



# Towards changing healthcare workers' behaviour: a qualitative study exploring non-compliance through appraisals of infection prevention and control practices

N. Shah<sup>a</sup>, E. Castro-Sánchez<sup>a,\*</sup>, E. Charani<sup>a</sup>, L.N. Drumright<sup>b</sup>, A.H. Holmes<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Healthcare Associated Infection and Antimicrobial Resistance at Imperial College London, London, UK

<sup>b</sup>Department of Medicine, University of Cambridge, Cambridge Biomedical Campus, Cambridge, UK

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received 30 May 2014

Accepted 8 January 2015

Available online 26 February 2015

### Keywords:

Attribution of responsibility

Healthcare workers' behaviour

Risk appraisal

Healthcare-associated infection

Infection prevention and control

Non-compliance



## SUMMARY

**Background:** Improving behaviour in infection prevention and control (IPC) practice remains a challenge, and understanding the determinants of healthcare workers' (HCWs) behaviour is fundamental to develop effective and sustained behaviour change interventions.

**Aim:** To identify behaviours of HCWs that facilitated non-compliance with IPC practices, focusing on how appraisals of IPC duties and social and environmental circumstances shaped and influenced non-compliant behaviour. This study aimed to: (1) identify how HCWs rationalized their own behaviour and the behaviour of others; (2) highlight challenging areas of IPC compliance; and (3) describe the context of the working environment that may explain inconsistencies in IPC practices.

**Methods:** Clinical staff at a National Health Service hospital group in London, UK were interviewed between December 2010 and July 2011 using qualitative methods. Responses were analysed using a thematic framework.

**Findings:** Three ways in which HCWs appraised their behaviour were identified through accounts of IPC policies and practices: (1) attribution of responsibilities, with ambiguity about responsibility for certain IPC practices; (2) prioritization and risk appraisal, which demonstrated a divergence in values attached to some IPC policies and practices; and (3) hierarchy of influence highlighted that traditional clinical roles challenged work relationships.

**Conclusions:** Overall, behaviours are not entirely independent of policy rules, but often an amalgamation of local normative practices, individual preferences and a degree of professional isolation.

© 2015 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of the Healthcare Infection Society. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

\* Corresponding author. Address: NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Healthcare Associated Infection and Antimicrobial Resistance at Imperial College London, London W12 0NN, UK. Tel.: +44 (0) 203 313 2732; fax: +44 (0) 208 383 3394.

E-mail address: [e.castro-sanchez@imperial.ac.uk](mailto:e.castro-sanchez@imperial.ac.uk) (E. Castro-Sánchez).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2015.01.023>

0195-6701/© 2015 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of the Healthcare Infection Society. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

## Introduction

The prevention and management of healthcare-associated infections (HCAI) has advanced greatly over the last decade due to legislative, regulatory and organizational incentives.<sup>1,2</sup> However, these changes have not resolved the gap between

**Table I**  
Participants' demographics

Profession	Age, median (range)	Area of work	Years qualified, median (range)	Years in organization, median (range)
Pharmacists	30 (25–60)	Neonatal, Oncology, Intensive Care and Surgery, Rotational Medical, Haematology, HIV and Sexual Health, Medicine for the Elderly	7 (2–40)	4 (2–35)
Physicians, surgeons	38 (31–51)	Paediatric Intensive Care, Renal, Cancer Medicine, Microbiology, Stroke and Geriatrics, Orthopaedics, Critical Care, Children's Ambulatory Care	10 (1–32)	2 (1–10)
Nurses, midwives	40 (25–61)	Anaesthetics, Women and Children, Cardiology, Outpatient Antimicrobial Therapy, Colorectal Cancer, Education, Acute Surgery, Intensive Care, Orthopaedics, Renal, Cardiothoracic, Care of the Elderly, General Adult, Vascular Surgery	15 (2–35)	8 (1–26)

HIV, human immunodeficiency virus.

evidence base and clinical practice,<sup>3–6</sup> particularly in terms of healthcare workers' (HCWs) behavioural change.<sup>7,8</sup> Interventions aimed to improve HCWs' compliance with infection prevention and control (IPC) practices such as hand hygiene or antimicrobial stewardship have achieved varied success.<sup>9</sup> These interventions have focused on feedback mechanisms,<sup>8</sup> reminders,<sup>9</sup> 'champion' roles and financial incentives.<sup>10–13</sup> Overall, these approaches have mainly tackled memory and knowledge without acknowledgment of rational decision making.<sup>8,10,14</sup> However, targeting behaviours without addressing contextual influences on behaviour may divert away from the real causes of non-compliance.<sup>15,16</sup>

