Journal of Advances and Scholarly Researches in Allied Education
Vol. 19, Issue No. 6, December-2022, ISSN 2230-7540

The Role of Quality Health Information at Hospitals in Relation to Health Information Technology

Ahmed Shoaib Ibrahim Faqiri[1]*, Amnah Awwash Hassan Aljezani[2]

[1] Naqah Hospital in Riyadh, Health Informatics, Specialist

[2] Moraba'a PHC in Riyadh, Health Informatics, Technician

Abstract - Recent efforts have focused heavily on promoting HIT's usage to improve healthcare quality. However, there is still a lack of knowledge on how HIT adoption affects the quality of care provided to patients in hospitals. With this research, we aimed to learn how different HITs correlate with QI practices and tactics, POC adherence, risk-adjusted in-hospital mortality, patient satisfaction, and the perceptions of hospital quality managers and frontline physicians. In this study, we investigate how the adoption of HIT in Saudi hospitals affects the quality of patient care.

Keywords - Health information technology, Technology management, Information science, Health Care, Information systems management.

---------------------------------x---------------------------------

INTRODUCTION

The Institute of Medicine's 2001 report, Trying to cross the Quality Chasm, sparked a dramatic increase in interest in recent years in the role of HIT for improving health quality and patient safety by emphasizing "the critical value of information technology in the layout of health care systems" to meet six aims of care, namely, care "that is safe, effective, efficient, opportune, equitable, and patient-centered." Based on the findings, it was recommended that by the end of the decade, a digital health infrastructure be established to replace paper medical records. Since then, many hospitals and clinics have spent sizable sums on HIT acquisitions; Several private groups, since the federal government's creation of the Office of ONC under the Health and Human Services Services. Another sign of the rising agreement on the possible beneficial impact of HIT is the roughly $20 billion allocated for HIT in the American Recovery & Reinvestment Act of 2009.

There is a wide variety of HITs out there, all with the same goal: to enhance the safety and quality of patient care. To further guarantee things like the proper distribution of medicine, bar coding and RFID devices are also utilized to monitor the whereabouts of medications, medical equipment, surgical supplies, and patients.

Despite the increasing emphasis on IT, evidence of HIT adoption's effect on the quality of hospital treatment remains scant. No evidence that HIT enhances quality of life was discovered in a meta-analysis of 257 studies on its effects. Evidence- or protocol-based treatment adherence is improved by decision support systems that give out automated reminders for routine preventative treatments like vaccinations and blood tests. In addition, However, these studies often only looked at one technology in one setting, such as an academic medical center, limiting its applicability to HIT deployments at larger facilities or with other kinds of health care providers. Six further publications were published after 2006 that explore the link between HIT & treatment quality in various settings. Which polled 41 hospitals in Texas, found that a higher degree of automation of patient data procedures was associated with lower rates of in-hospital death and fewer occurrences of patient complaints. We analyzed data from 2,707 hospitals to see whether the use of EMRs, NACs, and PACS was linked to better patient outcomes. The adoption of electronic medical records was linked to fewer cases of healthcare-associated infections, and this correlation was statistically significant. Between 2004 and 2007, hospitals using both an EMR and CPOE showed modest but statistically significant increases in two of six process metrics of quality compared to hospitals using neither HIT. Acute myocardial infarction exhibited a weak link with the "computerization score" generated by the nation's 4,000 hospitals and process metrics, whereas heart failure, pneumonia, and all three showed no correlation. A comprehensive analysis of the study conducted was performed, and the findings were compared to patient outcomes. Of the 41 research considered, just 5 showed any kind of benefit to patients. This was due in part to the fact that only randomized controlled trials were included.

