Encouraging practitioners in infection prevention and control to publish: a cross-sectional survey

Journal of Infection Prevention
2016, Vol. 17(6) 289–292
DOI: 10.1177/1757177416663838
© The Author(s) 2016
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav
jip.sagepub.com

Lynn Melone¹, Lesley Price¹ and Jennie Wilson²

Abstract

Aim: The aim of this cross-sectional survey was to determine the views of infection prevention and control practitioners (IPCPs) on publishing research.

Methods: A convenience sample was obtained by approaching delegates at the 2015 Infection Prevention Society conference and data were captured via a hand-held electronic device.

Findings: Of the 79 respondents, most (83%) read the *Journal of Infection Prevention (JIP)* and found it useful for informing their practice (72%). However, most (91%) had never published in *JIP*, and less than half (40%) published elsewhere. The main barrier to publication was not having work suitable for publication (38%). Support (37%), training in writing for publication (10%) and time (9%) were considered to be important facilitators in encouraging respondents to publish.

Discussion: Strategies that support IPCPs in developing their writing skills may encourage more IPCPs to disseminate evidence to support best practice by publishing their work in peer-reviewed journals.

Keywords

Barriers and facilitators, writing for publication

Date received: 27 April 2016; accepted: 2 July 2016

Introduction

Dissemination of the findings from research is essential in order to support evidence-based practice. Publication in peer-reviewed journals such as the *Journal of Infection Prevention (JIP)* is acknowledged as the key strategy for dissemination, in addition to being an important indicator of both institutional and individual achievement in research (Kapp et al., 2011; Rickard et al., 2009). The publishing of findings not only provides tangible outcomes but is important for academic recognition and continuing professional development (Kapp et al., 2011). Despite these benefits, many researchers never publish their work and a study by Hicks (1993) highlights the extent of this problem. Only 1% from a sample size of 550 midwives published their work, even though almost two-thirds had conducted self-initiated research (Hicks, 1993). More current research has also indicated that there are still barriers for nurses writing for publication (Albarrañ and Scholes, 2005). Some common barriers to writing for publication reported in the literature appear to be: lack of time; lack of confidence; difficulty in identifying

how to start and what to write; and inexperience and lack of knowledge of the process (Dowling et al., 2013; Keen et al., 2007; McGrail et al., 2006; Staudt et al., 2003). Some less frequently mentioned obstacles are: fear of their work being rejected; lack of skills in academic writing; lack of support and resources; and personal responsibilities (Kapp et al., 2007; Keen et al., 2007; Staudt et al., 2003).

This cross-sectional survey study was conducted at the Infection Prevention Society (IPS) 2015 Conference in Liverpool to establish participants' views on publishing their research, particularly in *JIP*. The aim of the survey

¹Institute for Applied Health Research, Glasgow Caledonian University, Glasgow, UK

²Richard Wells Research Centre, University of West London, Brentford, UK

Corresponding author:

Lynn Melone, Institute for Applied Health Research, Glasgow Caledonian University, Cowcaddens Road, Glasgow, G4 0BA, UK.
Email: Lynn.Melone@gcu.ac.uk

was to increase participants' awareness of the potential for publishing in *JIP* and to understand the factors that would encourage IPCPs to publish in this journal.

Methods

A questionnaire was developed in SurveyMonkey© and face validity was checked by members of the *JIP* Editorial Management Group and the IPS Consultative Committee. A convenience sample was obtained by approaching delegates and asking them to complete the survey via a hand-held electronic device. Consent was implied by willingness to participate in the survey. The questionnaire consisted of 12 questions (Table 1). All questions had pre-defined options (except question 7 which allowed free text) to ensure quick completion and good response rates. Not all questions were required to be answered by all respondents. Some questions only allowed one option to be chosen while other questions permitted more than one option to be selected. One question used a Likert scale. Descriptive analysis using frequencies and percentages was used to analyse the responses. Content analysis (Silverman, 2010) identified themes from free text and was used to report on the most frequent responses.