In this sense, the application of theoretical frameworks from social sciences to explain HCWs' behaviour appears to be underused.<sup>17–20</sup> The application of behavioural theory in intervention design and evaluation is becoming widely recognized for its potential to facilitate behavioural change in health settings.<sup>21</sup> Adequate compliance with IPC practices is compounded by the complexity of health care, and remains a key issue.<sup>22–25</sup>

The use of qualitative research allows the identification of behavioural patterns and values about IPC policies and practices.<sup>26</sup> Whilst HCWs' attitudes and beliefs about IPC activities have been well researched,<sup>23</sup> few studies have investigated simultaneous perceptions from different professional groups.<sup>27–29</sup> In such studies, the main focus was compliance with policies and guidelines,<sup>4,17,22,23</sup> with lack of teamwork and communication, competing priorities and disagreement with policies identified as barriers to compliance.<sup>29–33</sup> However, it is still unclear how and why these affect IPC practices.<sup>34</sup> Given that much behaviour results from decision making and self-regulation,<sup>6,35</sup> it is appropriate to consider how HCWs appraise their compliance with particular IPC practices.

This qualitative study sought to identify behaviours of HCWs that facilitated non-compliance with IPC practices, focusing on how appraisals of IPC duties and social circumstances generated, shaped and influenced non-compliant behaviour. The study aimed to: (1) identify how HCWs rationalized their own behaviour and the behaviour of others; (2) highlight challenging areas of IPC compliance; and (3) describe contextual features of the working environment that may explain inconsistencies in IPC practices.

## Methods

Semi-structured interviews were conducted at three tertiary hospitals in London, UK. Eligible participants were doctors, pharmacists, nurses or midwives working in any of the hospitals, with regular contact with patients and/or prescription of antimicrobials, and who consented to participate in the study.

### Recruitment and sampling

Potential participants were identified from staff lists provided by the Human Resources Department. Staff lists were used for sampling in order to achieve maximum variation. The authors wanted to include as wide a range of specialities as possible in the sample, and to do this, staff were selected from a list that did not categorize them by speciality but only by profession. Based on their job titles, staff were grouped by profession, hospital site and seniority. Study invitations were sent via e-mail, with a follow-up sent two weeks later. Recruitment and interviews took place between December 2010 and July 2011. Participants were recruited until data saturation was achieved. The final sample consisted of 10 doctors, 10 pharmacists, 18 nurses and one midwife (see Table I) out of 80 (49%) individuals invited to participate.

### Interview procedure

Study procedures were approved by the UK National Research Ethics Service. Written informed consent was obtained prior to interviews. Semi-structured interview guides (Table II) were developed from meetings with key informants in IPC and following systematic reviews of the literature.<sup>9,25</sup> Topics included IPC, HCAs, antimicrobial prescribing and catheter management, with questions on beliefs about HCAs, rationalization of HCAI prevention activities, barriers encountered during practice, and definitions about the participant's role and the roles of others. The interviews were conducted outside working hours. Participants were coded using numbers, and interview data were anonymized using this coding system. All interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim.

