



Nurses' knowledge and practice of pressure ulcer prevention and treatment: An observational study

Mohammad Y.N. Saleh^{a,*}, Panos Papanikolaou^b, Omayyah S. Nassar^c, Abeer Shahin^d, Denis Anthony^e

^a Clinical Nursing Department, School of Nursing, The University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan

^b Independent Investigator of Nursing Issues, 3 Thrush Close Cardiff, CF3 0PE, UK

^c Maternal Child Health Department, School of Nursing, The University of Jordan, Jordan

^d Community Health Nursing Department, School of Nursing, The University of Jordan, Jordan

^e Applied Health Research, School of Healthcare, G20 Baines Wing, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9UT, UK

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Pressure ulcer
Knowledge
Pressure ulcer prevention
Pressure ulcer treatment
Jordan

ABSTRACT

Aims and objectives: To assess nurses' knowledge on pressure ulcer (PU) prevention and treatment in Jordan, and the frequency of and factors influencing nurses' implementation of PU prevention and treatment interventions.

Background: Highly educated and experienced nurses can provide effective PU care; however, previous studies highlighted poor knowledge and implementation of PU care.

Design: A correlational study examining nurses' knowledge of PU prevention and frequency of PU preventive actions in Jordanian hospitals.

Methods: Participants were 377 nurses and 318 patients from 11 hospitals. Data were collected to quantify the frequency of nurses' implementation of pressure ulcer prevention and treatment interventions for patients suffering from PUs and/or at risk of PU development using a self-reported cross-sectional survey and prospective 8-h observation.

Results: For observed PU prevention while type of hospital and number of beds in units were significant it is not known without further work if this is replicable. For observed PU treatment, linear regression analysis revealed significant negative beta values for more than 50 beds in clinical unit ($\beta = -2.49$).

Conclusion: The study addressed new factors, facilitating the provision of prevention and treatment strategies to PU development, including type of clinical institution and number of beds in clinical unit.

Relevance to clinical practice: There is a need to develop training programmes to improve insufficient nurses' knowledge and, thus, clinical practices on PU prevention and treatment. These programmes would assist both junior and senior nurses and other key stakeholders (e.g. hospital managers, policy-makers, and educators) to improve the performance of PU services, thus, minimising patient suffering.

1. Introduction

Pressure ulcers (PUs) are a major health problem, resulting in reduced quality of life [1] and demanding resources from healthcare systems worldwide [2]. PUs are seen as an outcome of poor-quality nursing care [3]; they are largely preventable [4] and clinical guidelines are available to assist clinicians. In 2017, Anthony et al. reported that there were 854 grade 2–4 PUs in a single year (2015) in Greater Glasgow and Clyde (an area of Scotland with a population of 1.2 million), of which 48.4% were assessed as avoidable [5]. PU rates continue to increase significantly [6] in some regions, but not in all. For example,

in Germany, total prevalence fell from 12.5% in 2002 to 5.0% in 2008, probably due to more effective PU prevention strategies [7]. Differences in PU prevalence among countries may be attributed to differences in the risk levels and/or use of different prevention strategies. Halfens et al. [8] compared PU prevalence among Austrian, Swiss, and Dutch hospitals. The PU rate was highest among Dutch hospitals which was probably not due to different risk scores as when only at risk patients were considered the rate remained higher. Preventive measures differed among the countries and this may be the explanation for differing rates.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: m.saleh@ju.edu.jo (M.Y.N. Saleh), oceanspirit89@gmail.com (P. Papanikolaou), omayah64@live.com, o.Nassar@ju.edu.jo (O.S. Nassar), abeer_shahen@yahoo.com, abeer.Shaheen@ju.edu.jo (A. Shahin), d.anthony@leeds.ac.uk (D. Anthony).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtv.2019.10.005>

Received 10 October 2018; Received in revised form 31 July 2019; Accepted 21 October 2019

0965-206X/© 2019 Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of Tissue Viability Society.

1.1. Nurses' knowledge about PU prevention and treatment

Nurses' knowledge about PU prevention and treatment is a prerequisite to undertake effective prevention and therapeutic interventions of PU and its complications, which can lead to mortality if not treated effectively.

Numerous studies on nurses' knowledge about PU management revealed contradictory findings. Nurses' knowledge about PU prevention is a significant predictor of implementing PU prevention in practice [9]. In 2006, Pancorbo-Hidalgo et al. identified that about 65% of nurses implemented PU prevention interventions [10]. Aslan and Giersbergen [11] confirmed that almost 59% of Turkish nurses implemented PU knowledge in clinical practice.

Several studies have shown inadequate knowledge about PU prevention and treatment, though Demarré et al. [12] revealed that knowledge was not a significant independent predictor for applying PU prevention to at-risk nursing-home residents. Further, a Jordanian study revealed that 73% of nurses had inadequate PU knowledge and skills, leading to ineffective prevention and implementation plans [13]. Saleh et al. [14] showed that, although nurses had adequate PU knowledge, their prevention measures were insufficient. Thus, there is a gap between theory and practice.

Several factors influencing knowledge about PU prevention and treatment indicated conflicting findings. For example, despite nurses with bachelor degrees having better knowledge on PU prevention, this was not associated with providing PU prevention [15]. One study revealed that highly educated nurses demonstrated less knowledge than those with baccalaureate degrees [16]. Additionally, nurses working in orthopaedic, trauma, and emergency departments lacked knowledge about PU prevention, classification, and management [17,18].