Results

The total number of participants who completed the survey was 79; of these, 58 (73%) were IPS members and 65 (83%) indicated that they read *JIP*. Forty-five (58%) of the

survey respondents worked in an infection prevention and control job role. Respondents preferred to read the hard copy of *JIP* ($n = 56$, 89%) rather than online ($n = 24$, 38%), with most reading it once or twice a month ($n = 45$, 90%). Most respondents read *JIP* soon after receiving it and 47 (72%) rated it as useful for informing their practice (score of between 7 and 10).

Overall, 72 (91%) of respondents have never published in *JIP*, although 29 (40%) have published elsewhere. Although 16 (20%) participants would not consider publishing in *JIP* in the future, the main reason given for this was 'I don't have anything suitable for publication' ($n = 6$, 38%). Some of the other reasons given for not publishing in *JIP* were: never having written for publication ($n = 4$, 25%); lack of time ($n = 3$, 19%); lack of confidence ($n = 1$, 6%); and not having the necessary skills ($n = 1$, 6%). The most common factor mentioned that would encourage respondents to publish was the provision of some type of support ($n = 29$, 37%), followed by training in writing for publication ($n = 8$, 10%) and time ($n = 7$, 9%) (Figure 1).

Discussion

Although many previous studies have investigated specific approaches to support writing for publication, this survey has gathered opinions about barriers and facilitators to publishing directly from healthcare professionals attending an infection prevention and control conference. The key barriers to writing for publication identified in this survey were not having suitable work to publish, lack of writing

Table 1. Questionnaire on publishing.

Topic 1: Survey respondents' demographics	
Question 1	Are you an IPS member? (Yes/No/Don't know)
Question 2	What is your job role? (Pre-defined options – only one option could be selected)
Topic 2: <i>JIP</i>	
Question 3	Have you ever read <i>JIP</i> ? (Yes/No/Don't know) (If 'No' or 'Don't know' respondent automatically taken to question 6)
Question 4	How many times a month on average do you access <i>JIP</i> , either as a paper copy or online? (1 to 10)
Question 5	Overall, how would you rate the value of <i>JIP</i> for informing your practice? (Scale: 0=not useful to 10=extremely useful)
Topic 3: Papers/topic of interest	
Question 6	What types of papers are of most interest to you? (Pre-defined options – more than one option could be selected)
Question 7	What topics are of most interest to you? (Free text)
Topic 4: Publishing	
Question 8	Have you published in <i>JIP</i> ? (Yes/No/Don't know)
Question 9	Have you published your work elsewhere? (Yes/No/Don't know)
Question 10	Would you consider publishing in <i>JIP</i> in the future? (Yes/No/Don't know) (If 'Yes' respondent automatically taken to question 12)
Question 11	Which of the following describes your main reason for not submitting your research/study? (Pre-defined options – only one option could be selected)
Question 12	What would encourage you to publish your work? (Predefined options – more than one option could be selected)

Figure 1. Factors that would encourage respondents to publish their work.

experience, confidence or skills and insufficient time. These mirror those reported in earlier literature (Dowling et al., 2013; Keen et al., 2007; McGrail et al., 2006; Staudt et al., 2003). A systematic review of the interventions to increase publication rates concluded that writing courses, writing mentorship and support groups are all facilitators in helping support and motivate authors to publish their work (McGrail et al., 2006). This is borne out by this survey which indicated that support from others and training in writing for publication were the most important factors that would encourage respondents to publish.

Writing is a skill which can be taught and learned (Rickard et al., 2009). Training can be delivered in various formats such as writing courses, workshops or via writing seminars. Two studies explored how writing courses can help and support writing for publication (Murray and Newton, 2008; Richardson and Carrick-Sen, 2011). Murray and Newton's (2008) qualitative study involved interviewing allied health professionals who had previously attended a six-month writing for publication course and discovered that those who attended had improved writing confidence, enhanced writing skills and increased publication productivity. Another study outlined the effect of a five-session writing seminar series on encouraging publishing behaviours among nurses and found this approach to be

more effective in increasing publication rates than a one-day workshop (Lawrence and Folcik, 1996).

