



## Changing the default to promote influenza vaccination among health care workers



Birthe A Lehmann<sup>a,\*</sup>, Gretchen B Chapman<sup>b</sup>, Frits ME Franssen<sup>c</sup>, Gerjo Kok<sup>d</sup>, Robert AC Ruiter<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Center for Infectious Disease Control, Epidemiology and Surveillance, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), PO Box 1, Bilthoven, BA 3720, The Netherlands

<sup>b</sup> Department of Psychology, Rutgers University, 152 Frelinghuysen Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8020, USA

<sup>c</sup> CIRO+, Centre of Expertise for Chronic Organ Failure, Hornerheide 1, Horn, NM 6085, The Netherlands

<sup>d</sup> Department of Work & Social Psychology, Faculty of Psychology and Neuroscience, Maastricht University, PO Box 616, Maastricht, MD 6200, The Netherlands

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 1 September 2015

Received in revised form 15 January 2016

Accepted 20 January 2016

Available online 3 February 2016

#### Keywords:

Influenza

Vaccination

Intervention

Health care workers

Default

### ABSTRACT

**Background:** The prevention of health care acquired infections is an important objective for patient safety and infection control in all health care settings. Influenza vaccination uptake among health care workers (HCWs) is the most effective method to prevent transmission to patients, but vaccination coverage rates are low among HCWs. Several educational campaigns have been developed to increase the influenza vaccination coverage rates of HCWs, but showed only small effects. The aim of this study was to test an opt-out strategy in promoting uptake among HCWs in a tertiary care center for patients with complex chronic organ failure.

**Methods:** HCWs were randomly assigned to one of two conditions. In the opt-out condition ( $N=61$ ), participants received an e-mail with a pre-scheduled appointment for influenza vaccination, which could be changed or canceled. In the opt-in condition ( $N=61$ ), participants received an e-mail explaining that they had to schedule an appointment if they wanted to get vaccinated.

**Results:** The findings show no statistically detectable effect of condition on being vaccinated against influenza. However, HCWs in the opt-out condition were more likely to have an appointment for influenza vaccination, which in turn increased the probability of getting vaccinated.

**Conclusion:** To change the default to promote influenza vaccination among HCWs might be an easy and cost-effective alternative to the complex vaccination campaigns that have been proposed in recent years.

© 2016 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

The prevention of health care acquired or nosocomial infections is an important objective for patient safety and infection control in all healthcare settings [1]. Several studies reported on the incidence of influenza infections leading to nosocomial outbreaks with negative consequences for patients and the healthcare organization [2–6]. A review including 12 nosocomial outbreaks in healthcare settings reported an infection prevalence of up to 50% among patients on the epidemic ward [3]. Sartor and colleagues [6] found

that 41% of patients and 23% of healthcare workers (HCWs) contracted influenza on an internal medicine ward during an outbreak, which resulted in additional morbidity, as well as considerable interferences with and delay of healthcare services.

Nosocomial outbreaks are especially problematic for immunosuppressed patients, including those with underlying chronic diseases leading to increased morbidity, mortality and associated costs [7–9]. In particular, patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) have been shown to suffer from a 15% to 50% acute exacerbation following a respiratory infection [9]. Patients get infected with influenza through relatives, other patients, or HCWs. It is estimated that 20% of HCWs get infected with influenza annually [10]. Many of them continue working and thereby promote the spread of influenza [11]. Vaccination against influenza is the most effective method to prevent nosocomial transmission [12,13], and studies showed that vaccination helps to reduce influenza-related diseases and mortality among

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +31 30 274 4768.

E-mail addresses: [birthe.lehmann@rivm.nl](mailto:birthe.lehmann@rivm.nl) (B.A. Lehmann), [gretchen.chapman@rutgers.edu](mailto:gretchen.chapman@rutgers.edu) (G.B. Chapman), [fritsfranssen@ciro-horn.nl](mailto:fritsfranssen@ciro-horn.nl) (F.M. Franssen), [g.kok@maastrichtuniversity.nl](mailto:g.kok@maastrichtuniversity.nl) (G. Kok), [r.ruiter@maastrichtuniversity.nl](mailto:r.ruiter@maastrichtuniversity.nl) (R.A. Ruiter).

patients with chronic lung diseases [14]. A Dutch study executed in University hospitals showed that an increase of 10.8% in the vaccination uptake of HCWs through means of a multi-faceted program resulted in approximately 6% fewer patients with nosocomial influenza and/or pneumonia compared with control hospitals [15]. In addition, studies clearly indicated that vaccinating HCWs is cost-effective [6,16,17].

Despite all evidence for the effectiveness of vaccination in the prevention of nosocomial infections, vaccination coverage rates among European HCWs are low. A study by Blank, Schwenkglens, and Szucs [18] in 11 European countries reported vaccination rates of between 6.4% and 26.3% among HCWs. Attitude is an important determinant predicting HCWs' intention to get vaccinated against influenza [19,20]. The common sense strategy to change attitudes is to give people factual information and good arguments for the desired health behavior (i.e., getting vaccinated against influenza). In accordance, proposed theoretical methods to change attitudes and underlying beliefs are oftentimes educational in nature [21]. However, an increasing number of studies conclude that information alone cannot achieve behavior change [22]. Nevertheless, several educational campaigns have been developed to increase the influenza vaccination coverage rates of HCWs [15,23–25], but showed only small effects. Consequently, there seems to be a need for a radically different approach to change vaccination behavior.

