

There's No Place Like Home: A Qualitative Study of the Working Conditions of Home Health Care Providers

Pia Markkanen, ScD

Margaret Quinn, ScD, CIH

Catherine Galligan, MSc

Stephanie Chalupka, EdD, APRN

Letitia Davis, ScD

Angela Laramie, MPH

I was recently asked . . . to place a midline in somebody's arm and the situation was just horrific. The living situation of the patient. Very cluttery, no place, we didn't have one, not even a table to use. (a focus group participant)

Objective: Home health care (HHC) is one of the fastest growing US industries. Its working conditions have been challenging to evaluate, because the work environments are highly variable and geographically dispersed. This study aims to characterize qualitatively the work experience and hazards of HHC clinicians, with a focus on risk factors for bloodborne pathogen exposures. **Methods:** The researchers conducted five focus group discussions with HHC clinicians and ten in-depth interviews with HHC agency managers and trade union representatives in Massachusetts. **Results:** HHC clinicians face serious occupational hazards, including violence in neighborhoods and homes, lack of workstations, heavy patient lifting, improper disposal of dressings or sharp medical devices, and high productivity demands. **Conclusions:** The social context of the home-work environment challenges the implementation of preventive interventions to reduce occupational hazards in HHC. (J Occup Environ Med. 2007;49:327–337)

Health care is one of the largest US industries, constituting 13.5 million jobs.¹ The home health care (HHC) sector represents 5.8% of overall US health care employment and is one of the fastest growing parts of the economy.¹ For example, 56% growth in the home health aide occupation is predicted between 2004 and 2014.² Reasons for the HHC industry expansion include the increasing elderly population, availability of medical monitoring and advanced treatment technologies in the home, overall health care cost savings, and patients' preference for receiving care at home.¹ In Massachusetts, senior home health care has gained legislative support: a new law on long-term care choice,³ adopted in August 2006, strengthens the ability of Massachusetts citizens to use Medicaid funds to compensate health services in private settings, rather than in nursing homes.⁴

This growing demand for HHC is placing pressure on agencies to hire more nurses and aides. Internationally, a study by Maybud and Wiskow revealed that the global health care professional shortage has fostered fierce competition, sometimes with aggressive recruitment campaigns.⁵ A literature review by Janiszewski Goodin explored factors for the severe shortage of registered nurses in the United States and concluded that facilitation of the immigration of foreign health care professionals is a

From the Departments of Work Environment (Drs Markkanen and Quinn, Ms Galligan), and Nursing (Dr Chalupka), School of Health and Environment, University of Massachusetts Lowell, Lowell, MA; and the Occupational Health Surveillance Program (Dr Davis and Ms Laramie), Massachusetts Department of Public Health, Boston, MA.

Address correspondence to: Pia Markkanen, ScD, Department of Work Environment, Kitson 200, School of Health and Environment, University of Massachusetts Lowell, One University Avenue, Lowell, MA 01854; E-mail: Pia_Markkanen@uml.edu.

Copyright © 2007 by American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine

DOI: 10.1097/JOM.0b013e3180326552

critical solution.⁶ Unless the current trends change, a 20% deficit in the registered nurse workforce is forecast in the United States by 2020.^{5,6} Consequently, it is not surprising that immigrant HHC clinicians increased by 114% from 1990 to 2000, compared with a 31% growth of US-born clinicians.⁷ A review of direct care workers in long-term care revealed that half of home health aides were nonwhite and 89% of them were female.⁸

A significant occupational hazard in health care is exposure to blood-borne pathogens through sharp injuries and other routes. It is estimated that about 385,000 needlestick and other percutaneous sharp injuries are sustained annually by hospital-based health care clinicians—an average of 1000 sharp injuries a day.^{9,10} In addition to the physical and mental toll on injured workers and their families, sharp injuries carry a high monetary cost. It is estimated that short-term follow-up medical treatments range from \$50 to \$3800 in the United States, and long-term treatment associated with HIV, HBV, or HCV seroconversion can reach hundreds of thousands of US dollars.¹¹ Unreported sharp injuries and blood/body fluid exposures, estimated to range from 40% to 80%,^{9,11,12} present a 2-fold dilemma according to Wilburn¹²: 1) Injured health care workers often do not receive timely post-HIV exposure prophylaxis that may be up to 80% effective against HIV infection; and 2) the magnitude of the problem remains unknown and challenges the implementation of appropriate interventions, such as the implementation of safe work practices and the development of improved medical devices with features of sharp injury prevention.