**Table II**  
Interview guides

Topic	Aims	Main questions
<b>1. Daily work life</b>	Gain contextual information about participants daily work life	–Can we start with you describing a typical working day?
<b>2. Respondent's perspectives on role in infection prevention and management in general</b>	Explore: –Perceived prominence of, and priority given to, infection control in the trust –Perceived role and importance of infection control in own day-to-day work	We would like to talk with you a little bit about infection prevention and management. –Do you think healthcare-associated infections are a problem in your hospital? Can you explain? –What infection prevention and management activities do you carry out in your own day-to-day work? – <u>Probe</u> : What activities in your day-to-day work do you associate with infection prevention? Why? – <u>Probe</u> : Do you consider the prevention and control of infection to be a priority in your day-to-day work? How do you address these priorities? –In your opinion, who has responsibility for management of healthcare-associated infections in your hospital? Why? – <u>Probe</u> : Which areas of infection prevention and management receive the most attention within your hospital?
<b>3. Barriers and facilitators to compliance with infection control guidelines</b>	Explore perceived barriers to, influences on and facilitators for compliance with infection control guidelines in general	–Are you aware of any specific standards associated with infection prevention and management? – <u>Probe</u> : Are there any hospital standards (i.e. policy or guidelines) that you are aware of? –In your view, what are the main challenges for preventing and managing healthcare-associated infections in your hospital? –If any, what <u>barriers</u> are there to you complying with recommendations regarding infection prevention and management? – <u>Probe</u> : Personal barriers? – <u>Probe</u> : Organizational barriers? –What factors, if any, would make it easier for you to prevent or manage healthcare-associated infections? Can you think of specific examples? –How do you feel about <u>encouraging</u> your colleagues to comply with infection control practices? Can you think of any examples? – <u>Probe</u> : How would your attitude differ dependent on which type of colleague? (Seniors? Peers? Juniors? Trainees? Different professional groups?) – <u>Probe</u> : How would your attitude differ dependent on what aspect of infection control it is? (e.g. handwashing, device management) –Do you feel anything would need to change to reduce the risk of healthcare-associated infections? If so, what are these changes?
<b>4. Vascular access (line insertion, monitoring and administration of intravenous medications)</b>	Explore perceived infection control issues relating to line insertion and monitoring, including: –Knowledge and understanding –Perceived responsibility for infection control –Challenges for/barriers to infection control –Potential facilitators to infection control	Can we change topics and talk a little bit about peripheral lines? –What, if any, aspects of peripheral vascular access (including line insertion and monitoring, and administration of intravenous medications) does your job involve? –In your opinion, what are the main infection risks associated with peripheral lines? ( <i>Asked only to doctors and nurses</i> ) – <u>Probe</u> : Are there any infection prevention measures to be considered when <u>inserting peripheral lines</u> ? Could you describe these? Are there any circumstances where you would not follow infection control measures whilst inserting a peripheral line? Can you provide any examples of these?

Table II (continued)

Topic	Aims	Main questions
<b>5. Antibiotic prescribing and management</b>	Explore perceptions of: –Role of antibiotic prescribing in infection control –Knowledge of antibiotic prescribing guidelines –Barriers to compliance with antibiotic prescribing guidelines –Potential facilitators to compliance with antibiotic prescribing guidelines	<p>–<u>Probe</u>: Are there any infection prevention measures to be considered when <u>administering intravenous medications</u>? Could you describe these?</p> <p>–<u>Probe</u>: What barriers do you personally face in adhering to infection prevention measures when administering intravenous medications?</p> <p>–Are you aware of any specific standards associated with peripheral line insertion, monitoring of peripheral lines or intravenous drug administration? Could you describe these? (<i>Asked only to doctors and nurses</i>)</p> <p>–<u>Probe</u>: Where/how, if at all, have you learned about these standards?</p> <p>–<u>Probe</u>: How do you keep up to date with any changes to procedures or practice relating to peripheral line insertion or care (including intravenous drug administration)? How would you like to be kept up to date with changes?</p> <p>–Who, in your view, has responsibility for managing the insertion and care of peripheral lines?</p> <p>–<u>Probe</u>: How clear do you think it is, within your department, where responsibilities lie?</p> <p>–Is there any follow-on care associated with peripheral lines following insertion?</p> <p>–<u>Probe</u>: Are there any challenges to performing these? If so, what are they?</p> <p>–<u>Probe</u>: Organizational challenges?</p> <p>–What do you think could be done to improve compliance with recommended infection control guidelines for the insertion and care of peripheral lines?</p> <p>Thank you, we will now focus on antibiotic management</p> <p>–What aspects of antibiotic prescribing and management are you involved in?</p> <p>–<u>Probe</u>: Prescribing? Monitoring? Restricting? Administering?</p> <p>–<u>Probe</u>: Are you aware of any specific standards associated with antibiotic prescribing and management?</p> <p>–<u>Probe</u>: Are you aware of any Imperial Trust policy on antibiotic prescribing and management?</p> <p>–Do you think antibiotic prescribing has potential to put patients at risk of infection? If so, how? (<i>Asked only to doctors and pharmacists</i>)</p> <p>–Is it easy or difficult to adhere to trust policy on antibiotic prescribing and management? Why?</p> <p>–<u>Probe</u>: To what extent do you have confidence in the current antibiotic policy?</p> <p>–<u>Probe</u>: Do you feel you have had sufficient education and training on antibiotic prescribing and management?</p> <p>–Do your colleagues comply with the policy?</p> <p>–<u>Probe</u>: Do you feel you are in a position to question the antibiotic prescribing/management behaviour of your colleagues and superiors?</p> <p>–<u>Probe</u>: Who, in your view, is responsible for making sure that the prescribing and management of antibiotics is optimal?</p> <p>–<u>Probe</u>: How clear do you think it is, within your department, where responsibilities lie?</p> <p>–What barriers do you personally face when to optimizing your prescribing and monitoring practices? (<i>Asked only to doctors and pharmacists</i>)</p> <p>–<u>Probe</u>: What would facilitate you to optimize antibiotic prescribing?</p>