An approach that has shown to be effective in influencing behavior is nudging [26]. Nudges are small and simple changes in the environment that push decision makers in the right direction without restricting their choice autonomy. One such nudge that has shown to be able to promote health behavior is the default effect [26,27]. Decision makers show the tendency of sticking with a default option, the option that comes into effect if the decision maker does not actively decide against it. A study by Chapman, Li, Colby, and Yoon [28] manipulated the default by sending e-mail appointments for annual influenza vaccination to University staff. Employees in the opt-out condition had an appointment by default and had to actively cancel it if they did not want to have an appointment (or they could ignore the appointment, which most did). Employees in the opt-in condition did not have an appointment and had to actively make an appointment if they wanted to have an appointment for vaccination (or they could be vaccinated as walk-ins). A 12% absolute increase in vaccination rate was found in favor of the opt-out condition. In addition, it was found that appointment status mediated the relationship between condition and getting vaccinated.

Because HCWs are an important source of nosocomial infections in vulnerable patient groups, and previous educational interventions have failed or only reached small effects, this replication study tested the use of the default strategy to increase the influenza vaccination uptake of HCWs in a Dutch expert center for patients with chronic organ failure using a randomized experimental design. It was hypothesized that appointment status mediates the relationship between condition and getting vaccinated, like it did in the study of Chapman and colleagues [28].

## 2. Methods

### 2.1. Setting, participants, design and procedure

CIRO+ is a center of expertise for the diagnosis and treatment of patients with complex chronic organ failure, in particular obstructive pulmonary diseases (i.e., COPD and asthma) and chronic heart failure. It is located in the south of the Netherlands. The center employs 122 people, including (chest) physicians (approximately 6%), nursing staff (33%), psychotherapists and social workers (5%), ergo-therapists (3%), physiotherapists (14%), laboratory

workers (18%), biomechanical engineers (4%), dieticians (11%), and researchers (6%). Most employees have patient contact. The annual procedure for influenza vaccination of HCWs in the center is as follows: The chest physician sends an e-mail to all employees that free vaccination is available at one day mid-October and if they want to get vaccinated they have to respond to the e-mail. Depending on the number of employees who respond, the center buys vaccines and the employees are vaccinated as walk-ins by a nurse at the day specified in the e-mail.

In the beginning of October 2014, CIRO+ employees were invited to attend a presentation, outlining the available evidence regarding the effectiveness of influenza vaccination in protecting patients, during one of their regular educational seminars. In mid-October, all 122 employees at CIRO+ were randomly assigned to one of two conditions in a one-factorial between-subjects design (email invitation: opt-in vs. opt-out). Randomization was done by the first author, who listed employees alphabetically by their last name and split the sample in half. Employees were blind to group assignment, as were the nurses administering the vaccination. Those in the opt-out condition received an e-mail from the responsible chest physician (FMEF) explaining that they had been scheduled for the annual influenza vaccination, with the day, time, and location provided. Vaccinations free of charge were given on two different days of the week. Hyperlinks in the e-mail allowed participants to change or cancel the appointment day and/or time. For those in the opt-in condition, the e-mail explained that there were two days on which free influenza vaccinations were available and they had to schedule an appointment by responding to the chest physician via e-mail if they wanted to get vaccinated, which resembled the annual procedure at this center. In the week of the vaccinations, all opt-out participants that had changed or did not cancel their appointment were sent a reminder. Opt-in participants were not sent a reminder.

### 2.2. Data analysis

Pearson Chi-Square analysis was conducted with SPSS 21.0 to test for a difference in influenza vaccination uptake between the opt-in and the opt-out condition. Mplus 7 was used to test for mediation of appointment status. The bias corrected and accelerated (BCa) confidence intervals were set at .95 with 5000 resamples.

## 3. Results

The study sample consisted of 122 CIRO+ employees, of which 97 (79.5%) were female. Of the 61 participants that were randomly assigned to the opt-in condition, 12 scheduled an appointment, of which 8 got vaccinated, while 49 participants did not make an appointment, of which 2 got vaccinated. In the opt-out condition, 37 of the 61 participants cancelled their appointment. Of the 24 participants that did not cancel their appointment, 19 retained their original appointment of whom 12 got vaccinated and 7 did not. The appointment was changed to a different time and/or day by 5 participants; all 5 received the vaccination (see Table 1).

In the opt-in condition, 10 of 61 participants (16.4%) were vaccinated against influenza, compared with 17 of 61 participants (27.9%) in the opt-out condition, an 11.5% absolute difference [95%

**Table 1**  
Overview of HCWs' behavior in the two conditions and vaccination uptake.

	Opt-in	Opt-out
Assigned	61	61
Appointment	12	24 (5 rescheduled)
Vaccinated	10 (2 without appointment)	17
%	16.4	27.9

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/10963192>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/10963192>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)