To date, most documented information about health care hazards originates from hospitals. Only a few studies have evaluated health and safety in HHC. Perry et al examined sharp injuries in homecare and inpatient settings by analyzing EPINet

data (Exposure Prevention Information Network, International Health Care Worker Safety Center, University of Virginia) of 84 hospitals from 1993 through 1998 and HHC agencies affiliated with these hospitals.¹³ Their analysis revealed that 40% of reported sharp injuries in homes were associated with blood drawing or intravenous access procedures, compared with 34% for the same procedures in hospital patient rooms. In the home setting, 48% of percutaneous injuries occurred either after the use of a sharp medical device (sharp) or during sharp disposal, compared with 38% for the same injury mechanism in hospital patient rooms.¹³

Haiduven and Ferrol noted that in the United States, more HIV patients are being cared for in the home setting than in other health care settings and that patients who are hepatitis C positive, who may not be aware of their HCV status, are receiving home care for other conditions.¹⁴ Homecare patients infected with HIV require more injections or intravenous administrations than those with noninfectious conditions,^{15,16} making blood exposures all the more dangerous for HHC clinicians caring for HIV-positive patients. More research is needed to collect information from home settings systematically, where clinicians are vulnerable to bloodborne pathogen exposures as well as other workplace hazards so that effective occupational health interventions can be implemented.

Project SHARRP

To investigate the risks associated with blood and body fluid exposures in HHC, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) awarded a 4-year grant (2004–2008) to the School of Health and Environment at the University of Massachusetts Lowell (UMass Lowell). This research undertaking was named Project SHARRP, which stands for

Safe Homecare and Risk Reduction for Providers. In addition to UMass Lowell, the SHARRP research team includes the Occupational Health Surveillance Program of the Massachusetts Department of Public Health. A structured working relationship was established with several industry and union partners that agreed to provide access to their staff or constituency for conducting the research.

Objectives

This paper examines findings of the initial qualitative research phase of Project SHARRP. The qualitative assessment, composed of five focus group discussions and ten in-depth interviews, had the following objectives: 1) to investigate and describe the nature of HHC work and its associated occupational health risk factors, circumstances surrounding sharp injuries and other blood exposures, as well as availability and efficacy of safety medical devices; and 2) to compare the two methodologies used in order to evaluate the type of information they yielded.

Materials and Methods

Two types of qualitative research methods were employed: clinician focus groups and specialist/manager in-depth interviews. The intent of the focus groups was to elucidate the general nature of work as well as risk factors regarding exposures to bloodborne pathogens in HHC from the perspective of clinicians in nonsupervisory positions delivering homecare services. The specialist interviews sought to complement the focus groups by providing insights into bloodborne pathogen exposures and other workplace hazards, safety policies, medical device procurement practices, and other topics from the perspective of agency managers, supervisors, specialists, and health care union representatives. Study materials and protocols were approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of UMass Lowell. Agency and union representatives critiqued and assisted

in developing study participant recruitment materials.

Study Population

In the United States, major occupations that provide HHC services include: nurses, therapists, home health aides, and personal and home-care aides.¹ This study focuses on nurses and home health aides, the occupations most likely to encounter sharp medical devices (sharps) and blood and body fluid exposures.

Recruitment of Study Subjects

We engaged each partner agency and union in recruiting participants for a focus group of their workers or members to be held in a private room at their site. At one large agency, focus groups were planned at two offices: a larger city office and a small suburban office. Two criteria were required for participation: 1) minimum age of 18 years, and 2) experience in handling sharps in homes or working in homes where there is a likelihood of exposure to blood and body fluids. With the assistance of our agency/union contact, HHC aides and nurses received packets containing an informational brochure, a letter of invitation, and reply materials for participating in a focus group. These were distributed through work mailboxes (for agency staff) or by mail (for union members). Interested candidates completed the reply form and returned it in the attached prepaid envelope by mail or to a secure collection box in the workplace. The group size limit was set at ten participants, with the intention of randomly selecting ten names from the group of volunteers. Seventeen nurses and seven home health aides (24 total) were recruited from all agencies and unions.

For the specialist/manager interviews, our agency and union contacts were invited by phone and follow-up letter to participate in an in-depth interview. They were also asked to identify additional interview candidates belonging to any of these categories: 1) infection control

practitioners, 2) health care union leaders, 3) occupational health nurses, and 4) managers or program coordinators of any clinical HHC units where sharp instruments are used. Ten agency managers and union representatives were recruited from all agencies and unions. Their health care experience ranged from 10 to 45 years.

Conduct of Focus Groups and Interviews

Focus groups and interviews were conducted at agency or union offices. A stipend of \$50 per participant was paid to the individual at the time of the session if the session was outside work hours. If the session took place during work hours, the individuals were compensated by their agency at their regular rate, and the stipend per participant was paid to the agency.

All focus groups were moderated by the same researcher, supported by assistants who took handwritten notes, oversaw tape recording, and performed other functional tasks. Interviews were conducted by investigators with professional experience matching that of the interviewees, such as nursing, management, or trade unions. After obtaining a signed consent, a tape recorder was activated and the discussion commenced, following a standard script. A few minutes before the end of the allotted time (90 minutes for a focus group or 60 minutes for an interview), the tape recorder was stopped and participants were offered a few minutes to add unrecorded comments. The session closed with the distribution of anonymous participant evaluation forms.

Follow-up

After each focus group and interview, recording tapes were copied and sent to a transcription service. The research team verified all typed transcripts and analyzed them thematically using NVivo qualitative research software, version 2.0 (QSR International Pty Ltd, Doncaster, Victoria 3108, Australia). All partic-

ipants received a cover letter thanking them for their participation, a summary of the aggregate findings of all focus groups, and a voluntary feedback form with a prepaid mail-back envelope. Interview participants received a transcript of their own interview session.

