.2%) that believed that hand washing and rubbing are to be performed in a sequence. Only the same group of students had a large percentage (77.3%) who chose 20 seconds as the minimal time needed for hand washing via alcohol-based hand rub. These comparisons were as well statistically significant (P = 0.000).

Tables 3 and 4 compared the group's personal hygiene practices using chi-square test. In the table, it is observed that a large portion of all the groups claimed to wash their hands before

cooking meals, although only among the nursing students was there a 100% outcome. Also, almost all members in each group (100%) stated that they wash their hands after using the rest room, with exception of 1 (14.3%) of the pre-med students who did not practice this. On the other hand, use of alcohol or medicated soap to wash hands was not a common practice among the groups (clinical - 27.8%, MD - 19.2%, Nursing -18.2%, pre-med – 14.3%). In the same vein, although not many of the participants had the practice of turning off the tap with their elbow (clinical - 44.4%, MD - 11.5%, Nursing - 27.3%, pre-med - 28.6%), participants in their pre-med still had many who turn off the tap with their palm (71.4%). Furthermore, although many of the participants prefer using paper towel to dry their hands, 30.8% of participants in MD group practice the use of general towels to dry their hands. These comparisons were statistically significant (P < 0.05).

Table 1. Respondents Knowledge of hand hygiene based on WHO guidelines
--

Inquiries		Pro	χ ² -value	P value		
	Clinical	MD	Nursing	Pre- Med	_ ^	
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)		
Heard of hand hygien	e practices					
YES	18 (100)	26 (100)	22 (100)	7 (100)	74.0	0.000
NO	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
Where did you hear a	bout hand hyg	iene?				
Mum	0 (0)	0 (0)	1(4.5)	0 (0)		
Friend	1 (5.6)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
Home	0 (0.0)	4 (15.4)	1 (4.5)	0 (0)		
Learnt it	0 (0.0)	1(3.8)	0 (0)	0 (0)	93.75	0.000
School	11 (61.1)	15(57.7)	15(68.2)	5 (71.4)		
Seminar	3 (16.7)	1 (3.8)	0 (0)	1 (14.3)		
Social Media	3 (16.7)	5 (19.2)	4 (18.2)	1 (14.3)		
All of the above	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (4.5)	0 (0)		
Times of hand washir	ng					
1 – 3 times	2 (11.1)	9 (34.6)	0 (0)	2 (28.6)		
4 – 7 times	10 (55.6)	11(42.3)	11(50.0)	2 (28.6)	61.25	0.000
7 – 10 times	2 (11.1)	4 (15.4)	0 (0)	1 (14.3)		
>10 times	4 (22.2)	1 (3.8)	11(50.0)	2 (28.6)		
Notice boards remind	me of hand hy	/giene		x <i>i</i>		
YES	11 (61.1)	14(53.8)	16(72.7)	4 (57.1)	75.89	0.000
NO	7 (38.9)	12(46.2)	6 (27.3)	3 (42.9)		
Infection Prevention t	eam have a po	sitive influe	ence on my	hand hygier	ne	
YES	14 (77.8)	20(76.9)	17(77.3)	6 (85.7)	37.70	0.000
NO	4 (22.2)	5 (19.2)	5 (22.7)	1 (14.3)		
I have sufficient know	ledge about h	and hygien	e			
YES	17 (94.4)	23(88.5)	22(100)	5 (71.4)	80.45	0.000
NO	1 (5.6)	3 (11.5)	0 (Ò)	2 (28.6)		
Any formal training in	hand hygiene	, , ,	× /			
YES	13 (72.2)	10(38.5)	20(90.9)	2 (28.6)	92.22	0.000
NO	5 (27.8)	16(61.5)	2 (9.1)	5 (71.4)		