(continued on next page)

Table II (continued)

Topic	Aims	Main questions
6. Communication	Explore knowledge and perceptions of, confidence in and perceived influence of infection control data collected by the trust	<p>–What do you think could be done on an organizational level to improve antibiotic prescribing and management?</p> <p>–Do you know of any data collected by Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust to monitor compliance with infection control practice or antibiotic prescribing?</p> <p>–<u>Probe</u>: Is this presented to and/or your colleagues? If so, how?</p> <p>–<u>Probe</u>: To what extent do you have confidence in the data collected? Why?</p> <p>–<u>Probe</u>: Could anything be done to improve your confidence in data?</p> <p>–<u>Probe</u>: To what extent do you think it influences your own behaviour or practice? In what ways? Why?</p> <p>–How, if at all, would you change the way in which data are collected and presented?</p> <p>–In your opinion, what is the most effective way of receiving information relating to infection prevention and management?</p> <p><i>Present stimulus materials</i></p> <p>–In your time at Imperial, have you seen any of these communication materials around infection control and/or antibiotic prescribing? How would you rate the effectiveness of these materials and the messages they promote?</p> <p>–<u>Probe</u>: Effective channel?</p> <p>–<u>Probe</u>: Effective message?</p>
7. Conclusions	Check whether there are any additional issues that the respondent would like to raise	<p>–Are there any questions that you would like to ask?</p> <p>–Is there anything that you would like to add?</p> <p>–Thank you very much for your time</p>

## Analysis

Analysis of the data involved an inductive approach to code formation together with a deductive framework for data indexing.<sup>36,37</sup> Initial concepts about HCWs' behaviour and sources of non-compliance were identified and categorized. Comparison with themes identified in systematic reviews<sup>9,25</sup> led to thematic codes in the analytic framework. Data were indexed in three distinct areas: peripheral vascular access; antimicrobial prescribing; and standard infection prevention and control practices. Three researchers (NS, ECS and EC) independently analysed the transcripts line-by-line, charting emerging relationships between the themes using the framework described until no new relationships emerged. Initially, six themes were identified: IPC activities and tasks; associations made with IPC; expectations of others; guidelines and policies; perspectives on IPC; and responsibilities. Ninety-five codes were incorporated, which were subsequently refined during the charting process and distilled when mapping and interpreting the data. Table III presents an example of the transit from participants' quotes to a thematic category. The three researchers participated in weekly meetings to discuss the data in the transcripts and the emerging themes. To ensure robustness of the findings, all three researchers read all the interviews, and any ideas about emerging themes were discussed in detail until consensus was reached. All researchers agreed on the final major themes. After the final thematic framework was agreed, previous transcripts were re-

evaluated and data were re-indexed into the new analysis framework.

## Results

Key themes emerging from the analysis were: attribution of responsibility; prioritization and risk appraisal; and hierarchy of influence. These are described in detail below. They highlight inconsistencies and ambiguity in practice, and depict HCWs' different motivations for compliance with IPC practice and antimicrobial prescribing. Participants' demographics are provided in Table I.