Researchers looked at 2,619 hospitals' EMR use in relation to patient outcomes and costs. Researchers found that EMRs did not reduce the number of patient safety events; however, they did aid in responding to an incident, which led to fewer deaths, shorter hospital stays, or cheaper expenditures.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Fortin et al. **(2019)**[1] the lack of availability and effectiveness of this technology is the main obstacle to its widespread adoption in the healthcare industry. This is a major factor that prevents the widespread adoption of IT.

Viitanen (2019)[2] one of the biggest problems with using technology is that people don't know how to use the devices that are crucial to completing the job. who also stressed the need of education or therapy in this field.

Marrow (2018)[3] training is the most crucial aspect of IT usage,. More training, he said, yields better outcomes, and is the primary reason this approach has been so widely adopted in the medical industry.

Gagnon (2020)[4] notes that the medical staff and patients immediately come to mind when discussing health care, leading the researcher to conclude that the most significant challenges involve the patient's involvement in the use of technology in a specific manner, and thus favor providing patients with opportunities for appropriate training. One of the most crucial applications of data collected so far in the computerized health information system is restricted training.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

What follows is a discussion of the study's sample and methods for collecting data. In addition, are described in great depth. Here, we'll go through the steps involved in gathering information and establishing standards for evaluating structures via the use of data and variable measurement.

Study participants, data gathering methods, and measurement scale

An online questionnaire was used to compile the information. Almost majority of the replies were gathered via in-person interviews. Questions pertaining to HIT, HIT QUALITY, and HOSPITAL PERFORMANCE were used to compile the data. Information was gathered from clinical administrators, departmental medical team supervisors, management supervisors, and departmental medical physicians at public hospitals in Saudi Arabia. Respondents come from every division of the hospital and from every specialty represented by MDs. Human resources management experts from five different hospitals were interviewed to determine the hospital population sizes. About 1,500 people were involved, including doctors, medical directors, non-medical directors, and both medical & non-medical supervisors. The response percentage from the five Saudi teaching hospitals was about 90%. As 53 out of 533 questionnaires were deemed ineligible for inclusion, the final sample size is 500. The number of responses from the questionnaires obtained was enough for evaluating the study hypotheses. Table shows the percentage of hospitals that took part.

Table 1: Number and percentage of hospitals involved

Name of the hospital	Percent (%)	Frequency
Prince Mohammad Bin Abdul Aziz Hospital	22.8	114
King Saud Medical City Hospital	24.8	124
Gynecology and Pediatrics' Hospital	10	50
Al Jazeera Hospital	16	80
Al-Adwani General Hospital	26.4	132
Total	100.0	500

Sampling methods

Picking the right sample size is crucial for getting reliable results. The likelihood of your sample deviating from the whole population will be reduced if you choose a big enough sample. When doing research, a reduced sample size may lead to erroneous findings. The optimal number of observations for a study depends on its purpose, but for each independent variable, researchers typically suggest no less than five observations. When there are several signs for a hidden variable and the data fit a normal distribution.

The normative number of observations per indicator variable in a sample is 10. The researchers set a sample size of 50 subjects for 41 observation in the research instruments to guarantee they got adequate data from participating hospitals. To choose a study population sample that is scientifically valid, we employed stratified random sampling.

Table 2: Professions Selected, Frequency, & Percentage

Professions	Percent (%)	Frequency
Head of department	13	65
Manager	9	31
Supervisors	12.4	62
Senior officer	6.2	123
Head of Medical Unit	24.6	45
Resident Doctor	22	110
Specialist Doctor	12.8	64
Total	100.0	500

The respondents' occupations broke down as follows: 6.2% were managers, 24.6% were senior officers, 12.4% were supervisory-level management, 13% were department heads, 9% were medical unit heads, 22.2% were residents, and 12.8% were specialists.

Table 3: Indicate the degree of schooling, the frequency, and the percentage.