Inquiries		Pro	χ2-value	P value		
	Clinical	MD	Nursing	Pre- Med		
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)		
Is hand the main route of	i transmissi	on				
YES	16 (88.9)	24(92.3)	22 (100)	7 (100)	76.80	0.000
NO	2 (11.1)	2 (7.7)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
Which hand hygiene pro	mote transr	nission				
-Hand washing after exposure	1 (5.6)	6 (23.1)	5 (22.7)	3 (42.9)		
-Hand washing before touching a patient	3 (16.7)	5 (19.2)	5 (22.7)	0 (0.0)	20.43	0.202
-Hand washing immediately after risk	4 (22.2)	2 (7.7)	3 (13.6)	1 (14.3)		
-Hand washing before an aseptic procedure	9 (50.0)	10(38.5)	8 (36.4)	3 (42.9)		
Which is true? Alcohol b	ased Hand	rubbing:				
-Causes skin dryness than hand washing	1 (5.6)	2 (7.7)	1 (4.5)	2 (28.6)		
-Is more effective than hand washing	0 (0)	2 (7.7)	2 (9.1)	1 (14.3)	25.67	0.059
-Is more rapid than hand washing	8 (44.4)	9 (34.6)	2 (9.1)	2 (28.6)		
-Hand washing rubbing are to be performed in a sequence	8 (44.4)	11(42.3)	15(68.2)	2 (28.6)		
Minimal time needed for	hand washi	ing via alco	hol-based l	hand rub		
5 secs	5 (27.8)	1 (3.8)	0 (0)	2 (28.6)		
10 secs	4 (22.2)	7 (26.9)	2 (9.1)	1 (14.3)	92.45	0.000
15 secs	2 (11.1)	7 (26.9)	3 (13.6)	1 (14.3)		
20 secs	7 (38.9)	11(42.3)	17(77.3)	3 (42.9)		
Which of the following sl	hould be av	oided?				
Artificial fingernails	6 (33.3)	14(53.8)	13(59.1)	3 (42.9)		
Damaged skin	9 (50.0)	7 (26.9)	0 (0)	4 (57.1)	101.58	0.000
Regular use of a hand cream	0 (0)	3 (11.5)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
Wearing jewelry	3 (16.7)	2 (7.7)	9 (40.9)	0 (0)		

Table 2. Respondents Knowledge of hand hygiene based on WHO guidelines

Tables 5 and 6 are outlines of the respondents' adopted moments of hand hygiene in clinical practices. Washing of hands before any physical examination was strongly agreed to by especially the nursing students (81.8%) and MD students (76.9%), although none of the participants disagreed to this practice. 11.1% of the clinical students disagreed to the practices of washing hands before blood sample extraction and always washing hands after shaking hands with patients. While same range of percentage of the groups were neutral to the practice of washing hands after touching patients' food package (clinical – 27.8%, MD – 26.9%, Nursing – 22.7%, pre-med – 28.6%), only among the nursing

students was there a high level of strong adoption to the practice always washing hands after touching patients bed linen (strongly agree = 81.8%). These comparisons were statistically significant (*P* < 0.05).

Tables 7 and 8 shows the attitude of participants towards hand hygiene practices. Among the groups, only the nursing students had more than half (68.2%) that strongly agreed to the attitude of adhering to correct hand hygiene practice at all times. Also 71.4% of the pre-med students were neutral to the attitude of been reluctant to ask others to engage in hand hygiene although 50% of the nursing students disagreed to this

reluctance. A good number of the participants across the groups affirmed to having a feeling of guilt if they omit hand hygiene. Furthermore, almost all the nursing students (95.5%) strongly agreed that hand hygiene was an essential part of their role, which others also popularly affirmed to but not as strongly as the nursing students.

Inquiries		Program				
	Clinical	MD	Nursing	Pre- Med		value
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)		
Do you wash your ha	ands before coo	king meals	?			
YES	16(88.9)	23(88.5)	22(100)	6 (85.7)	76.93	0.000
NO	2 (11.1)	3 (11.5)	0 (0)	1 (14.3)		
Do you wash your ha	ands after cooki	ng meals?				
YES	17(94.4)	24(92.3)	21(95.5)	7 (100)	39.96	0.000
NO	0 (0)	2 (7.7)	1 (4.5)	0 (0)		
Do you wash your ha	ands after using	the rest roo	om?			
YES	18(100)	26(100)	22(100)	6 (85.7)	83.69	0.000
NO	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (14.3)		
Do you wash your ha	ands after scrate	ching your l	nair?			
YES	2 (11.1)	9 (34.6)	10(45.5)	4 (57.1)	81.24	0.000
NO	16(88.9)	17(65.4)	12(54.5)	3 (42.9)		
Do you wash your ha	ands after pickir	ng your nos	e?			
YES	12(66.7)	16(61.5)	14(63.6)	4 (57.1)	74.24	0.000
NO	6 (33.3)	10(38.5)	8 (36.4)	3 (42.9)		
Do you use alcohol o	or medicated so	ap to wash	your hands	?		
Alcohol	5 (27.8)	5 (19.2)	4 (18.2)	1 (14.3)	42.14	0.000
Medicated soap	13(72.2)	21(80.8)	18(81.8)	5 (71.4)		