Results

Nature of HHC Work: Advantages, Challenges, and General Work Hazards

Tables 1 and 2 show the main advantages and challenges of working in HHC as well as examples of potential hazards, as reported by the interviewees and focus group participants. Many study subjects had work experience in the hospital setting prior to working in HHC. The chief advantages were identified as flexibility, independence, and autonomy, especially for clinicians who have childcare responsibilities. The home-work environment is diverse and constantly changing with patients' ages ranging from newborn to 100 years old, different disease diagnoses and patient personalities, as well as various housing environments. HHC clinicians often bond with patients and families, witness patients' health progress, and/or receive gestures of appreciation and gratitude—all of which create a strong sense of meaning for their work. One focus group participant described:

She [the hospice patient] took this big bag out, and she [had] hand knitted an afghan for me. She said, "I wanted you to have this . . . I wanted to hand it to you personally before I go . . ." . . . I wrapped up in that the other night, and I just [thought] about her, you know. The hands, here's a person that's in hospice, they knitted a blanket . . . That's what makes this job worthwhile, not the gift, the love.

Another participant in the same focus group expressed sadness when describing the loss of two patients after long-lasting care relationships:

I had two people. One I worked for nine years and eight months, until she died. She was 99. And the other one I worked with 10 years. She was almost 90. I don't think I ever want to work that long with one person again, because they get so attached.

TABLE 1
Advantages and Challenges of Home Health Care Described in Focus Groups and Interviews

		Cited in:	
		Focus Groups	Interviews
Advantages			
Flexibility, independence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accommodates family responsibilities 	✓	✓
Long-term patient relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work not restricted within four walls • See patients' health progress • Learn to know patients and families 	✓	✓
Acts of appreciation and gratitude by the patients		✓	
Diversity of nursing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversity of patients, diagnoses, and environments • Teach and support patients to improve their lives (eg, teach a teenage girl how to draw blood off IV line) • Multitasked work duties 	✓	✓
Informality of work		✓	
Supervisor support		✓	
Patient's choice bears importance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patient chooses to stay and be cared for at home • Patient has position of power at home (vs facility-based care setting) • Choosing to die comfortably either at home or in hospice 		✓
Cost-effectiveness of healthcare			✓
Challenges			
Detailed paperwork	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medicare billing, insurances, payment reimbursements 	✓	✓
Long-distance travel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paperwork often continues at home • Long-distance driving • Waiting for public transportation (eg, in the city areas, especially in the dark) 	✓	✓
Emotional attachment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patient dies 	✓	
Insensitive, cranky, or moody patients/family members		✓	
High patient workload		✓	
Lack of information about patient's health condition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern of health aides 	✓	
Culture shock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extreme poverty in some neighborhoods 	✓	
Isolation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some situations where a nurse does not have skills or lacks needed medical supplies • No timely backup, or help may not be available 		✓
Time constrains and productivity pressures			✓
Communication boundaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficulty reaching physicians in the field • Provider-patient language differences 		✓
Less salary than in the hospital setting			✓
Possibility of a sentinel event	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sudden health deterioration of a patient 		✓

As the biggest challenge, both the focus group participants and interviewees described detailed paperwork for medical care insurance, billing, and reimbursement. Moreover, the workday often does not end when the last patient is seen because paperwork may need to be completed at home:

I love taking care of the patients but spending hours every night on the computer is very daunting and it's very hard to do it day in and day out which is what you have to do. And it eats into your family time and I think that's very difficult.

All focus groups described long-distance driving as exhausting and time-consuming. One interviewee pinpointed a challenge which clinicians may encounter when being out in the field alone: as difficulties or uncontrollable situations arise (eg, security and safety concerns, lack of supplies, or needing specific clinical skills that a nurse or home health aide may lack), backup support may not be nearby and a physician may not be available by phone on a short notice. All study subjects were concerned

about the threat of violence in a patient's neighborhood or inside a patient's home. In addition, clinicians care for patients who live in poverty. Thus, they encountering hazardous conditions that their patients face every day, such as neighborhoods where drug use is widespread, guns in homes, pest infestations, unsanitary conditions, indoor air-quality concerns (eg, due to deteriorating buildings and cigarette smoking), clutter, rickety stairs, inadequate lighting, and unshoveled walkways. Other hazards include ag-