Education level	Percent	Frequency
Higher Specialty in Medicine	19.6	98
Diploma	15.4	77
Postgraduate	30	150
Graduate degree	35	175
Total	100.0	500

Variable measurement

The software packages AMOS or SEM, both included in SPSS version 22, are used to test hypotheses. Cronbach's alpha was used to determine the level of dependability in this study. We also used exploratory factor analysis to see whether there was any correlation between the variables. Confirmatory factor analysis of the second order was also used to examine the construct validity and ensure that the predicted construct loads into the expected number of underlying sub-constructs. At last, we employed Structural Equation Modelling to evaluate the relationship among the explanatory, mediating, and criterion variables.

RESULTS

Investigative factor analysis

Extensive EFA was performed once the data was input to determine the differentiating characteristics. We utilized the promax rotation of the Principal Components Extraction Method, factoring in all of the components that had been adjusted to reflect the HIT-Q, HP-Q, and PER-Q aspects of health information excellence, access, or performance. The dimensions for continuing to use health information technology were verified using a factor loading that is more simply interpretable and Kaiser's rule concept, which requires eigenvalues to be greater than 1. The dimensionality of the constructs is shown in Table 5 of the EFA findings. Interface, Performance had, & Functions had are the three parts of health IT . Tables provide the results of the EFA for the various Health Information constructs.

Table 4: EFA pattern matrix representation for HIT

	Component		
	1	2	3
QIT- Interface 1	0.862		
QIT- Interface 2	0.828		
QIT- Interface 3	0.858		
QIT- Interface 4	0.807		
QIT- Interface 5	0.780		
QIT- Interface 6	0.879		
QIT- Interface 7	0.822		
QIT- Interface 8	0.784		
QIT- Functions 1			-0.860
QIT- Functions 3			-0.859
QIT- Functions 2			-0.847
QIT- Performance 1		0.866	
QIT- Performance 2		0.944	
QIT- Performance 3		0.829	

Table 5: Total variance represented and explained

Component	first-order eigen values			sums of rotation for squared loadings
	Percentage of Variance	Total	Cumulative Percentage	Total
1	62.325	8.454	60.325	7.671
2	3.144	0.543	82.174	
3	11.643	1.481	71.958	5.442
4	2.877	0.104	84.081	
5	7.042	0.979	79.040	5.312

Table presents the results of an EFA, demonstrating that the constructs are unidimensional. Five factors—process orientation, worker conditions, enhance clinical, patient happiness, operational efficiency, & financial performance—combine to determine the success of a hospital. The tables below provide the results of the EFA for each measure of hospital performance.

Table 6: The Efficacy of Care Delivery Displayed by an EFA Pattern Matrixa

	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
HP-OE_3	0.783				
HP-OE_2	0.719				
HP-OE_4	0.686				
HP-OE_1	0.555				
HP-P-4	0.478				
HP-P-3	0.480				
HP-P-2	0.449		0.446		
H-POI-2		-0.753			
H-POI-7		-0.712			
H-POI-5		-0.732			
H-POI-4		-0.674			
H-POI-6		-0.720			
H-POI-3		-0.759			
H-POI-8		-0.716			
H-POI-9		-0.641			
H-POI-1		-0.588			
HP-CQ1			0.756		
HP-CQ4			0.617		
HP-CQ2			0.680		
HP-CQ3			0.679		
HP-P-1			0.555		
HP-FP-2				0.667	
HP-FP-1					
HP-FP-3				0.678	
HP-WC-2					0.621
HP-WC-1					0.683
HP-WC-3					0.474

Table 7: Illustrating the overall variance

Component	first-order eigenvalues			sums of rotation for squared loadings
	Percentage of Variance	Total	Cumulative Percentage	Total
1	35.402	10.088	37.412	10.078
2	3.741	1.023	61.641	
3	4.842	1.320	55.038	1.320
4	7.621	2.050	45.022	2.070
5	3.842	1.030	56.870	1.030
6	5.134	1.349	50.126	1.379
7	3.218	0.862	64.849	

Validity And Reliability Of Cfa

Accordingly, the recommended CFA validation techniques were used for this investigation. Construct validity was examined using a 2nd confirmatory factor analysis using maximum-likelihood criteria. The model was used to analyze the relationships between healthcare IT, information quality, and hospital efficiency. Check out Table for the final results. It's important to note, however, that this model is quite sensitive to the number of data points used to estimate it.