1.2. Factors influencing nurses' implementation of PU management

Moore and Price [19] confirmed that well-educated nurses, having received additional formal training on skin and PU risk assessment, were aware that early actions would reduce the likelihood of PU occurrence. Insufficient documentation and training may have impeded their ability to provide effective preventive care-plans. Both factors have been repeatedly recognised as important for effective nursing [20].

Number of unit beds also affects PU prevention and practices. For instance, crowding is a common problem in Greek hospitals [21]. In Jordan, however, the number of unit beds was not associated with implementing PU prevention and treatment interventions [9].

Nurses' characteristics such as gender, age, and experience may influence implementing PU prevention and treatment. There are findings such as that male nurses showed better knowledge on PU prevention [13] that remain to be replicated or substantiated. The literature confirmed no associations with nurses' knowledge and implementation of PU care [9,11]. Although having more than 10 years' experience was significantly associated with PU prevention knowledge, work experience was not influential in practising better PU prevention [15].

International PU prevention guidelines recommend using an established risk assessment scale (RAS) [6]. The purpose of a RAS (e.g. the Braden scale) is to guide nurses' clinical judgement [10] to expand the clinical effectiveness of PU prevention (e.g. incidence reduction). The predictive capability of nurses' clinical judgement can be augmented by access to structured PU risk assessment activities [22]. This might be expected to improve nurses' clinical effectiveness of PU prevention. RASs, along with advanced PU prevention measures, have been employed recently in Jordan hospitals, which may explain nurses' lack of PU prevention [9].

What is most needed is to explore factors influencing PU care, to determine the level of knowledge and observe its implementation in clinical practice [19]. Thus, the present study was developed to assess

nurses' knowledge and practice of PU prevention and treatment in Jordan and to observe factors associated with PU care in clinical practice.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Aims

This study aimed to assess:

- Nurses' knowledge of pressure ulcer prevention and treatment.
- Frequency of observed implementation of pressure ulcer prevention and treatment in clinical practice.
- Factors influencing nurses' implementation of pressure ulcer prevention and treatment interventions.

2.2. Study design

This is a correlational study examining nurses' knowledge of PU prevention and frequency of PU preventive actions in Jordanian hospitals.

First, a self-reported cross-sectional survey was undertaken to assess nurses' knowledge of PU prevention and treatment. Next, a prospective 8-h observation quantified the frequency of nurses' PU prevention and treatment interventions for patients suffering from, or at risk of PUs.

2.3. Sample and setting

Inclusion criteria were hospitals in Jordan with 200 or more beds and medical-surgical, and critical care units. Eleven hospitals (6 government, 2 university, 1 military, and 2 private) met the inclusion criteria [23].

From these, a list of all units with potential PU patients, including medical-surgical, and critical care units was obtained from the nursing directors. Three clinical units per hospital were randomly selected (33 in total). All selected units implemented the Braden RAS as a requirement for hospital accreditation [24].

Nurses working in the selected units were surveyed. The sample consisted of registered nurses with baccalaureate and/or 3-year diploma, and associate degree nurses (2-year diploma). All participants were involved in direct patient assessment and PU prevention and treatment. Senior nurses were excluded. Observed patients were adults (18 years and older), and having at least a mild risk of developing a pressure ulcer- Braden score ≤ 17 . We also included any patient suffering from PU grade 1–4 according to EPUAP-NPUAP guidelines [25], who had been admitted to critical care or medical-surgical unit for at least 24 h, regardless of their Braden score.

2.4. Power calculation

A power analysis using G*power [26] gave a required sample size of 128 for an independent groups *t*-test. This figure used power = 0.80, $\alpha = 0.05$ (2-tailed) and effect size = 0.5 (medium effect). A sample of 377 nurses and 318 patients was achieved.

2.5. Measures

2.5.1. Nurse demographics and professional characteristics

Nurses' characteristics included gender, age, education, having postgraduate education, experience, hospital type, type of clinical unit number of unit beds, knowledge about PU, having PU training, using PU RAS and PU classification system involvement in PU research, and whether they agree with EPUAP-NPUAP's [25] definition of PU.

2.5.2. Patients' demographics

Observed patients' characteristics included gender, age, hospital

type, length of stay, previous hospitalisation, medical diagnosis, and level of PU risk using the Braden scale.

2.5.3. Nurses' knowledge and implementation of PU prevention and treatment

In the first part of the study a questionnaire collected data about Jordanian nurses' knowledge and practice of PU prevention and treatment, based on previous works [9,21,27] and EPUAP-NPUAP's PU prevention and treatment recommendations (6, 25). An initial 60-item questionnaire was subjected to validation by researchers and expert nurses (n = 10), assessing comprehensiveness, clarity, avoidance of ambiguity, and content validity. This involved circulating the draft items until there was consensus on content, order, and wording. The questionnaire contained the following subscales:

- PU prevention: 16 interventions considered effective/ineffective according to EPUAP-NPUAP [6,25] guidelines and expert panel.
- PU treatment: 29 interventions considered effective/ineffective according to EPUAP-NPUAP [6,25] guidelines and expert panel.

For each intervention, participants were asked to indicate its degree of appropriateness according to their knowledge (yes = 1/no = 0). Eleven items were reverse-coded (Appendix 1). The total knowledge index scores were reached by adding positive responses in both subscales. Cronbach's alpha reliability was as follows: total instrument = 0.61, prevention knowledge subscale = 0.47, treatment knowledge subscale = 0.62, observed prevention subscale = 0.61, and observed treatment subscale = 0.71.