TABLE 2
General Work Hazards Described in Focus Groups and Interviews

Work Hazards		Cited in:	
		Focus Groups	Interviews
General security/personal safety concerns	● Unsafe neighborhoods (eg, drugs, guns, robbery, violence)	✓	✓
	● Violent or unstable patients/family members	✓	✓
	● Clinician out in the field alone		✓
	● Working during after-dark hours		✓
	● Snowy/slippery walkways, clutter, rickety or unsafe stairs, inadequate lighting, fire hazards	✓	✓
	● Entering an unknown place, not knowing the person who lives in the house	✓	
	● Pets (dogs [can bite when sensitive to sick master], birds, cats)	✓	
Rapid work pace	● Clinicians may feel rushed to complete an assignment, even a risky procedure		✓
	● Dealing with uncontrollable situations in a hurry and alone		✓
Long-distance driving	● Accidents	✓	
Hygiene issues	● Insects, rodents, hot indoor air, and other indoor air-quality concerns (smoking)	✓	
	● Carrying out risky sharps use procedures	✓	
Lack of workstations	● Heavy lifting and moving of patients or other items	✓	✓
Heavy lifting and moving		✓	
Lack of supplies		✓	
Allergies/irritations	● Cleaning chemicals, latex gloves	✓	
Exposures to bloodborne pathogens (see Table 3)		✓	✓

gressive animals and heavy patient lifting. In-depth interviewees identified underlying reasons for hazardous incidents. In addition to being out in the field alone, other root-causes included time constraints, rapid work pace, and productivity pressures—all of which may trigger clinicians to conduct even risky medical procedures in haste. In one focus group, the participants described the unpredictable nature of hazards. Often clinicians must enter a house where they do not know its residents, relationship dynamics between family members and friends of the residents, and the living environment inside.

Sharp Injuries and Blood Exposures: Circumstances and Underreporting

Table 3 summarizes circumstances related to sharp injuries, blood exposures, and near-exposures sustained by or familiar to study participants. The focus group discussants attributed sharp injury and blood contact risks to syringes and lancets left un-

covered in various places in the house, lack of proper sharp disposal containers, inadequate training for using the variety of medical devices encountered in the home, lack of proper workstations for procedures using sharps, sharp devices without safety features, diabetic and cancer patient treatment care tasks, dangerous distractions during a medical procedure (eg, pets, children), episodes of sudden profuse bleeding (eg, bleeding tumors and amputations), and wound care tasks. Patient-related risk factors included violent, confused, or uncooperative behaviors; sudden movements by patients or family members during procedures involving the use of a sharp device; improper dressing disposal practices; and unsafe sharp disposal habits.

The study subjects raised various reasons for not reporting sharp injuries and blood contacts, many of which correspond to those previously cited: time-consuming post-injury process; frightening possibility of infection and

the anxiety surrounding the post-exposure process; fear of being blamed as careless or perceived as a “bad nurse” by the employer; disease history of a patient (eg, an elderly patient thought not to be an infection risk); nonsevere exposure (scratch vs deep puncture); possible consequences on health insurance coverage (eg, increasing fees, future difficulties getting insurance); fear of implications for present or future job prospects; and lack of health insurance. “The big deal factor” and “the fear factor” were brought up repeatedly in both focus groups and interviews. “The big deal factor” combines reporting taking too much time, dedicated clinicians not wanting to disrupt the workday, unclear reporting procedures, and not having a health care facility in the immediate vicinity when the injury occurs. “The fear factor” comprises worries about developing an illness and not wanting to face it, being regarded as a careless clinician, and fear that the incident would adversely impact employment status. “The health

TABLE 3

Factors Related to Blood and Body Fluid Exposures, Sharp Injuries, or Near-Exposures as Expressed in Focus Groups and Interviews

Factor		Cited in:	
		Focus Groups	Interviews
Sharp disposal or management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Injuring others through trash, lack of disposal containers, overfilled containers, poor container design (too small or too big, no leakproof cover) ● Poor disposal technique either by patient or clinician (eg, handing over a syringe in a Styrofoam cup to a coworker) ● Patients leaving sharps around in the house 	✓	✓
Patient moving when clinician uses a needle or sharp item		✓	✓
Wound care	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Dressing change/disposal, treating bed sores, irrigation/forceful irrigation, dressing a deep wound, dressing comes off, debridement 	✓	✓
Certain medical conditions/treatments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lancets, pens, blood-draw, IV lines, insulin syringes (eg, used multiple times and left out unshielded) <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Incidents with blood-drawing equipment (eg, injuries with butterfly needles when patient flinches, Vacutainer explodes in the hand, blood-draw needle that extends through a Vacutainer adapter sticks, splashes if syringes used for blood drawing) ● Incidents with IV equipment (eg, Huber needle bounces [de-accessing and accessing a Port-A-Cath], “piggyback tubing”) ● Pulling needle out from a vein when the tourniquet is tight ● Amputations, bleeding tumors 	✓	✓
Patient falls and bleeds			✓
Malfunctioning/ineffective safety sharp device		✓	✓
Clutter/lack of workspace		✓	✓
Recapping habits		✓	✓
Exposure of health aides	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Bathing a patient, encountering sharps when housekeeping (eg, in linen) 		✓
Incidents in hospice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Patient may bleed out before dying; not enough time to put gloves on 		✓
Glove issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No glove use during blood work, slippery gloves 		✓
Carrying sharp supplies in nursing bag	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Traveling with sharps (eg, disposal container opened and syringe fell out) 	✓	✓
Different sharps supply vendors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Educating clinicians on all existing safety sharp products ● With a same agency, different products may be used for a same medical procedure 		✓

insurance factor”(ie, complete lack of health insurance, inadequate health insurance, or possible negative consequences affecting personal health insurance) also emerged as an underreporting theme.