### Attribution of responsibility

Attributing certain IPC responsibilities to other HCWs was a prominent behaviour among participants. HCWs focused their attention on perceived responsibilities, whilst simultaneously attributing IPC tasks to others considered more appropriate. To make these judgements, participants relied on traditional professional identities:

'I work as a physician so I don't do things, I do a lot of thinking and talking and organizing.' (Consultant Physician)

HCWs had different work expectations about themselves and others; for example, nurses were expected to manage and mitigate HCAI risks from the outset:

**Table III**  
Example of coding and analytical framework

Quotation	Code	Category	Theme
		IPC activities and tasks	Hierarchy of influence
		Associations with IPC	
		Policies	Prioritization and risk appraisal
		Views on IPC	
<p>'I would say maybe they don't really understand the reasons'</p> <p>'I know it's everyone's responsibility to spread the word. I don't feel comfortable and wouldn't want to do it.'</p> <p>'Are you aware of any specific standards within this trust around infection prevention and control in terms of guidelines and policy? [No]'</p> <p>'I don't think it's a pharmacist's responsibility [...] to be thinking about those sorts of things.'</p> <p>'So it's really everybody's responsibility'</p>	<p>Challenging practice</p> <p>Self-efficacy</p> <p>Knowledge/experience</p> <p>Identification of the role of others</p>	<p>Responsibilities</p> <p>Expectations of others</p>	<p><b>Attribution of responsibility</b></p>

IPC, infection prevention and control.

'The ward is really excellent in terms of infection ... the nurses have no problems challenging the consultants on any aspect of their practice.' (Physician)

At times, there were disagreements about responsibility to perform particular tasks, such as managing catheters, highlighting coordination issues:

'It's [managing peripheral vascular catheters] quite a grey area, the doctor will say it's the nurse and the nurse will say well the doctor

[who] put it in ... they're quite antagonistic with each other.' (Senior Nurse)

Whilst the importance of collective responsibility was widely recognized, ambiguity about what constituted appropriate IPC practice was highlighted:

'[HCAI prevention] it's not an individual responsibility and sometimes people might think 'How does it matter if I have touched the patient without washing my hands?'' (Consultant Physician)

Moreover, whilst such generalized consideration of IPC as everyone's responsibility was clear, the terms regarding which professionals should address suboptimal practice were less defined, leading to tensions. Such tensions affected the extent of interprofessional communication. For example, some nurses and pharmacists felt that they had responsibility but lacked the authority to reinforce adequate practices beyond their own remit:

'I'm obviously not going to tell an anaesthetist that I think they've put the endotracheal tube in the wrong way. But if I see the anaesthetist not put gloves on ... that I'm actually going to say you need gloves ... because I do own that aspect of the role.' (Senior Nurse)

Finally, senior doctors felt ultimately responsible for the clinical outcomes of their patients, but for these outcomes to be successful, they had to rely on junior staff to practice optimally:

'I don't go round checking the drug charts to see patients are on the right drugs ... I rely that people are sensible, that they are following guidelines, that the pharmacist has checked them, the middle ranking doctor's checking them.' (Consultant Physician)

### Prioritization and risk appraisal

Whilst eliminating the risk of HCAs was widely accepted, prioritization of IPC activities was performed amidst limited resources and demanding workloads. HCWs experienced conflicting issues where they acknowledged requirements to comply with a given IPC practice, but were not able to assign significant priority to it due to other competing demands. Prioritization of IPC activities was not always homogeneous between and within HCW groups, with differences fuelling tensions between professionals and obstructing attempts to reinforce IPC activities:

'When people come into hospital, they don't want to use the hand gel. So sometimes this is a challenge but we have to challenge everybody ... some of the staff, even the doctors have been offended ...' (Staff Nurse)

Personal experience was highly valued amongst HCWs and used to over-ride policy. HCWs tried to achieve a balance in their practice between HCAI risks and other patient needs, with 'shortcuts' reported by HCWs to reflect how such risk evaluations tended to over-rule organizational standards. As such, policies were valued only to the extent to which they met the perceived reality of clinical practice:

'Regarding peripheral lines, there was a big emphasis on taking them out [at] three days, but that almost started to over-ride clinical need of having a line in people who were difficult to get a line.' (Junior Doctor)

Perhaps not surprisingly, resource constraints facilitated 'cutting corners' leading to suboptimal practices, with implications for HCAI prevention:

'Nurses know what they're supposed to be doing, and when they don't do it, it's because we're too busy, short staffed, too stretched, they're cutting that corner when they feel under pressure to prioritize other things.' (Senior Nurse)