The questionnaire was piloted using a sample of 40 nurses after gaining ethical approval. Thirty-two questionnaires were received. Afterwards, some items were reworded for clarity and the questionnaire was revised to combine similar items and remove misleading or repeated items. The pilot sample was excluded from the main study.

2.5.4. Observed PU prevention and treatment

In the second part of the study, the items assessing nurses' knowledge in the first part were used to formulate an observational checklist to measure nurses' implementation of prevention and treatment interventions in clinical practice. For each item, the observer assessed nurses' performance assisting patients with and/or at risk of PU as follows: always = 2, sometimes = 1, never = 0.

The Braden scale was used to determine the risk of PU occurrence (cut-off score ≤ 17). EPUAP-NPUAP's classification system [6,25] was applied to distinguish those patients with PU. These checklists were assessed through an inter-rater reliability index. Two trained nurses assessed the performance of one nurse caring for a patient with grade 3PU. These nurses showed an almost 0.90 intra-class correlation coefficient in scoring checklist items and were in agreement with the researchers' (Tissue Viability Nurse Specialist) assessment.

2.6. Ethical considerations

Ethical approval was sought and granted by the Research and Ethics Committee at the School of Nursing, The University of Jordan, and the Research and Ethics Committee of each participating hospital. Participation was voluntary. The anonymity and confidentiality of both nurse and patient participants were ensured by assigning identification numbers to participants, restricted to the research team. The questionnaire contained detailed information about the study's objectives, and returned questionnaires implied consent.

Written consent was obtained from patients involved in the observation. Patient participants could choose to leave the study at any time, or they could refuse participation and/or inspection for PU development.

2.7. Data collection

2.7.1. Survey of knowledge

A detailed explanation of the study was presented to senior nurses at participating hospitals. A list of available nurses was prepared by selected hospitals one day before data collection. Questionnaires were distributed to nurses by the researchers via departmental managers and charge nurses. Each questionnaire had a covering letter explaining the study, its aims, and how to complete and return the form. Self-completed questionnaires were returned in a sealed envelope to the researchers.

2.7.2. Observation

When the self-reported questionnaires were collected from participants, observational checklists were used to measure nurses' implementation of PU prevention and treatment interventions. The observation procedure was implemented in nursing units that had completed the survey. The 8-h prospective observation of nurses' performance with patients showed that flexibility, consistency, and adequacy of PU prevention and treatment interventions were applied in clinical settings. Each nurse participant was observed separately. Observation followed an arranged plan with unannounced visits to participating units. To reduce observational bias, 10 nurses were trained for two weeks on the EPUAP-NPUAP [6,25] grading system, Braden scale for PU risk assessment, EPUAP guidelines for PU prevention and treatment, and using the observational checklists. Trained nurses reviewed patients' medical records to document patients' demographic data and identify eligibility.

Observed nurses who performed care with patients were aware of the observers' presence but not their specific tasks [28].

2.8. Data analysis

Items that were not practice-recommended were reverse-coded (Appendix 1). Total scores were computed for prevention knowledge, treatment knowledge, observed PU prevention, and observed PU treatment. Dependent variables were observed PU prevention and observed PU treatment (both normalised 0–100). Independent variables were type of clinical unit (medical-surgical or critical care), institution, number of beds in ward/unit, years of experience, basic education, higher education (yes/no), length of time since last attended PU training session, involvement in PU research (yes/no), knowledge sources about PU, using RAS (yes/no), agreement with definition of PU, PU grading (yes/no), and demographics (gender, age). Also, knowledge of prevention/treatment was calculated (normalised 0–100).

Univariate inferential tests were used to determine variables that may influence observed PU prevention/treatment (dependent variables). Both were roughly normally distributed by visual inspection using histograms. Finally, linear regression analysis was employed to show associations of independent variables found to be significant under univariate analysis, on observed implementation of PU prevention and PU treatment. Additionally, knowledge of prevention was added as a covariate for observed PU prevention, and knowledge of treatment was added as a covariate for observed PU treatment. Significant results were examined at $\alpha = 0.05$ (2-tailed) probability, and the beta showed the strength of the relationship between the dependent and independent variables.

3. Results

3.1. Descriptive statistics

Of 460 questionnaires distributed, 377 were returned (Response rate = 81.9%). In addition, of 360 eligible patients, 318 were observed for PU prevention and treatment intervention (Response rate = 88.3%). Demographic data of nurse participants are presented in Table 1 and

Table 1
Nurse Participant's characteristics (N = 377).