Table 3. Participants personal hygiene practices

Table 4. Participants personal hygiene practices

Inquiries		Pr	ogram		χ2-	P value
	Clinical	MD	Nursing	Pre- Med	value	
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)		
Do you turn off the ta	ap with your pal	m?				
YES	7 (38.9)	11(42.3)	4 (18.2)	5 (71.4)	45.03	0.000
NO	11(61.1)	14(53.8)	18(81.8)	2 (28.6)		
Do you turn off the ta	ap with your elb	ow?				
YES	8(44.4)	3 (11.5)	6 (27.3)	2 (28.6)	80.13	0.000
NO	10 (55.6)	23(88.5)	16(72.7)	5 (71.4)		
Do you spill little wa	ter on the tap be	fore turning	g it off?			
YES	15(83.3)	16(61.5)	9 (40.9)	5 (71.4)	81.97	0.000
NO	3 (16.7)	10(38.5)	13(59.1)	2 (28.6)		
Do you dry your han	ds after washing	g your hand	s			
YES	18(100)	24(92.3)	21(95.5)	6 (85.7)	76.41	0.000
NO	0 (0)	2 (7.7)	1 (4.5)	1 (14.3)		
What do you use to	dry hands					
General towel	2 (11.1)	8 (30.8)	2 (9.1)	0 (0)		
Paper towel	15(83.3)	12(46.2)	18(81.8)	5 (71.4)	37.62	0.000
Separate towel	1 (5.6)	5 (19.2)	2 (9.1)	1 (14.3)		

Hand hygiene practice		Pro	ogram		χ2-	P value
	Clinical	MD	Nursing	Pre- Med	value	
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)		
I wash my hands before	any physica	l examination	on			
AGREE	10 (55.6)	1 (3.8)	4 (18.2)	1 (14.3)		
DISAGREE	0 (0)	1 (3.8)	0 (0)	0 (0)	62.09	0.000
NEUTRAL	3 (16.7)	3 (11.5)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
STRONGLY AGREE	5 (27.8)	20(76.9)	18(81.8)	4 (57.1)		
STRONGLY DISAGREE	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (14.3)		
I wash my hands before	blood samp	le extractio	n			
AGREE	7 (38.9)	4 (15.4)	3 (13.6)	1 (14.3)		
DISAGREE	2 (11.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	53.31	0.000
NEUTRAL	5 (27.8)	4 (15.4)	1 (4.5)	0 (0)		
STRONGLY AGREE	3 (16.7)	17(65.4)	18(81.8)	5 (71.4)		
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1 (5.6)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
I wash my hands after bl	ood sample	extraction	with gloves			
AGREE	6 (33.3)	4 (15.4)	0 (0)	2 (28.6)		
NEUTRAL	4 (22.2)	6 (23.1)	1 (4.5)	1 (14.3)	38.74	0.001
STRONGLY AGREE	7 (38.9)	14(53.8)	20(90.9)	2 (28.6)		
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1 (5.6)	1 (3.8)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
I always wash my hands	after shakin	ig hands wi	th patients			
AGREE	7 (38.9)	2 (7.7)	4 (18.2)	1 (14.3)		
DISAGREE	2 (11.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	46.98	0.001
NEUTRAL	4 (22.2)	7 (26.9)	2 (9.1)	2 (28.6)		
STRONGLY AGREE	5 (27.8)	15(57.7)	16(72.7)	3 (42.9)		
STRONGLY DISAGREE	0 (0)	1 (3.8)	0 (0)	0 (0)		

Table 5. Respondents adopted moments of hand hygiene in clinical practices

Table 6. Respondents adopted moments of hand hygiene in clinical practices

Inquiries		Prog	gramme		χ2-	P value
	Clinical	MD	Nursing	Pre- Med	value	
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)		
I always wash my hands	after touch	ing patients	food packa	age		
AGREE	6 (33.3)	10(38.5)	8 (36.4)	3 (42.9)		
DISAGREE	0 (0)	1 (3.8)	0 (0)	0 (0)	33.27	0.032
NEUTRAL	5 (27.8)	7 (26.9)	5 (22.7)	2 (28.6)		
STRONGLY AGREE	7 (38.9)	6 (23.1)	9 (40.9)	1 (14.3)		
STRONGLY DISAGREE	0 (0)	1 (3.8)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
I always wash my hands	after touch	ing patients	bed linen			
AGREE	8 (44.4)	2 (7.7)	4 (18.2)	3 (42.9)		
DISAGREE	0 (0)	1 (3.8)	0 (0)	0 (0)	48.88	0.000
NEUTRAL	3 (16.7)	7 (26.9)	0 (0)	1 (14.3)		
STRONGLY AGREE	7 (38.9)	14(53.8)	18(81.8)	2 (28.6)		
STRONGLY DISAGREE	0 (0)	1 (3.8)	0 (0)	0 (0)		