### Hierarchy of influence

Although influencing the IPC compliance of others was reported as challenging, it was felt to be achievable if the working environment was supportive:

'I only get so far in challenging a visiting consultant if ... I have the support of my consultant team to do that.' (Senior Nurse)

However, HCWs also described instances where traditional hierarchical barriers prevented them from engaging on this matter:

'Although we are moving away from hierarchy in the medical profession, there's still an element of apprehension, challenging a surgeon. I sometimes felt that people feel a little bit apprehensive, challenging the surgeon who comes wearing coat and goes in and touches a patient. And it's just to again empower people and make them understand that they are as important a part of the team as a surgeon might be.' (Consultant Physician)

For junior doctors, negotiating antimicrobial prescribing was a challenging task as they found it difficult to break away from norms set by their seniors:

'I've had cases where I've asked the junior doctor to change something and he'll say no ... because the registrar asked me to ... They can't tell you the reason.' (Lead Pharmacist)

In comparison, senior doctors preferred greater autonomy in their practice. Exercising such autonomy resulted in disagreement to follow policies, as doctors considered themselves to be entitled to work independently:

'I'm a clinician and have some degree of independent practice. I don't feel that protocols are necessary to guide me, but definitely for people working on the ward.' (Physician)

Interestingly, other professions concurred with this view and highlighted how it created barriers to interdisciplinary dialogue on shared responsibilities.

## Discussion

These findings highlight how variation in compliance resulted from HCWs' appraisal of their own and others' responsibilities, risk and priorities, together with hierarchical influences and interprofessional dialogues about IPC. In this study, the appraisal and assumption of one's responsibilities over another's responsibilities seems to challenge communication between professionals. Negotiation of roles, status and influence in healthcare groups are shaped through professional identities and work characteristics and remit.<sup>30</sup> As the existing hierarchy within this system can only confer responsibilities to a certain extent, ambiguity about preferred or desired roles is not resolved due to competition for leadership.

Ambiguity and uncertainty are unlikely to emerge only at behavioural level.<sup>1,13,16,23</sup> For this reason, policy makers face the challenge of creating environments that respond to the needs of users whilst, paradoxically, removing the ability of these same users to opt for non-compliance.<sup>38</sup> Regarding the attribution of responsibility, Duerden argued that the responsibility for IPC is universal and thus requires compliance 'from board to ward'.<sup>39</sup> The current study highlights the situation where HCWs tended to focus on personal responsibilities, and their attribution of responsibilities of others meant that the focus on preventing infections was not synchronized. Ways in which these requirements can be met and balanced merits further study, although it is clear that IPC interventions should attempt to improve systematic processes and promote personal responsibility.<sup>16,24</sup>

For participants, optimal compliance with policies was relative to the perceived risk of undesirable outcomes resulting

from non-compliance, scarcity of resources and local norms. This combination of factors suggested that IPC practices were not perceived as homogeneous, with some policies being adhered to better than others. In this study, different settings, specialties and professional levels added complexity to the prioritization process as each presented different demands. Interestingly, according to the results, as senior staff set the pace of work and priorities for others, it would be necessary to make seniors aware of this influence and encourage their consolidation as positive role models in IPC practice.<sup>40</sup>

The risk of HCAs from non-compliance was routinely evaluated or appraised by staff, and short-cuts were often taken, ultimately becoming acceptable norms. More importantly, the results show that HCWs adapted and organized their IPC duties around their clinical environment. This demonstrated that motivation to reduce the risk of HCAI was used to resolve deficit of resources, and HCWs tried to maintain the balance in the work system by 'making do' with what was available.<sup>35</sup>

Whilst the different professions could be seen as separate social entities arranged in a hierarchical order, complying with the division of labour and responsibilities expected requires some interdependence related to the IPC activity concerned.<sup>26</sup> However, this arrangement may not always foster collaboration due to existing social barriers, and would have implications for communication and managerial styles.<sup>33</sup>

The results shed light on the difficulty to engender cohesion and foster commitment to IPC compliance in multi-professional teams where divergent views about policy and clinical practice exist, as they are more likely to support the norms held in their respective professions.<sup>4,28,29</sup> Behaviours are not entirely independent of policy, but an amalgamation of local practices, individual preferences and a degree of professional socialization and internalization.<sup>41</sup> Thus, policies require reasonable pragmatism, accounting for local differences and recognizing uncertainty, together with ceding autonomy when appropriate, particularly on the negotiation of responsibilities, duties and promotion of collaboration within an increasingly complex and multi-disciplinary healthcare system.<sup>30</sup>