		N	%
Institution	Governmental	133	35.3
	University	86	22.8
	Private	66	17.5
	Military	92	24.4
Unit	Medical-surgical	175	46.4
	Critical care	202	53.6
Unit Beds M = 22 SD = 14 R = 5-64	Less than 10	101	26.8
	10–20	102	27.1
	21–30	53	14.1
	31–40	94	24.9
	41–50	3	0.8
	More than 50	16	4.2
	Experience in Years	Less than 1 year	78
	1–4	140	37.1
	5–10	103	27.3
	11–15	32	8.5
	16–20	14	3.7
	More than 20 years	10	2.7
Gender	Male	189	50.1
	Female	188	49.9
Age (years) M = 27.4 SD = 4.5 R = 21-50	21–26	207	54.9
	27–32	125	33.2
	33–38	31	8.2
	39–44	12	3.2
	45–50	2	0.5
	Basic Education	BsC	329
	Diploma 3 years	32	8.5
	Associate Degree 2 years	15	4.0
Higher education	Yes	63	16.7
	No	314	83.3
Source of knowledge	University Degree	178	47.2
	In service education	43	11.4
	Conference attendance	4	1.1
	Product Promotion	24	6.4
	Degree plus in service education	128	34.0
Last attended PU training	Less than one year ago	113	30.0
	1–2 years	57	15.1
	More than 2 years	70	18.6
	Never attended	136	36.1
Using RAS	Yes	129	34.2
	No	248	65.8
Involved in PU research	Yes	38	10.1
	No	339	89.9
Agreement with PU definition	Disagree	42	11.1
	Agree	335	88.9
Availability PU classification (Grading)	Yes	187	49.6
	No	190	50.4

M = Mean, SD = Std. Deviation, R (Range) = Min-Max.

observed patients' characteristics are presented in Table 2. Knowledge sources about PU were largely from formal education or in-service education. Most nurses (89.9%, n = 339) were not involved in research activities on pressure ulcers. Only 34.2% stated using RAS. About 90% of participants (n = 335) agreed on the definition of PU and 49.6% acknowledged using the EPUAP-NPUAP classification system. Regarding observed patients, about 168 (52.8%) were aged ≥ 60 years and most (89.9%, n = 286) had previous hospitalisation. Half had a short length of stay, for 1–3 days (52.5%, n = 167), and 218 (68.6%) had mild to moderate risk of PU development. Sixty-six percent and 79% of nurse participants disagreed with using 'doughnuts' and 'massage', respectively, yet 32% said they always use 'doughnuts' to prevent pressure ulcers.

The knowledge and observed implementation scores are shown in Tables 3 and 4. Table 5 shows knowledge and implementation indices of PU prevention and treatment. Results showed less than satisfactory knowledge on PU prevention and treatment (74.5% and 72.6% respectively, where we would hope to have at least 80%) and very inadequate

Table 2
Observed patient's characteristics (N = 318).

Patient's Characteristics	n (%)	
Institution	Governmental	126 (39.6%)
	University	80 (25.1%)
	Private	31 (9.7%)
	Military	81 (25.5%)
Gender	Male	204 (64.1%)
	Female	114 (35.8%)
Age (in years)	18–39	69 (21.7%)
	40–59	81 (25.5%)
	60–69	82 (25.7%)
	70–79	64 (20.1%)
	80–89	18 (5.7%)
	≥ 90	4 (1.2%)
	Length of stay	1 day-3 Days
	4 days–6 days	83 (26.1%)
	1 week–29 days	49 (15.4%)
	1 month-6 months	19 (5.9%)
	> 6 Months	0 (0.0%)
Previous hospitalisation	Yes	286 (89.9%)
	No	32 (10.1%)
Diagnosis	Medical-surgical	197 (61.9%)
	Critically ill	121 (38.01%)
Level of PU risk using Braden scale	≤ 9 (Severe risk)	57 (17.9%)
	10-12 (High risk)	43 (13.5%)
	13-14 (Moderate risk)	61 (19.2%)
	15-17 (Mild risk)	157 (49.3%)

implementation of PU prevention and treatment (49.2% and 44.9%, respectively).

3.2. Univariate analysis

Institution was significantly associated with observed prevention and treatment interventions (p = 0.001), with the military hospital having higher implementation than governmental, university, or private hospitals in both cases. Type of clinical unit, namely critical care, was significant for observed prevention (p = 0.007), but not significant for observed treatment. Gender was not significant for either implementations, nor were experience, age, basic education, knowledge sources, last attended PU training, involvement in PU research, agreement with PU definition or PU classification. Higher education was significant for implementing treatment (p = 0.005), but was not significant for prevention. Using RAS was significant for treatment (p = 0.031), with higher implementation for those employing a RAS. Number of beds was significant for both prevention and treatment (p = 0.001 and p = 0.018), with units having fewer beds experiencing higher implementation than larger units in both cases.

3.3. Regression analysis

Linear regression used observed prevention as the dependent variable. Independent variables included institution, type of clinical unit, number of beds in unit, and knowledge about PU prevention, all were significant under univariate analysis. All categorical independent variables were dummy coded, except for knowledge of prevention. This gave significant negative beta values for the type of institution (university and private hospitals) and significant positive association for the number of beds in unit (10–20 beds) (Table 6).

For observed treatment (Table 7), linear regression used observed treatment as dependent and independent variables were those significant under univariate analysis-institution, higher education, using RAS, number of beds in unit, and knowledge about PU treatment. All independent variables were dummy coded, except for treatment knowledge. This gave significant negative beta values for institution (governmental and private hospitals) and also for number of beds in unit (> 50 beds).

Table 3
Assessed level of prevention knowledge and the actual preventive care provided.