Table 7. Respondents attitude towards hand hygiene practices

Inquiries	Program		χ2-	P value		
	Clinical	MD	Nursing	Pre- Med	value	
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)		
I adhere to correct han	d hygiene pra	ctice at all t	times			
AGREE	13 (72.2)	8 (30.8)	7 (31.8)	1 (14.3)		
NEUTRAL	2 (11.1)	5 (19.2)	0 (0)	3 (42.9)	42.63	0.000
STRONGLY AGREE	3 (16.7)	11(42.3)	15(68.2)	2 (28.6)		

Abiodun et al.; IJTDH, 43(6): 1-11, 2022;	Article no.IJTDH.85492
---	------------------------

Inquiries	Program				χ2-	P value
	Clinical	MD	Nursing	Pre- Med	value	
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)		
Emergencies and other p	priorities ma		more diffic	ult		
AGREE	11(61.1)	9 (34.6)	5 (22.7)	3 (42.9)		
DISAGREE	2 (11.1)	5 (19.2)	2 (9.1)	0 (0)	58.44	0.000
NEUTRAL	2 (11.1)	4 (15.4)	6 (27.3)	1 (14.3)		
STRONGLY AGREE	3 (16.7)	8 (30.8)	9 (40.9)	0 (0)		
STRONGLY DISAGREE	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (14.3)		
I feel frustrated when oth	ners omit ha	nd hygiene				
AGREE	8 (44.4)	10(45.5)	10(45.5)	3 (42.9)	54.28	0.000
DISAGREE	2 (11.1)	4 (15.4)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
NEUTRAL	7 (38.9)	7 (26.9)	4 (18.2)	3 (42.9)		
STRONGLY AGREE	1 (5.6)	5 (19.2)	8 (36.4)	0 (0)		
I am reluctant to ask othe	ers to engag	ge in hand h	ygiene			
AGREE	0 (0)	2 (7.7)	2 (9.1)	0 (0)		
DISAGREE	7 (38.9)	5 (19.2)	11(50.0)	1 (14.3)	58.38	0.000
NEUTRAL	7 (38.9)	12(46.2)	3 (13.6)	5 (71.4)		
STRONGLY AGREE	0 (0)	3 (11.5)	2 (9.1)	0 (0)		
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4 (22.2)	4 (15.4)	4 (18.2)	0 (0)		
I feel guilty if I omit hand	hygiene					
AGREE	12(66.7)	15(57.7)	11(50.0)	2 (28.6)		
DISAGREE	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (14.3)	67.54	0.000
NEUTRAL	3 (16.7)	6 (23.1)	0 (0)	2 (28.6)		
STRONGLY AGREE	2 (11.1)	4 (15.4)	11(50.0)	1 (14.3)		
STRONGLY DISAGREE	1 (5.6)	1 (3.8)	0 (Ò)	0 (0)		

Table 8. Respondents attitude towards hand hygiene practices

Inquiries		Pr		χ2-	P value	
	Clinical	MD	Nursing	Pre- Med	value	
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)		
Sometimes I miss out of	hand hygiei	ne because	I forget it			
AGREE	7 (38.9)	8 (30.8)	7 (31.8)	3 (42.9)		
DISAGREE	2 (11.1)	4 (15.4)	5 (22.7)	1 (14.3)	54.34	0.000
NEUTRAL	6 (33.3)	3 (11.5)	1 (4.5)	1 (14.3)		
STRONGLY AGREE	3 (16.7)	8 (30.8)	5 (22.7)	0 (0)		
STRONGLY DISAGREE	0 (0)	3 (11.5)	4 (18.2)	1 (14.3)		
Hand hygiene is an esse	ntial part of	my role				
AGREE	10 (55.6)	9 (34.6)	1 (4.5)	3 (42.9)		
NEUTRAL	1 (5.6)	4 (15.4)	0 (0)	1 (14.3)	61.85	0.000
STRONGLY AGREE	7 (38.9)	13(50.0)	21(95.5)	2 (28.6)		
The frequency of hand h	ygiene requ	ired makes	it difficult			
AGREE	5 (27.8)	8 (30.8)	4 (18.2)	2 (28.6)		
DISAGREE	3 (16.7)	4 (15.4)	7 (31.8)	2 (28.6)	33.78	0.028
NEUTRAL	4 (22.2)	5 (19.2)	4 (18.2)	1 (14.3)		
STRONGLY AGREE	2 (11.1)	3 (11.5)	5 (22.7)	1 (14.3)		
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4 (22.2)	5 (19.2)	2 (9.1)	0 (0)		
It is difficult for me to att	end hand hy	giene clas	ses			
AGREE	0 (0)	6 (23.1)	1 (4.5)	0 (0)		
DISAGREE	7 (38.9)	5 (19.2)	8 (36.4)	0 (0)	62.61	0.000
NEUTRAL	5 (27.8)	9 (34.6)	2 (9.1)	3 (42.9)		
STRONGLY AGREE	3 (16.7)	5 (19.2)	2 (9.1)	1 (14.3)		
STRONGLY DISAGREE	3 (16.7)	1 (3.8)	9 (40.9)	1 (14.3)		