Preventive Measures, Safety Sharps, and Purchasing Practices

Study participants provided views and recommendations for preventing exposures to bloodborne pathogens (Table 4). Both research methods

highlighted the importance of providing properly designed medical devices with sharp injury prevention features and sharp disposal containers. Interviewees stressed the need for medical device designers to communicate with users and incorporate their feedback into improved product design.

In a focus group representing one HHC agency, more than 90% of medical devices used were reported to be devices with sharp injury prevention features. In another group,

participants described circumstances in which safety features on devices were entirely absent, for example, in lancets used by diabetic patients. When sharps with safety features were available, many focus group discussants thought that safety was improved (eg, retractable needles and syringes were repeatedly cited as protective). In addition to retractable needles, butterfly needles with a “stiff section” that minimized unexpected movement of the device, needleless IV systems, blood-draw-

TABLE 4

Advice on Prevention of Blood Exposures and Sharps Injuries and Improving Exposure Reporting as Expressed in Focus Groups and Interviews

		Cited in:	
		Focus Groups	Interviews
Safety sharps design	● Easy to use	✓	
	● Needleless systems	✓	✓
	● Designers collaborate with sharps users		✓
	● Improving retractable needle design; no splashbacks or pain to patients		✓
	● Device fully tested before market introduction		✓
	● Reduced cost for safety devices		✓
Sharp disposal containers and practices	● Being prepared with a container ready	✓	
	● Improved container design		
	● Safe sharp containers for patients (eg, diabetics)		
	● One disposal container for one sharp		
	● Have two sharp disposal containers ready		✓
	● Disposal containers provided by patients		
Training of clinicians	● Leakproof cover for disposal container		
	● Not punished when reporting injuries	✓	
	● Pre-event planning for an injury (patient care plan)		✓
	● Educational intervention after sharps injury/blood exposure		
Safe work area	● Reporting is the right thing to do		
	● Setting up a clean, safe work area for sharps use	✓	
Work posture	● Work area that is clear of distractions	✓	
	● Heavy patients should recline before sharp insertion	✓	
	● IV or blood draw procedure, set the patient in a position you are comfortable with		✓
Dressing disposal	● Improving current awkward practice		✓
Patient education		✓	
Safe butterfly needle use	● When a needle is in the patient, keep your hand on the needle in case the patient flinches		✓
	● Standardizing sharps for improved safety	✓	
Consistency among manufacturers and vendors	● Participating in committees/meetings on bloodborne pathogen prevention		✓
Compensated involvement of clinicians			
Injury and exposure reports	● Using reports as lessons learned from staff safety and patient safety perspective one agency reporting form for all workplace injuries		✓
Home health aides/personal care attendants (PCAs)	● Aides need better information about patient health status	✓	
Standard precautions	● Consistent use of personal protective equipment (gloves, gown, face protection)	✓	
	● Using gloves when drawing blood		✓

ing equipment with sliding sheaths, and safety Huber needles (with a self-blunting tip, activated when removing the needle from an IV port) helped make their work safer. However, sometimes safety mechanisms did not activate properly or otherwise failed to protect nurses. For effective use of a device with sharp injury protection features, adequate training and practice are necessary, especially when first introduced and implemented. In addition, patients can become agitated if the device use

seems complicated. The lack of consistency and lack of standardization across device manufacturers were identified as risk factors. Numerous styles of a single medical device (eg, IV equipment and Glucometers) pose training challenges. Lack of standard design is a problem especially when an insurance agency arranges for medical products to be delivered to the home, often selecting devices different than those provided by or familiar to the homecare agency clinicians.

All in-depth interviews elucidated incentives and barriers to the purchase and selection of medical devices. A representative of one private HHC agency described her agency's practice of procuring medical devices through a national distributor of medical supplies. If the agency's preferred medical devices are not carried by the distributor, the distributor tries to acquire them elsewhere. If unsuccessful, the agency can purchase them someplace else. In a hospital-affiliated HHC agency, medical

devices are often ordered through the hospital's purchasing department. A patient's health insurance may also influence the medical device used in the home. One manager explained that insurance companies have purchasing contracts with certain device vendors; the lowest price is often the determining factor for treatments and devices; hence, many homecare patients do not necessarily receive the safest or the easiest-to-use product.

Discussion

Comparison of Two Methodologies

McDonald and colleagues have highlighted the effectiveness of qualitative methods for understanding job tasks and estimating occupational exposures, particularly for autonomous workers who tend to be dispersed with no fixed workplace.¹⁷ Our study supports this assertion. The data gathered for this study, using open-ended questions in focus groups and interviews, permit a detailed, complex, and structured analysis of the hazards of work in HHC. The picture that emerges is much fuller than if we had first imposed close-ended survey questions on the study population. These qualitative methods also produced more balanced data that may lead to better interventions. For example, in addition to the hazards, we learned about the many positive aspects of HHC. The best interventions should eliminate or minimize the hazards, without eroding the benefits.