PU prevention knowledge and implementation	Prevention knowledge		Prevention Implementation		
	Yes (%)	No (%)	Never (%)	Sometimes (%)	Always (%)
1. Assess pressure ulcer using risk assessment scale such as The Braden scale	71.1	28.9	24.9	54.4	20.7
2. Inspect and document skin condition on daily basis (basically areas at risk and bony prominences such as the Sacrum) for dryness, cracking, erythema (redness), maceration, Fragility, heat and induration.	90.2	9.8	3.7	92.8	3.5
3. Avoid excessive friction (rubbing) and/or friction over bony prominences in patient's movements	88.1	11.9	5.0	94.2	0.8
4. Avoid excessive moisture due to incontinence, perspiration, wound drainage and maintain skin clean and dry.	90.5	9.5	0.8	97.9	1.3
5. Assess, support and maintain nutritionally compromised patients. For example, the need for NGT feeding and serum Albumin level.	85.9	14.1	22.3	77.2	0.5
6. Maintain patient's activity (outside the bed) and mobility (within the bed) according to patient's health condition	92.3	7.7	21.2	76.4	2.4
7. Reposition those patients at risk frequently and on regular basis (if it is safe to do so)	92.8	7.2	0.0	87.0	13.0
8. Use pillows, foam wedges to relief pressure over bony prominences such as knees, or heels	91.5	8.5	1.9	95.8	2.3
9. Use principles of safe manual handling during transfer and/or positioning of the patient	90.5	9.5	0.0	97.8	2.2
10. For those patients seated on chair, they should not exceed 2 h out of the bed	80.1	19.9	5.9	72.3	21.8
11. Encourage patients to reposition themselves and redistribute weight every 15 min (if this possible)	81.2	16.2	13.0	49.9	37.1
12. Educate nurses and/or care givers the principles of pressure ulcer prevention	88.1	11.9	10.1	88.5	1.4
13. ^a Use skin barrier creams to protect reddened skin	13.3	86.7	2.4	91.0	6.6
14. ^a Use alcohol solution on the skin	55.4	44.6	37.6	62.4	0.0
15. ^a Use donuts-type devices to relieve pressure on areas at risk	34.0	66.0	15.6	52.5	31.9
16. ^a Massage reddened areas and/or bony prominences is helpful in pressure ulcer prevention	21.0	79.0	10.1	86.2	3.7

^a Reverse-coded items.

Table 4
Assessed level of knowledge of implementation and the actual treatment implemented.

PU treatment knowledge and implementation	Treatment knowledge		PU Treatment Implementation		
	Yes (%)	No (%)	Never (%)	Sometimes (%)	Always (%)
1. Existence of appropriate pressure ulcer definition	82.5	17.5	6.1	81.4	12.5
2. Using valid classification system that define pressure ulcer into four stages (grades)	70.0	30.0	7.5	85.7	6.8
3. Full assessment and documentation of a pressure ulcer included (location, size, grade, wound bed, exudates, pain, surrounding skin, and undermining) on daily or weekly basis	84.9	15.1	1.6	92.8	5.6
4. Re evaluate a pressure ulcer as the patient's condition deteriorates	85.9	14.1	4.2	93.4	2.4
5. Performing complete physical examination for those patients who are newly developed pressure ulcer	82.8	17.2	11.7	84.1	4.2
6. Assess and manage nutritional needs of patients who developed or at risk of pressure ulcer development such as food ingestion	84.1	15.9	3.7	94.4	1.9
7. Assess for and manage pain related to pressure ulcer development	89.7	10.3	1.9	98.1	0.0
8. Educate nurses and caregivers on pressure ulcer management	85.9	14.1	1.9	95.8	2.3
9. Manual repositioning of the patient of at least 3 h	83.3	16.7	8.8	91.2	0.0
10. Using special devices inpatient's repositioning such as sliding sheet, sliding board and/or hoist	68.2	31.8	10.1	58.4	31.5
11. Assess patient's bed or chair for safety, mobility, and comfortability	88.3	11.7	1.6	96.0	2.4
12. Avoid positioning of the patient on a developed pressure ulcer	63.7	36.3	22.8	77.2	0.0
13. Apply pressure ulcer relief, reduction, or redistribution devices such as alternating air mattress (bed), low air loss system, foam overlays, gel pads, and/or air fluidized beds	81.4	18.6	2.1	91.2	6.7
14. Debridement (removal of dead tissues) of necrotic tissues using surgical (scalpel), enzymatic agents, and/or hydrocolloid hydrogel dressings	84.1	15.9	1.9	93.9	4.2
15. Clean a pressure ulcer using normal saline 0.9% solution	89.9	10.1	2.1	97.3	0.6
16. Cover a pressure ulcer with moist primary dressings such as hydrocolloids	76.4	23.6	20.7	77.4	1.9
17. Wound dressing protocol planned and supervised by Tissue Viability Nurse Specialist (TVNS)	67.4	32.6	39.6	33.2	27.2
18. Assess for signs and symptoms of pressure ulcer wound infection such as purulent discharge, odor, pathology findings, and/or osteomyelitis	89.1	10.9	3.2	96.8	0.0
19. Apply aseptic technique (hand washing, sterile dressing) in caring those patients who are having infected pressure ulcer or with signs and symptoms of osteomyelitis	91.8	8.2	1.6	98.4	0.0
20. Collaborate with healthcare professionals to provide adjunctive therapies relevant to pressure ulcer care such as electrotherapy, hyperbaric oxygenation, or laser therapy	60.5	39.5	30.9	43.4	25.7
21. Obtain Tissue culture for infected pressure ulcer	83.2	16.8	26.6	57.8	15.6
22. ^a Using antiseptics frequently to clean pressure ulcer wound such as iodine povidine, H2O2, chlorhexidine	27.6	72.4	38.0	62	0.0
23. ^a Dry dressing used on a pressure ulcer such as dry gauze or iodine soaked gauze	22.5	77.5	30.9	69.1	0.0
24. ^a Change dressing on daily basis regardless the condition of the wound bed and findings of wound assessment	24.4	75.6	7.8	92.2	0.0
25. ^a Use topical antibiotics on pressure ulcer with signs of infection	10.1	89.9	18.6	81.4	0.0
26. Antibiotics are prescribed according to the results of swab culture in an infected pressure ulcer	88.1	11.9	2.2	96.8	1.0
27. ^a Use alternative methods in pressure ulcer treatment such as (honey, heat, or other preparations)	57.5	42.5	55.3	22.3	22.4
28. ^a Leave the necrotic (dead) tissues with no debridement on ulcers without signs of infection	43.2	56.8	62.8	37.2	0.0
29. ^a Use the same type of dressing for all ulcers	36.9	63.1	38.8	61.2	0.0

