

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**THE EFFECT OF A WATER FLOW TIMER
ON FOODSERVICE FOOD HANDLERS'
HANDWASHING BEHAVIOR**

Purdue University

Avery Foodservice Research Laboratory

Carl Behnke, PhD, Barbara Almanza, PhD, RDN, EunSol Her, MS

December 2017

1. INTRODUCTION

Importance of proper handwashing

- Poor personal hygiene is one of five risk factors contributing to foodborne illness in foodservice and retail food stores, and thus proper handwashing is critical (FDA, 2010, 2017; Green et al., 2006, 2007).
- However, compliance with proper handwashing is still problematic (e.g., only 24% in full service restaurants; FDA, 2010).

Passive/indirect intervention strategies for behavioral change

- Mounting evidence suggests that classical education strategies of knowledge transfer are not sufficient to drive behavioral change (Evans & McCormack, 2008; Schroeder et al., 2016).
- Instead, *active/direct* interventions involving motivational or behavior-based training (Pellegrino, Crandall, O'Bryan, & Seo, 2015; Yu, Neal, Dawson, & Madera, 2017) are gaining interest and found effective in improving hand hygiene practices.
- In comparison, *passive/indirect* interventions with only a subtle change in the environment or system (FDA, 2010; Green et al., 2007; Pellegrino et al., 2015; Viator, Blitstein, Brophy, & Fraser, 2015) may also help behavioral changes with less time/cost commitment and fewer financial obligations for restaurant operations.

Water flow timer

- Sufficient duration (≥ 20 sec; ServSafe®) is an important component in proper handwashing to reduce the number of microorganisms on hands (CDC, 2015).

- The presence of a water flow timer may lead food handlers to be more involved in a proper handwashing duration by providing immediate, continuous, real-time, and personalized feedback.

1.1. Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to address whether:

- (1) the presence of a water flow timer improves foodservice food handlers' handwashing behavior;
- (2) the presence of a water flow timer in conjunction with an informational poster facilitates the effect; and
- (3) the effects are affected by high consumer volume.

2. METHODS

Site Selection and Sample

- A student-operated *a la carte* restaurant on a large Midwestern university campus was the site of the experiment.
- The intervention hand sink was centrally located within the kitchen and was most frequently used.
- Sample included sophomore and senior hospitality students ($n = 70$) and non-student employees ($n = 9$), more than 90% of whom were certified with ServSafe[®] Food Protection Manager Examination.

Design/Instruments/Data Collection

- A within-group, multiple-intervention experiment was conducted over the course of four weeks from September 12th to October 6th, 2017.

- Multiple-intervention included:
 - Week 1) baseline phase;
 - Week 2) a single intervention phase using a water flow timer (SaniTimer[®]);
 - Week 3) multiple intervention phase using the water flow timer and an informational poster (developed based on ServSafe[®]); and
 - Week 4) withdrawal phase.
- The water flow timer was attached to a faucet and had a digital display face approximately 2" in diameter, which enabled food handlers to observe a thirty second countdown on a display that begins when the water starts flowing and continues until thirty seconds have passed.
- The informational poster highlighted proper five-step handwashing procedures and the minimum duration of scrubbing with soap as well as total five steps.
- Data were collected from Tuesday to Friday, 7:30am to 2:30pm, using a small motion-detecting video camera (AUKEY DR-01 Dash Cam) that included a date and time stamp for recordings.
- The motion-detecting video camera was installed on the top of a sink with the lens directed at the faucet only, thereby capturing handwashing instances without person-identifiable information.

Behavioral measures

- **Quantitative**
 - Frequency of handwashing instances
 - Overall duration of handwashing instances

- **Qualitative**
 - Compliance to proper scrubbing duration (≥ 10 sec or not)
 - Compliance to proper five-step handwashing sequence (wetting, soaping, scrubbing, washing, and drying)
 - Compliance to complete proper handwashing (meeting both proper scrubbing duration and five-step handwashing sequence or not)

3. RESULTS

- A total of 839 handwashing instances were observed over 112 hours (see Table 1 for detailed frequencies and descriptive statistics of all measures).
- The analysis of variance (ANOVA) results showed that frequency of handwashing instances did not significantly vary across the weeks ($p = .43$).
- The ANOVA results showed that, despite the highest consumer traffic, duration of handwashing instances significantly increased in week 2 over week 1 (14.9 sec vs. 11.6 sec; $p = .002$) and significantly dropped in week 4 in comparison to week 3 (12.8 sec vs. 15.7 sec; $p = .02$).
- Although not definitive, the logistic regression results suggested that the compliance rates for proper scrubbing duration ($p = .095$) and complete proper handwashing varied across the weeks ($p = .071$; i.e., higher percentages in week 2 and week 3 than in week 1 and week 4), and that the compliance rate for following the proper five-step sequence increased in week 2 over week 1 (49.1% vs. 40.7%; $p = .076$) despite the high consumer volumes in week 2 and week 3.