Whilst the current study attempted to limit researcher bias from analysis through agreement of findings between three analysts, the nature of qualitative research means that current results remain subjective. The study focused on three main HCW groups: physicians, pharmacists and nurses (allied professionals were not included). The current study described HCWs' self-reported behaviours and appraisals of infection prevention practice. Future studies should triangulate any findings and strengthen the analysis of relationships between factors. Furthermore, participants in this study were recruited from one organization and local norms may differ elsewhere.

Mitigating the risk of HCAI requires eliminating ambiguity through negotiation of personal responsibility, together with locally relevant policies. Additionally, well-designed interventions that achieve sustained behavioural change need rigorous testing and evaluation in different clinical settings.<sup>14</sup>

## Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Rachel Edwards for contributing to the early phases of the research; Raheelah Ahmad for advice about the study design and development of the thematic

framework; and Oswin Baker, Julia Davies and Susan Farrell for assisting with interviews.

## Conflict of interest statement

AH is affiliated with the Imperial Centre for Patient Safety and Service Quality funded by the UK NIHR. LD is supported by an NIHR Career Development Award (NIHR CDF-2011-04-017).

## Funding source

The research was funded by the National Institute for Health Research Health Protection Research Unit (NIHR HPRU) in Healthcare Associated Infection and Antimicrobial Resistance at Imperial College London in partnership with Public Health England (PHE). The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the National Health Service, the NIHR, the Department of Health or PHE.

## References

- Murray E, Holmes A. Addressing healthcare-associated infections and antimicrobial resistance from an organizational perspective: progress and challenges. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2012;67(Suppl. 1):i29.
- Duerden B. Biology, politics and performance management: tackling healthcare-associated infections in the NHS in England. *Clin Risk* 2010;16:169–172.
- Duerden B. Controlling healthcare-associated infections in the NHS. *Clin Med* 2008;8:140–143.
- Grol R, Grimshaw A. From best evidence to best practice: effective implementation of change in patients' care. *Lancet* 2003;362:1225–1230.
- Michie S, Johnston M, Abraham C, Lawton R, Parker D, Walker A. Making psychological theory useful for implementing evidence based practice: a consensus approach. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2005;14:26–33.
- Godin G, Bélanger-Gravel A, Eccles M, Grimshaw J. Healthcare professionals' intentions and behaviours: a systematic review of studies based on social cognitive theories. *Imp Sci* 2008;3:36.
- Michie S, van Stralen M, West R. The behaviour change wheel: a new method for characterising and designing behaviour change interventions. *Imp Sci* 2011;6:42.
- Marteau T. Behavioural medicine: changing our behaviour. *BMJ* 2006;332:437–438.
- Edwards R, Charani E, Sevdalis N, et al. Optimising infection prevention and control practice using behaviour change: a systematic review. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2012;12:318–329.
- Bauchner H, Simpson L, Chessare J. Changing physicians' behaviour. *Arch Dis Child* 2001;84:459–462.
- Damschroder LJ, Banaszak-Holl J, Kowalski CP, Forman J, Saint S, Krein SL. The role of the champion in infection prevention: results from a multisite qualitative study. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2009;18:434–440.
- Hendy J, Barlow J. The role of the organizational champion in achieving health system change. *Soc Sci Med* 2012;74:348–355.
- Hulscher M, Grol R, van der Meer J. Antibiotic prescribing in hospitals: a social and behavioural scientific approach. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2012;10:167–175.
- Squires JE, Suh KN, Linklater S, et al. Improving physician hand hygiene compliance using behavioural theories: a study protocol. *Imp Sci* 2013;8:16.
- Carver CS, Scheier MF. *On the self-regulation of behaviour*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2001.
- Reason J. Human error: models and management. *BMJ* 2000;320:768–770.