The focus group narratives reflected clinicians' personal experiences encountered at homes when caring for patients; details were often vivid and emotionally powerful. The interviews with managers and union representatives provided an overview of HHC work, rather than specific personal clinical experiences. They provided factual examples on incidents, practices, and policies either at the workplace or in a larger health care community. The in-depth interview narra-

tives illustrated underlying causes of sharp injuries and hazardous exposures (eg, time constraints, productivity pressures, isolation) as well as broader health policy concerns. For example, the following is an opinion by a HHC agency interviewee:

I'm actually a big advocate in universal health care ... and even though there are drawbacks to universal health care, I really think that it takes away that middle insurance huge issues [sic] that complicate our mission tremendously. So it's the paperwork part.

In particular, Table 3, which depicts blood contact, sharp injury, and near-exposure risk factors, demonstrates how the two study methods generated diverse data perspectives. Of 20 examples, only 8 were reported similarly in both the focus groups and in-depth interviews. Together, the data collected by these two methods provide a more informed evaluation of HHC work than would be obtained with either method alone. In focus groups, "the memory work effect" and experience sharing are significant research methodology advantages. One individual's narrative may awaken "dormant" memories in other focus group discussants to enrich the conversation, or when someone initiates sharing a sensitive experience (eg, blood exposure), others are likely to talk openly about their own experiences. Because the focus groups were limited to frontline clinicians, it was not possible to obtain detailed information on topics occurring at the agency level, such as device purchasing and safety policies. Therefore, in-depth interviews with specialists were necessary. If possible, it is better to conduct focus groups and interviews during working hours, provided there are no adverse consequences to the participants. Although we provided a \$50 incentive for focus group participation, many clinicians said that this was not necessarily a strong motivator to participate after working hours, especially if anyone had childcare

responsibilities or long travel to the interview venue.

Dedication Versus Dangers

The clinicians who participated in the focus groups uniformly reflected commitment to their profession, satisfaction in forming meaningful relationships with patients, sensitivity to the patient's suffering, and awareness of personal safety concerns in the field. A home visit requires circumstances that are not necessarily encountered in facility-based care job settings: for example, frequent long-distance driving, lack of workstations, housekeeping (clutter) and hygiene issues, sudden disruptions (pets, kids, family members), and most of all being alone in the field without support when an unexpected, difficult situation arises. HHC nurses and home health aides face a wide range of physical and psychosocial hazards. Violence emerged as an important occupational hazard, especially in neighborhoods of pervasive drug use. Although clinicians are advised to leave an unsafe situation, it must first be assessed as "dangerous." Furthermore, they face a range of serious ergonomic risk factors, namely lifting and moving patients as well as awkward and static postures. For 2004, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported an incidence rate of 5.3 nonfatal occupational injury and illness cases per 100 workers for home health care services. The overall private industry incidence rate is 4.8 similar cases.¹⁸ Based on 1995 to 1996 West Virginia workers' compensation data, Myer and Muntaner analyzed the types of 386 total injuries recorded for HHC workers: overexertion injuries and falls accounted for 63% of total injuries, while motor vehicle accidents accounted for 13.5% of injuries.¹⁹ In many HHC settings, equipment and assistance for lifting and moving or for responding to a patient's fall may be nonexistent or minimal.¹⁹

Clinicians' dedication to their profession and patients emerged clearly as they provided views on preventing

sharp injuries and blood exposures (Table 4). While highlighting the importance of availability of properly designed devices with engineered sharp injury prevention features and sharp disposal containers, they also stressed personal responsibility for safe work practices (eg, setting up a clean and safe work area where procedures utilizing sharp devices are performed, and eliminating extraneous distractions). In one focus group discussion, the sense of personal responsibility and accountability became intense. An “our-own-fault” type of self-blame emerged several times, for example:

An overfilled sharps container is nobody's fault but our own for not checking on them . . . Because we keep them in the car. So it's not often that we use them. We don't use them every day. So you get your assignment in the morning and you're thinking OK, I've got my sharps and you get the laboratory stuff you need but then when you go to use it and you're already at the patient's home, [my colleague] is smart, she has a backup [disposal container], I don't.

Maybe [a reason for] under-reporting is because most of the time it is our fault from carelessness or something like that. So maybe we're feeling oh, God, you know . . .

In any industry, both the self-blame and “worker-error” mindset create a challenge for implementing effective occupational health interventions. When safety systems function well, they should “design out” or minimize the potential for incidents, regardless of whether the incident is caused by the user, patient, or work environment. In the health care industry context, medical devices, including those for blood drawing and medication administration, should be designed in such a way that sharp injury risks are minimized.