^a Reverse-coded items.

Table 5
Nurses' knowledge index and implementation index of PU prevention and treatment.

Index	M	SD	Min - Max	Percentiles		
				25th	50th	75th
Knowledge of PU Prevention	74.5	11.1	31–100	68.7	75.0	81.2
Knowledge of PU treatment	72.6	11.0	38–93	65.5	75.8	79.3
Observed implementation of PU prevention	49.2	8.1	34–78	43.7	50.0	56.2
Observed implementation of PU treatment	44.9	6.9	29–64	41.3	43.1	48.2

M = Mean, SD = Std. Deviation.

Table 6
Regression analysis of observed PU prevention interventions (obtained from linear regression using enter method).

	B	Std. Error	Standardized Beta	t	P Value ^a
(Constant)	54.3	3.30		16.4	< 0.001 ^a
Knowledge of PU prevention	-0.01	0.04	-0.02	-0.36	0.711
University Hospital	-4.37	1.32	-0.23	-3.31	0.001 ^a
Private Hospital	-3.67	1.48	-0.17	-2.57	0.011 ^a
Military Hospital	0.34	1.44	0.01	0.23	0.812
Critical Care unit	-1.21	1.33	-0.07	-0.91	0.362
Number of unit beds					
< 10	1.8	1.55	0.10	1.17	0.240
10–20	3.7	1.33	0.21	2.77	0.006 ^a
21–30	2.9	1.59	0.12	1.83	0.06
41–50	0.93	4.60	0.13	0.202	0.84
> 50	2.0	2.29	0.05	0.874	0.38

^a Regression analysis of PU observed prevention intervention final model produced at a = 0.05, F = 3.65, P < 0.001, R² = 0.32.

Table 7
Regression analysis of observed PU treatment interventions (obtained from linear regression using enter method).

	B	Std. Error	Standardized Beta	t	P Value ^a
(Constant)	44.12	2.66		16.57	< 0.001
Knowledge of PU treatment	0.029	0.034	0.045	0.84	0.39
Governmental Hospital	-7.24	1.009	-0.493	-7.19	< 0.001 ^a
University Hospital	-2.28	1.25	-0.190	-1.899	0.059
Private Hospital	-8.51	1.399	-0.422	-6.08	< 0.001 ^a
Having higher education	0.34	1.006	0.018	0.339	0.735
Using RAS	0.41	0.88	0.027	0.46	0.645
Number of unit beds					
< 10	1.33	1.01	0.084	1.31	0.19
21–30	0.38	1.26	0.019	0.30	0.76
31–40	-1.63	1.09	-0.103	-1.49	0.13
41–50	-0.30	3.78	-0.004	-0.07	0.93
> 50	-5.00	2.04	-0.147	-2.49	0.013 ^a

^a Regression analysis of observed PU treatment intervention final model produced at a = 0.05, F = 8.801, P < 0.001, R² = 0.508.

4. Discussion

The present study assessed nurses' knowledge and practice of PU prevention and treatment in Jordan and explored factors associated with PU care in clinical practice.

Pressure ulcer care was better in the military hospitals, but with only one military hospital included it is difficult to interpret this result – it may just be that the particular military hospital has high standards not generalizable to other military hospitals.

The number of beds in clinical units was only significant for prevention interventions for units with 10–20 beds, neither more nor fewer were significant (though 31–40 beds approaches significance) and it is possible this result is not replicable. For treatment interventions only beds > 50 was significant. A previous study found no such relation with bed size [9]. This may be attributable to limited nursing resources in clinical units with more beds (and far more beds than would be typical in most countries).

Nurses have less than adequate knowledge of PU prevention and very inadequate implementation of PU care. There is a need to increase pressure ulcer training both in nurse education and continuing education after graduation.

Our study revealed that more educated nurses did not provide better PU treatment. However, highly educated nurses were aware that undertaking early actions would reduce the likelihood of PU [19]. Training and documentation are recognised as being essential for providing PU care [20]. A consideration is the mismatch between supply and demand for highly educated nursing services (19). Additionally, anecdotal evidence suggests that more educated nurses undertake less hands-on care. Poor knowledge of managing PU complications by highly educated nurses was evident compared with those holding a baccalaureate degree [16]. Additionally, highly educated nurses may have insufficient clinical experience; in Jordan, many degree-level nurses continue with postgraduate education at the expense of clinical experience.