17. Eccles M, Grimshaw J, Walker A, Johnston M, Pitts N. Changing the behavior of healthcare professionals: the use of theory in promoting the uptake of research findings. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2005;58:107–112.
18. Eccles M, Grimshaw J, Johnston M, et al. Applying psychological theories to evidence-based clinical practice: identifying factors predictive of managing upper respiratory tract infections without antibiotics. *Imp Sci* 2007;2:26.
19. Forman J, Creswell J, Damschroder L, Kowalski C, Krein S. Qualitative research methods: key features and insights gained from use in infection prevention research. *Am J Infect Control* 2008;36:764–771.
20. Robertson N, Baker R, Hearnshaw H. Changing the clinical behaviour of doctors: a psychological framework. *BMJ Qual Saf* 1996;5:51–54.
21. Fuller C, Michie S, Savage J, et al. The Feedback Intervention Trial (FIT) – improving hand-hygiene compliance in UK healthcare workers: a stepped wedge cluster randomised controlled trial. *PLOS One* 2012;7:e41617.
22. Grimshaw J, Eccles M, Walker A, Thomas R. Changing physicians' behavior: what works and thoughts on getting more things to work. *J Contin Educ Health Prof* 2002;22:237–243.
23. Gurses AP, Seidl KL, Vaidya V, et al. Systems ambiguity and guideline compliance: a qualitative study of how intensive care units follow evidence-based guidelines to reduce healthcare associated infections. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2008;7:351–359.
24. Mah MW, Meyers G. Toward a socioethical approach to behavior change. *Am J Infect Control* 2002;34:73–79.
25. Charani E, Edwards R, Sevdalis N, et al. Behavior change strategies to influence antimicrobial prescribing in acute care: a systematic review. *Clin Infect Dis* 2011;53:651–662.
26. Currie G, Finn R, Martin G. Accounting for the 'dark side' of new organizational forms: the case of healthcare professionals. *Hum Relat* 2008;61:539.
27. Erasmus V, Brouwer W, van Beeck E, et al. A qualitative exploration of reasons for poor hand hygiene among hospital workers: lack of positive role models and of convincing evidence that hand hygiene prevents cross-infection. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2009;30:415–419.
28. McDonald R, Waring J, Harrison S, Walshe K, Boaden R. Rules and guidelines in clinical practice: a qualitative study in operating theatres of doctors' and nurses' views. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2005;14:290–294.
29. Dixon-Woods M, Suokas A, Pitchforth E, Tarrant C. An ethnographic study of classifying and accounting for risk at the sharp end of medical wards. *Soc Sci Med* 2009;69:362–369.
30. Poole M, Real K. Groups and themes in healthcare: communication and effectiveness. In: Thompson T, Dorsey A, Miller K, Parrott R, editors. *Handbook of health communication*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Association; 2003.
31. Pittet D. Improving adherence to hand hygiene practice: a multidisciplinary approach. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2001;7:234–240.
32. Saint S, Kowalski C, Forman J, et al. A multicenter qualitative study on preventing hospital-acquired urinary tract infection in US hospitals. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2008;29:333–341.
33. Gittell J, Fairfield K, Bierbaum B, et al. Impact of relational coordination on quality of care, postoperative pain and functioning, and length of stay: a nine-hospital study of surgical patients. *Med Care* 2000;38:807–819.
34. Armstrong D. Clinical autonomy, individual and collective: the problem of changing doctors' behaviour. *Soc Sci Med* 2002;55:1771–1777.
35. Horlick-Jones T. Informal logics of risk: contingency and modes of practical reasoning. *J Risk Res* 2005;8:253–272.
36. Bradley EH, Curry LA, Devers KJ. Qualitative data analysis for health services research: developing taxonomy, themes, and theory. *Health Serv Res* 2007;42:1758–1772.
37. Pope C, Ziebland S, Mays N. Qualitative research in health care: analysing qualitative data. *BMJ* 2000;320:114–116.
38. Davey P, Brown E, Charani E, et al. Interventions to improve antibiotic prescribing practices for hospital inpatients (Review). *Cochrane Database System Rev* 2013;5:1–203.
39. Duerden B. Responsibility for managing healthcare-associated infections: where does the buck stop? *J Hosp Infect* 2009;73:414–417.
40. Armstrong D, Ogden J. The role of etiquette and experimentation in explaining how doctors change behaviour: a qualitative study. *Social Health Illn* 2006;28:951–968.
41. Gabbay J, le May A. Evidence based guidelines or collectively constructed 'mindlines?' Ethnographic study of knowledge management in primary care. *BMJ* 2004;30:1013.