Beltrami et al²⁰ assessed risk factors for blood exposures among HHC nurses and identified 14,744 home visits that included at least one sharp use procedure. During these visits, gloves were worn during 52% of the time; masks, 5%; gowns, 3%; and goggles or other eye protection, 2%.²⁰ Their findings raise concerns about the application of standard precautions that require using these per-

sonal protective items. Linkages with improved workplace infection control practices and management commitment for occupational health interventions have been identified. Green-McKenzie et al have found strong associations among infection control practices and 1) the availability of personal protective equipment, 2) the presence of engineering controls, and 3) organizational commitment to safety.²¹ Gershon et al introduced a safety climate scale to measure hospitals' safety culture with respect to management of bloodborne pathogens. It was significantly associated with both employees' compliance with safe work practices and the number of exposure incidents.²²

Underreporting Dilemma

Many clinicians in our study reported personal experiences with sharp injuries and blood exposures. They also described many barriers to reporting an injury or exposure. In a study of 1163 nurses employed in a variety of health care settings, Brown and colleagues found that reporting of work-related injuries was reduced when nurses felt that their work culture fostered a climate of blame.²³ Nurses were also less inclined to report work-related injuries when working in nonstandard work arrangements.²³

Our study found that reporting a blood exposure can be a time-consuming and frightening “big deal” and that these factors also can influence reporting. Factors related to the health condition of the patients, such as infection status, also influence reporting. These findings are consistent with Backinger and Koustenis, who determined that HHC clinicians may be more likely to report needlestick injuries when a patient is known to be infectious; when the fear of infection is low, the commitment to report remains low.¹⁵ Haiduven identified the following reasons for not reporting exposures: lack of knowledge regarding the need to report, time constraints, dissatisfaction with reporting and follow-up

procedures, and confidentiality concerns.²⁴ Gershon et al report that most hospital-based clinicians found their follow-up care after bloodborne pathogen exposure to be excellent.²² Our focus group discussants also noted that hospitals have more supportive reporting of bloodborne pathogen exposure and follow-up system than the HHC setting. Post-exposure follow-up and treatment can be initiated quickly in hospitals, whereas clinicians providing home-care might be miles away from the nearest health care facility. In another study, Gershon and colleagues determined that low reporting rates among workers in correctional health care facilities may reflect the difficulty of receiving post-exposure care; consequently, only serious bloodborne pathogen exposures are reported.²⁵

Both the focus groups and interviews raised “the health insurance factor” as an underreporting issue. One of our interviewees highlighted that many home health aides stand at the margins of the workforce and their jobs can be very temporary. Because steady employment is paramount, it is unlikely that they would choose to report a needlestick or blood exposure. The “health insurance factor” also indicates that there is a lack of understanding about workers' compensation insurance coverage. This lack of understanding highlights the need for better education by employers of both the reporting procedures and workers' compensation coverage.

Social Context of Home as a Workplace

Clarke et al suggest that needlestick injuries can serve as a proxy for a range of safety and quality issues; hence, it is vital to understand the organizational context in which they occur.²⁶ For hospital settings, such organizational problems as understaffing, inadequate administrative support, and poor morale were identified as risk factors. As in hospital

settings, sharp injuries and blood exposures can serve a proxy for safety and quality practices in homecare settings. Regrettably, home as a work environment is too often assumed to be “comfortable” and not a priority for occupational health interventions. However, many HHC tasks are similar to those performed in hospitals, including blood drawing, administering medication through injection or intravenous therapy, and wound care with bloody dressings. Each of these presents risks of infection from bloodborne pathogens.

It is vital to acknowledge the importance of gender and race or ethnicity in the homecare work environment. The vast majority of HHC practitioners are women,⁸ and the number of foreign-born HHC clinicians has been increasing.⁷ Results from Duke University’s Health and Safety Surveillance System show an elevated risk of blood and body fluid exposure among Hispanic employees.²⁷ Through her study of HHC workers in Montreal, Cognet determined that a HHC provider’s job is not only associated with heavy physical risk factors and emotional burdens, but also with invisibility of HHC providers’ skills that the society has molded into an easily quantifiable task list with little value.²⁸ Despite the problems, the study notes that HHC providers often contribute more than what is required, declare a love of their labor, and feel a strong sense of accomplishment.²⁸ Our study identified similar findings. Despite the hazards, most HHC clinicians found their work profoundly meaningful, citing rewarding relationships with patients and their families, flexibility and independent work (compared with the hospital setting), and regular confirmation that they make positive impacts on people’s lives.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Massachusetts legislation to support health care of the elderly

population in private settings rather than nursing homes^{3,4} indicates that the HHC industry will continue to grow. Despite its social and economic importance, hazardous job exposures are still poorly characterized in HHC. We hypothesize that this is because the social context of the caregivers and their work environment makes them invisible. The home is not recognized as a workplace, the workers are predominantly female, and many are immigrants. Our qualitative study has demonstrated that HHC clinicians face regularly social and physical hazards, including those associated with bloodborne infection. Research is needed to quantify occupational risks and identify effective interventions. Health and safety interventions should be aimed at reducing harmful exposures while preserving or enhancing the meaningful aspects of the job.

Acknowledgments

This study is funded by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) grant 1R01 OH008229. The authors are grateful to the homecare agency and trade union staff who participated in this study and to the dedicated home health care clinicians everywhere. Research materials of this study are available by contacting the corresponding author.