We suggest that the recent use of RASs (the Braden scale) and clinical employability of PU definition and PU staging in Jordan may orient nurses to organise clinically effective PU prevention plans. Most nurses agreed with the latest definition of PU and that using structured RAS was significant for PU treatment. But no predictive value was evident regarding their impact on undertaking effective PU prevention and treatment. A higher Braden score may increase use of PU prevention and treatment activities, though there is no evidence that using such scales reduces pressure ulcer incidence. In addition, the validity and reliability of frequently used RASs for PU are questionable due to limited evidence regarding their usefulness [22]. However, the predictive capability of nurses' clinical judgement can be augmented through access to structured PU risk assessment activities. Besides, the usefulness of a structured RAS has no clinical significance once the PU has developed [29].

Our study found no influence of nurses' demographics (e.g. age, gender) on their likelihood of undertaking PU care activities. The literature suggests that neither demographics nor experience influence PU care [30].

4.1. Limitations to the study

The observed data on nurses' knowledge were self-reported. The observation approach was applied to at-risk patients and the PU interventions were examined. Yet, the unplanned observations were exclusive of the prevention and treatment care provided—not all PU interventions provided to at-risk patients could be observed. Further, the 8-hour observation interval may have missed observing changes on patients' skin and PU interventions.

The questionnaire and its content validity have not been tested other than by its piloting and the team of experts, respectively. Also, familiarity of ward nurses with the investigator may have biased their use of PU management interventions.

5. Conclusions

PU treatment is less good in units with > 50 beds which leads one to consider that work load, occupancy rate, availability of resources, and nurse–patient ratios essential to plan effective PU care may be different in these units. Additional investigation is required to shed light on the theory–practice gap, perhaps through an experimental approach, to

improve the transformation of knowledge into practice.

5.1. Relevance to clinical practice

Significant gaps of knowledge were identified on skin assessments, risk assessment procedures, and management strategies regarding nurses' views towards PU care policies. Therefore, there is a clear need to develop training programmes to improve the clinical utility of nurses' knowledge regarding PU prevention and treatment. These training programmes would assist both junior and senior nurses (e.g. nurse managers) and other key stakeholders (e.g. hospital managers, policy-makers, and educators) to improve PU prevention and treatment services, thus minimising patients' suffering. One form of training would be to arrange courses regarding the effective management of PU and its complications. At ward level, senior nurses would update junior staff, while promoting best practice. Another form would be to introduce a simulation-based training system for different stages of PU management, such as debridement of a deep ulcer.

Regular updates on best practice should be shared among ward staff and newcomers to ensure excellent standards are maintained, reducing

the theory–practice gap and the time-lag between research findings and implementation. Consequently, the well-being of patients and their families would improve, and there would be long-term cost-savings for healthcare organisations due to reduced patients' stays.

This study's practice implications move beyond the specific nursing specialty (i.e. PU management) and are applicable to other specialties. In palliative care, it is imperative to provide lifelong training to nurses to bridge the theory–practice gap and well-recognised strategies address this issue (e.g. use of a nurse-link) [31]. Similar activities help to improve the translation of knowledge into practice in other specialties (e.g. paediatric nursing) and geographical areas (e.g. Pakistan) [32].

Funding

This research has been funded by Deanship of Scientific Research at the University of Jordan.

Declaration of competing interest

No conflict of interest for any of the authors.

Appendix 1. Description of the reverse-coded items used in the analysis

Prevention interventions

Item no. 13: Use skin barrier creams to protect reddened skin

Item no.14: Use alcohol solution on the skin.

Item no.15: Use donuts-type devices to relieve pressure on areas at risk.

Item no. 16: Massage reddened areas and/or bony prominences is helpful in pressure ulcer prevention.

Treatment interventions

Item no. 22: Using antiseptics frequently to clean PrU wounds (e.g. iodine providing, H₂O₂, chlorohexidine).

Item no. 23: Dry dressing used on a PrU such as dry gauze or iodine soaked gauze.

Item no. 24: Change dressing on daily basis regardless of the condition of the wound-bed and findings of wound assessment.

Item no. 25: Use topical antibiotics on PrU with signs of infection

Item no. 27: Use alternative methods in PrU treatment such as (honey, heat, or other preparations)

Item no. 28: Leave the necrotic (dead) tissues with no debridement on ulcers without signs of infection

Item no. 29: Use the same type of dressing for all ulcers.

Source: Original items as adapted from the tool (Saleh et al., 2013).