Abiodun et al.; IJTDH, 43(6): 1-11, 2022; Article no.IJTDH.85492

4. DISCUSSION

This study was aimed at evaluating the knowledge, practice and attitude of medical and nursing students on handwashing hygiene. In this study, there was a generally high level of awareness of hand washing hygiene among the participants. This outcome can be as a result of the advent of the covid-19 pandemic which has caused an increase in public enlightenment on the need for frequent hand washing as a critical preventive measure of the disease among other steps. This reason for high level of awareness has been shown by other similar studies [15.16]. In a study to detect the level of knowledge and practice as a preventive measure to combat COVID-19 disease in Saudi Arabia, it was revealed that 84% of the population realizes and practices handwashing [16].

This awareness however did not seem to be well sufficient among the respondents of this present study, as evident in some of their responses on certain details about handwashing hygiene. For example, some of the participants felt washing their hands 1-3 times a day was sufficient to meet their hygienic requirements. Some also indicated that 5 seconds was ok as the minimal time needed for hand washing via alcohol-based hand rub which may not be entirely correct. The participants of this study do not seem to be isolated in this knowledge gap. In a study conducted by Almoslem et al., among students in Saudi Arabia [15], it was observed that only 46% of the students thought that handwashing prevents diseases, and 34% of them thought that it dirt. The insufficient knowledge removes observed in this study could be due to the fact that а large percentage of the participants especially among the MD and Pre-med students were yet to have any hygiene formal training on handwashing which is very essential particularly because of the nature of the profession they are training for. It is therefore important that training on handwashing be formalized among medical students especially at the inception of their coming to school.

Furthermore, there also seem to be a fairly high level of practice of basic handwashing requirements among the study participants especially in the areas of washing hands before and after cooking meals, after using the restroom or picking nose, as well as drying hands after washing. A high percentage of the respondents

also had a good habit of washing hands with medicated soap which is higher than what has been reported bv other studies [17]. Handwashing with soap plays a crucial role in the prevention of waterand foodborne diseases by 50% to 70%, and pneumonia, impetigo, and diarrhoeal diseases by 40% to 50% [17].

Additionally, in the adoption of proper hand hygiene during clinical practice, though there was a fair performance across the study population, the nursing students seemed to perform better. For example, only among the nursing students was there a high level of strong adoption to the practice always washing hands after touching patient's bed linen. This difference in the rate of adoption may be due to many factors such as the formal training most of the nursing students claimed to have had and the nature of their profession which demands high standards in hand hygiene especially while caring for patients.

5. CONCLUSION

This study has shown that although there seem to be a generally high level of awareness of hand hygiene among the participants, certain gaps in knowledge still exists which could mainly be due to lack of proper training on the subject. There seem to be a better level of practice of hand hygiene among the nursing students and those in clinical level, compared to other medical students which draws the need to introduce formal training on hand hygiene into medical schools especially from early years of training.