- Point-biserial correlation results showed that increased handwashing duration was positively associated with proper scrubbing duration ($r_{pb} = .51, p < .001$), proper sequence ($r_{pb} = .41, p < .001$), and complete proper handwashing ($r_{pb} = .45, p < .001$).

Table 1. Handwashing behavioral measures and consumer volume

Week	Frequency ^{ns.}	Duration ^{***}	Proper scrubbing duration [†]	Proper sequence ^{ns.}	Complete proper handwashing [†]	Consumer volume
1	204	11.6	8.3%	40.7%	6.4%	152
2	234	14.9	12.0%	49.1%	10.7%	244
3	186	15.7	11.3%	39.8%	8.1%	187
4	215	12.8	5.6%	46.0%	4.2%	158

Notes. Week 1. Baseline; Week 2. Timer; Week 3. Timer + Poster; Week 4. Withdrawal. Duration is in seconds.

Complete proper handwashing indicates compliance to both proper sequence and scrubbing. In the consumer volume, one day of the week 2 included special banquet for 100 consumers, greater than an average daily volume.

Superscripts indicate the significance testing across four weeks.

^{***} $p < .001$. [†] $p < .1$. ^{ns} $p \geq .1$.

4. CONCLUSION

- This study provided reliable and quantifiable data about food handlers' handwashing practices.
- Findings provided useful information about whether *passive/indirect* intervention strategies in handwashing practices such as the mere presence of a water flow timer are effective in driving behavioral changes of food handlers.
- If coupled with an *active/direct* training for providing the rationale, the effect of the *passive/indirect* intervention in its constant reinforcement may become even stronger.

NOTES

1. This report is an executive summary of a manuscript in preparation for journal submission.
2. The authors acknowledge the support provided by SaniTimer®.

References

- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2015). *Handwashing: Clean hands save lives. Show me the science—How to wash your hands*. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/handwashing/show-me-the-science-handwashing.html>
- Evans, W. D., & McCormack, L. (2008). Applying social marketing in health care: Communicating evidence to change consumer behavior. *Medical Decision Making*, 28(5), 781-792.
- Food and Drug Administration. (2010). *FDA trend analysis report on the occurrence of foodborne illness risk factors in selected institutional foodservice, restaurant, and retail food store facility types (1998-2008)*. Retrieved from <https://wayback.archive-it.org/7993/20170113095247/http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Food/GuidanceRegulation/RetailFoodProtection/FoodborneIllnessRiskFactorReduction/UCM369245.pdf>
- Food and Drug Administration. (2017). *Retail food protection: Employee health and personal hygiene handbook*. Retrieved from <https://www.fda.gov/food/guidanceregulation/retailfoodprotection/industryandregulatoryassistanceandtrainingresources/ucm113827.htm>
- Green, L. R., Radke, V., Mason, R., Bushnell, L., Reimann, D. W., Mack, J. C., ... & Selman, C. A. (2007). Factors related to food worker hand hygiene practices. *Journal of Food Protection*, 70(3), 661-666.
- Green, L. R., Selman, C. A., Radke, V., Ripley, D., Mack, J. C., Reimann, D. W., ... & Bushnell, L. (2006). Food worker hand washing practices: An observational study. *Journal of Food Protection*, 69(10), 2417-2423.
- Pellegrino, R., Crandall, P. G., O'Bryan, C. A., & Seo, H. S. (2015). A review of motivational models for improving hand hygiene among an increasingly diverse food service workforce. *Food Control*, 50, 446-456.
- Schroeder, M., Yang, L., Eifert, J., Boyer, R., Chase, M., & Nieto-Montenegro, S. (2016). Evaluation of how different signs affect poultry processing employees' hand washing practices. *Food Control*, 68, 1-6.
- Viator, C., Blitstein, J., Brophy, J. E., & Fraser, A. (2015). Preventing and controlling foodborne disease in commercial and institutional food service settings: A systematic review of published intervention studies. *Journal of Food Protection*, 78(2), 446-456.
- Yu, H., Neal, J., Dawson, M., & Madera, J. M. (2017). Implementation of behavior-based training can improve food service employees' handwashing frequencies, duration, and effectiveness. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly* (in press). doi: 10.1177/1938965517704370