References

- Gorecki C, Brown JM, Nelson EA, et al. Impact of pressure ulcers on quality of life in older people: a systematic review. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2009;57:1175–83.
- Posnett J, Gottrup F, Lundgren H, et al. The resource impact of wounds on health-care providers in Europe. *J Wound Care* 2009;18:154–61.
- Chamanga E, Ward R. Documentation and record-keeping in pressure ulcer management. *Nurs Stand* 2015;29(36):56–63. 2015.
- Elliott R, McKinley S, Fox V. Quality improvement program to reduce the prevalence of pressure ulcers in intensive care units. *Am J Crit Care* 2008;4(17):328–34.
- Anthony D, Hodgson H, Horner J. Reducing avoidable pressure ulcers. *Wounds UK*, May. 2017. p. 14–8.
- EPUAP and NPUAP. Prevention and treatment of pressure ulcers: quick reference guide. Washington DC: National Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel; 2009.
- Lahmann NA, Dassen T, Poehler A, Kottner J. Pressure ulcer prevalence rates from 2002 to 2008 in German long-term care facilities. *Aging Clin Exp Res* 2010;22:152–6.
- Halfens RJG, Meesterberends E, Nie-visser NC, Lohrmann C, Schönherr S, Meijers JMM, Hahn S, Vangeloven C, Schols JMGA. International prevalence measurement of care problems: results. *J Adv Nurs* 2013;69:e5–17.
- Saleh M, Al-Hussami M, D Anthony D. Pressure ulcer prevention and treatment knowledge of Jordanian nurses. *J Tissue Viability* 2013;22(1):1–11.
- Pancorbo-Hidalgo P, García-Fernández FP, López-Medina IM, Alvarez-Nieto C. Risk assessment scales for pressure ulcer prevention: a systematic review. *J Adv Nurs* 2006;54(1):94–110.
- Aslan A, Giersbergen M. Nurses' attitudes towards pressure ulcer prevention in Turkey. *J Tissue Viability* 2016;25:66–73.
- Demarré L, Vanderwee K, Defloor T, Verhaeghe S, Schoonhoven L, Beeckman D. Pressure ulcers: knowledge and attitude of nurses and nursing assistants in Belgian nursing homes. *J Clin Nurs* 2012;21:1425–34. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2702.2011.03878.x> Accessed February 2016.
- Qaddumi J, Khawaldeh A. Pressure ulcer prevention knowledge among Jordanian nurses: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Nurs* 2014;13(1)<http://www.biomedcentral.com/1472-6955/13/6> Accessed November, 2015.
- Saleh M, Anthony D, Parboteeah S. The impact of pressure ulcer risk assessment on patient outcomes among hospitalised patients. *J Clin Nurs* 2009;18(13):1923–9.
- Nuru N, Zewdu F, Amsalu S, Mehretie Y. Knowledge and practice of nurses towards prevention of pressure ulcer and associated factors in Gondar University Hospital, Northwest Ethiopia. *BMC Nurs* 2015;14(34):2–8.
- Beeckman D, Defloor T, Schoonhoven L, Vanderwee K. Knowledge and attitudes of nurses on pressure ulcer prevention: a cross-sectional multicenter study in Belgian hospitals. *Worldviews Evidence-Based Nurs* 2011. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6787.2011.00217.x> Accessed January, 2017.
- Iranmanesh S, Tafti AA, Rafiei H, Dehghan M, Razban F. Orthopaedic nurses' knowledge about pressure ulcers in Iran: a cross-sectional study. *J Wound Care* 2013;22(3):138–40.
- Rafiei H, Esmaeli M, Iranmanesh S, Lalegani H, Safdari H, Hassanpoor A. Knowledge about pressure ulcer prevention, classification and management: a survey of registered nurses working with trauma patients in the emergency department. *Int. J. Orthop. Trauma. Nurs* 2014;18(3):135–42.
- Moore Z, Price P. Nurses' attitudes, behaviors and perceived barriers towards pressure ulcer prevention. *J Clin Nurs* 2004;13:942–52.
- McDonagh V. Sustaining pressure ulcer prevention in practice. *Nurs. Times* 2013;109(15):12–6.
- Panagiotopoulou K, Kerr MS. Pressure area care: an exploration of Greek nurses' knowledge and practice. *J. Adv. Nurs* 2002;40(3):285–96.
- García-Fernández FP, Pancorbo-Hidalgo PL, Soldevilla AJJ. Predictive capacity of risk assessment scales and clinical judgment for pressure ulcers: a meta-analysis. *J Wound, Ostomy Cont Nurs* 2014;41(1):24–34.
- Jordan Ministry of Health. Retrieved from <http://www.moh.gov.jo/Pages/viewpage.aspx> Accessed April 2015.
- Health Care Accreditation Council (HCAC). Retrieved from <http://hcac.jo/ar-jo/NQSG> Accessed November 2015.
- EPUAP and NPUAP. Treatment of pressure ulcers: quick reference guide. Washington DC: National Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel; 2009.
- Faul F, Erdfelder E, Buchner A, Lang A. Statistical power analysis using G*Power 3.1: test for correlation and regression analysis. *Behav Res Methods* 2009;41(4):1149–60.

- [27] Bostrom J, Kenneth H. Staff nurse knowledge and perceptions about prevention of pressure sores. *Dermatol Nurs* 1992;4:365–78.
- [28] Polit Denise F, Tatano Beck Cheryl. *Nursing research: generating and assessing evidence for nursing practice*. Philadelphia: Wolters Kluwer Health; 2017.
- [29] Anthony D, Parboteeah S, Saleh M, Papanikolaou P. Norton, Waterlow and Braden scores: a review of the literature and a comparison between the scores and clinical judgement. *J Clin Nurs* 2008;17(5):646–53.
- [30] Hulsenboom MA, Bours GJWW, Halfens RJG. Knowledge of pressure ulcer prevention: a cross-sectional and comparative study among nurses. *BMC Nurs* 2007;6(2). <https://doi.org/10.1186/472-6955-6-2> Accessed November, 2015.
- [31] Ward C, Wright M. Fast-track palliative care training to bridge the theory-practice gap. *Nurs. Times* 2004;100(12):38–40.
- [32] Essani RR, Ali TS. Knowledge and practice gaps among pediatric nurses at a tertiary care hospital Karachi Pakistan. *ISRN. Pediatr* 2011. <https://doi.org/10.5402/2011/460818> Accessed July, 2016.