Time to write was also cited as a factor which would aid publishing, although this can be challenging for those working in clinical settings where other aspects of the role may be perceived to take precedence. Murray and Newton (2008) highlighted the importance of providing ongoing support to writers after course attendance to ensure time and space to write is provided within the workplace. There are different types of support and support groups and mentor support were mentioned as key approaches by our respondents to help facilitate them to publish. The practical and psychological benefits of these support methods have also been regularly documented in other studies and include: information sharing; discussion; constructive feedback; motivation; confidence; encouragement; and peer support (Frantz et al., 2011; Keen, 2007; Richardson and Carrick-Sen, 2011; Rickard et al., 2009; Steinert et al., 2008). Facilitating both time and support systems for writing for publication should be recognised as essential since the UK competences for practitioners in infection prevention and control require that they both participate in and disseminate knowledge from research and other related activities (Burnett, 2011). Sharing evidence from research or the implementation of novel practice is also fundamental

to assuring high quality infection prevention and control services (Wilson, 2015).

An easier publication and submission process and the provision of written guidance were also reported as factors which would encourage respondents to publish and these findings are supported in a study by Staudt et al. (2003) which suggested that courses and curriculums should provide information on the publication process. Collaborative writing involves a team of writers working together to produce a publication and is a useful process for inexperienced writers because they can be supported by more experienced writers, thereby enhancing quality and productivity (Keen, 2007; Ness et al., 2014).

In conclusion, this survey has highlighted that while many IPC practitioners value *JIP* in informing their own practice, most are reluctant to publish themselves. Provision of training in writing for publication and support through mentorship are strategies that may encourage more practitioners to disseminate their work through publication.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Peer review statement

Not commissioned; blind peer-reviewed.

References

- Albarran JW and Scholes J. (2005) How to get published: seven easy steps. *Nursing in Critical Care* 10: 72–77.
- Burnett E. (2011) Outcome competences for practitioners in infection prevention and control. *Journal of Infection Prevention* 12: 57–90.
- Dowling DA, Savrin C and Graham GC. (2013) Writing for publication: perspectives of graduate nursing students and doctorally prepared faculty. *Journal of Nursing Education* 52: 371–375.
- Frantz J, Phillips J and Rhoda A. (2011) Coaching for publication in higher education: views of the coach. *The Internet Journal of Allied Health Sciences & Practice* 9: 1–7.
- Hicks C. (1993) A survey of midwives' attitudes to, and involvement in, research: the first stage in identifying needs for a staff development programme. *Midwifery* 9: 51–62.
- Kapp CA, Albertyn RM and Frick BL. (2011) Writing for publication: an intervention to overcome barriers to scholarly writing. *South African Journal of Higher Education* 25: 741–759.
- Keen A. (2007) Writing for publication: pressures, barriers and support strategies. *Nursing Education Today* 27: 382–388.
- Lawrence MM and Folcik MA. (1996) Writing for publication. *Journal of Nursing Staff Development* 12: 289–293.
- McGrail MR, Rickard CM and Jones R. (2006) Publish or perish: a systematic review of interventions to increase academic publication rates. *Higher Education Research & Development* 25: 19–35.
- Murray R and Newton M. (2008) Facilitating writing for publication. *Physiotherapy* 94: 29–34.
- Ness V, Duffy K, McCallum J and Price L. (2014) Getting published: reflections of a collaborative writing group. *Nurse Education Today* 34: 1–5.
- Richardson A and Carrick-Sen D. (2011) Writing for publication made easy for nurses: an evaluation. *British Journal of Nursing* 20: 756–759.
- Rickard CM, McGrail MR, Jones R, O'Meara P, Robinson A, Burley M and Ray-Barruel G. (2009) Supporting academic publication: evaluation of a writing course combined with writers' support group. *Nurse Education Today* 29: 516–521.
- Silverman D. (2010) *Doing Qualitative Research*. 3rd edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Staudt MM, Dulmus C and Bennett GA. (2003) Facilitating writing by practitioners: survey of practitioners who have published. *Social Work* 48: 75–83.
- Steinert Y, McLeod PJ, Liben S and Snell L. (2008) Writing for publication in medical education: The benefits of a faculty development workshop and peer writing group. *Medical Teacher* 30: e280–e285.
- Wilson J. (2015) The art of scientific publication. *Journal of Infection Prevention* 16: 245–246.