References

1. United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Health Care. *Career Guide to Industries. 2006–07 Edition*. Available at: <http://www.bls.gov/oco/cg/cgs035.htm>. Accessed November 3, 2006.
2. United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Nursing, Psychiatric, and Home Health Aides. *Occupational Outlook Handbook. 2006–07 Edition*: Available at <http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos165.htm>. Accessed November 3, 2006.
3. Commonwealth of Massachusetts. *An Act Relative to Choice of Long-term Care*. 2006. Available at <http://www.mass.gov/legis/laws/seslaw06/sl060211.htm>. Accessed November 3, 2006.
4. Dembner A. New law to boost senior home care: Measure targets disabled, elderly on Medicaid. *The Boston Globe*; 2006; Friday, August 4: B3.
5. Maybud S, Wiskow C. Care trade: The international brokering of health care professionals. In: Kuptsch C, editor. *Merchants of Labour*. Geneva: International Institute for Labour Studies; 2006. p 223–238.
6. Janiszewski Goodin H. The nursing shortage in the United States of America: an integrative review of the literature. *J Adv Nurs*. 2003;43:335–343.
7. Paral R. Health worker shortages and the potential of immigration policy. *Immigration Policy in Focus*. 2004;3:1–12. Available at <http://www.aifl.org/ipc/ipf031104.asp>.
8. Wright B. *Direct care workers in long-term care*. Public Policy Institute: American Association of Retired Persons (AARP); 2005. Available at: http://www.aarp.org/research/longtermcare/nursinghomes/dd117_workers.html. Accessed November 3, 2006.
9. United States Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Workbook for designing, implementing, and evaluating a sharps injury prevention program*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Division of Healthcare and Quality Promotion; 2004. Available at <http://www.cdc.gov/sharpsafety/>. Accessed November 3, 2006.
10. Panlilio AL, Orelie JG, Srivastava PU, et al. Estimate of the annual number of percutaneous injuries among hospital-based healthcare workers in the United States, 1997–1998. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2004;25:556–562.
11. Lee JM, Botteman MF, Xanthakos N, et al. Needlestick injuries in the United States. Epidemiologic, economic, and quality of life issues. *AAOHN J*. 2005;53:117–133.
12. Wilburn SQ. Needlestick and sharps injury prevention. *Online J Issues Nurs*. 2004;9:5. Available at: http://www.nursingworld.org/ojin/topic25/tpc25_4.htm. Accessed November 3, 2006.
13. Perry J, Parker G, Jagger J. Percutaneous injuries in home healthcare settings. *Home Health Nurse*. 2001;19:342–344.
14. Haiduven D, Ferrol S. Sharps injuries in the home health care setting: risks for home health care workers. *AAOHN J*. 2004;52:102–108.
15. Backinger CL, Koustenis GH. Analysis of needlestick injuries to health care workers providing home care. *Am J Infect Control*. 1994;22:300–306.
16. Haiduven D. Prevention of sharps injuries in healthcare workers. *Business Briefing: Long-term Healthcare Strategies*. July 2003. p 76–80. Available at <http://www.touchbriefings.com/pdf/14/ACF62E4.PDF>.

17. McDonald MA, Loomis D, Kucera KL, Lipscomb HJ. Use of qualitative methods to map job tasks and exposures to occupational hazards for commercial fishermen. *Am J Ind Med.* 2004;46:23–31.
18. United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Workplace Injuries and Illnesses in 2004.* News release. 2005; November 17. Available at: <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/osh.pdf>. Accessed November 3, 2006.
19. Meyer JD, Muntaner C. Injuries in home health care workers: an analysis of occupational morbidity from a state compensation database. *Am J Ind Med.* 1999;35:295–301.
20. Beltrami EM, McArthur MA, McGeer A, et al. The nature and frequency of blood contacts among home healthcare workers. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 2000;21:765–770.
21. Green-McKenzie J, Gershon RR, Karkashian C. Infection control practices among correctional healthcare workers: effect of management attitudes and availability of protective equipment and engineering controls. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 2001;22:555–559.
22. Gershon RR, Karkashian CD, Grosch JW, et al. Hospital safety climate and its relationship with safe work practices and workplace exposure incidents. *Am J Infect Control.* 2000;28:211–221.
23. Brown JG, Trinkoff A, Rempfer K, et al. Nurses' inclination to report work-related injuries: organizational, workgroup, and individual factors associated with reporting. *AAOHN J.* 2005;53:213–217.
24. Haiduven D. Concerns of home care nurses regarding blood exposures and safer needle devices. *Business Briefing: Long-term Healthcare Strategies.* 2004;151–155. Available at http://www.touchbriefings.com/pdf/886/lth041_haiduven.pdf.
25. Gershon RR, Mitchell C, Sherman MF, et al. Hepatitis B vaccination in correctional health care workers. *Am J Infect Control.* 2005;33:510–518.
26. Clarke SP, Sloane DM, Aiken LH. Effects of hospital staffing and organizational climate on needlestick injuries to nurses. *Am J Public Health.* 2002;92:1115–1119.
27. Dement JM, Epling C, Østbye T, Pompeii LA, Hunt DL. Blood and body fluid exposure risks among health care workers: results from the Duke Health and Safety Surveillance System. *Am J Ind Med.* 2004;46:637–648.
28. Cagnet M. Women, Services and the Gift (in French, original title: *Les Femmes, les Services et le Don*). *Cahiers de recherche sociologique.* 2002;37:51–77.