CONSENT

The rationale for the study was explained to the participants in English language till they understand. A written informed consent was then obtained by requesting the subjects to sign or thumb print an informed consent form without any coercion or inducement. The consent form included the introduction, the purpose of the study, the risks and benefits to those who participate, confidentiality and voluntariness.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

Ethical approval was obtained from the Research Ethical Committee of the All Saints University School of Medicine.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researchers would love to appreciate the Director, staff and students of the Nursing department, All Saints University School of Medicine for the distribution, filling of the questionnaires and participation in this study. Also the researchers express their sincere gratitude towards all classes of medical students who cooperated and participated in this study. Finally, the researchers appreciate the Ethical Research Committee of All Saints University School of Medicine, Dominica for granting Ethical approval for the study.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

- Pittet D, Hugonnet S, Harbarth S, Mourouga P, Sauvan V, Touveneau S, et al. Effectiveness of a hospital-wide programme to improve compliance with hand hygiene. The Lancet. 2000;356(9238):1307–12.
- 2. Trampuz A, Widmer AF. Hand hygiene: a frequently missed lifesaving opportunity during patient care. Mayo Clin Proc. 2004 Jan;79(1):109–16.
- Ekwere TA, Okafor IP. Hand hygiene knowledge and practices among healthcare providers in a tertiary hospital, south west, Nigeria. Int J Infect Control [Internet]. 2013[Cited 2021 May 18];9(4). Available:https://www.ijic.info/article/view/1 1917
- Tibballs J. Teaching hospital medical staff to handwash. Med J Aust. 1996;164(7):395–8.
- 5. van De Mortel TF, Kermode S, Progano T, Sansoni J. A comparison of the hand hygiene knowledge, beliefs and practices of Italian nursing and medical students. J Adv Nurs. 2012;68(3):569–79.
- WHO | Water for health: Taking charge [Internet]. WHO. World Health Organization; [Cited 2021 May 18]. Available:http://www.who.int/water_sanitati on_health/publications/water-for-healthtaking-charge/en/
- 7. Nair SS, Hanumantappa R, Hiremath SG, Siraj MA, Raghunath P. Knowledge, attitude, and practice of hand hygiene

among medical and nursing students at a Tertiary Health Care Centre in Raichur, India. ISRN Prev Med [Internet]. 2014[Cited 2021 May 13]; 2014.

Available:https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pm c/articles/PMC4045463/

- Al Kadi A, Salati SA. Hand hygiene practices among medical students. Interdiscip Perspect Infect Dis [Internet]. 2012 [Cited 2021 May 13];2012. Available:https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pm c/articles/PMC3457633/
- Salati SA, Al Kadi A. Hand Hygiene practices in medical students: A follow-up study. Int Sch Res Not. 2014;2014:e591879.
- 10. Pittet D, Allegranzi B, Boyce J. World health organization world alliance for patient safety first global patient safety challenge core group of experts. The World Health Organization Guidelines on Hand Hygiene in Health Care and their consensus recommendations. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2009;30(7):611– 22.
- Duroy E, Le Coutour X. Hospital hygiene and medical students. Med Mal Infect. 2010;40(9):530–6.
- Feather A, Stone SP, Wessier A, Boursicot KA, Pratt C. Now please wash your hands: The handwashing behaviour of final MBBS candidates. J Hosp Infect. 2000;45(1):62– 4.
- 13. Afolabi OO, Adewumi EO, Medavarapu S, Ige TO, Alao OJ, Dada OE. A study to ascertain the practice of hand hygiene among medical students in commonwealth Dominica. Med Arch [Internet]. of 2016;[Cited 2021 May 13];8(5). Available:https://www.archivesofmedicine. com/abstract/a-study-to-ascertain-thepractice-of-hand-hygiene-amongmedicalstudents-in-commonwealth-ofdominica-17032.html
- Graf K, Chaberny IF, Vonberg R-P. Beliefs about hand hygiene: A survey in medical students in their first clinical year. Am J Infect Control. 2011;39(10):885–8.
- Almoslem MM, Alshehri TA, Althumairi AA, Aljassim MT, Hassan ME, Berekaa MM. Handwashing knowledge, attitudes, and practices among students in Eastern Province Schools, Saudi Arabia. Dzhambov A, editor. J Environ Public Health. 2021;2021:1–10.

Abiodun et al.; IJTDH, 43(6): 1-11, 2022; Article no.IJTDH.85492

- Siddiqui AA, Alshammary F, Amin J, Rathore HA, Hassan I, Ilyas M, et al. Knowledge and practice regarding prevention of COVID-19 among the Saudi Arabian population. Work. 2020;66(4): 767–75.
- Lee M-S, Hong SJ, Kim YT. Handwashing with soap and national handwashing projects in Korea: Focus on the National Handwashing Survey, 2006-2014. Epidemiol Health. 2015;37: 1–9.

© 2022 Abiodun et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history: The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here: https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/85492