Table 8: The EFA Pattern Matrixa for Representing the Credibility of Health Data

	Component	
	1	2
HIQ7	.947	
HIQ5	.762	
HIQ6	.931	
HIQ8	.823	
HIQ4	.514	-.446
HIQ2		-.870
HIQ1		-1.018
HIQ3		-.668

Considering that goodness-of-fit indexes for the models show values that fall within the predicted ranges, the second-order CFA's findings may be relied upon.

The research instruments were guaranteed to be valid and reliable by using CR and AVE. All of the AVEs were more than 0.5, and the CRs can be shown in Table to be greater than 0.70. Construct convergent validity has been shown. All items obtained p-values lower than 0.05 and loading factors greater than 0.58.

Table 9: KMO & Bartlett's test representation

KMO & Bartlett's Test		
KMO Test for Sampling Adequacy		.949
Bartlett's Sphericity Test	Chi-Square Approx.	3584.506
	Sig.	.000
	Df	28

As a result, all of the chosen items were adequate for measuring the research variables according to the rule of. To evaluate the model, There was an application for a factor analysis, and it was a confirming one. The results showed that the data or the model were in close agreement: Statistical significance (p0.0001): 2/df = 3.537, CFI = 0.901, RMSEA = 0.073, & GFI = 0.876.

Full-Fledged Sem Analysis

Here, we investigate the repercussions of interrelated concepts on one another. After consulting with experts in quantitative research who advised using SEM to properly observe and uncover the impact between constructs, a more thorough SEM investigation was performed. The results of the implemented SEM model supported the hypothesis that the data could be represented by the model. However, several important inferences emerged. It is important to note that the quality of medical information or health information technology both have positive direct effects on hospital performance. Health information quality, on the other hand, mediates some of the connection between HIT and hospital efficiency. The SEM model includes representations for the health information allows components, the quality - of - care constructs, or the health information technology actors.

Table 10: Representing the Full Explanatory Variance

Component	first-order eigenvalues			sums of rotation for squared loadings
	percentage of Variance	Total	Cumulative percentage	Total
1	74.574	6.035	74.554	5.628
2	6.543	.523	81.126	5.241
3	4.621	.360	85.737	

Explicitly shows the estimated causal effect of the model's components across the board in a SEM. Each of the 8 constructs in the model is represented by one of 40 variables. Research data were well suited by the model. There is a summary of the model's goodness-of-fit statistics in Table. Goodness of fit statistics, such as RMSEA, CFI, and so on are consistent with the model's adequacy when they are within the recommended ranges. The statistical cutoffs employed were an RMSEA of 0.08 or less, a CFI of 0.90 or better, and a normed chi-square of fewer than 5. Loading coefficients were from 0.76 to 0.95, all within acceptable ranges, a significant improvement above the original threshold of 0.5. Statistically significant links between all constructs are further supported by analyzing the predicted outcomes. Connections between process improvement, workforce condition, clinical quality, operating excellence, and financial success are clear and statistically significant. The correlation coefficients between the variables are more than 1.96, suggesting that there are significant relationships between them. In addition, the model showed no evidence of any interactions, either direct or indirect, between its constituent parts. The effect sizes were all statistically and relatively substantial, but their values are in keeping with a causal association.

We can see from the tablo that HIT has direct effects on healthcare quality, that HIT affects HIT quality, that HIT quality affects hospital performance, and that HIT indirectly affects hospital performance through HIT quality as a possible moderating function. Direct findings for all three variables are higher compared to 0.08, while route results of the analysis are greater than compared to 0.2.

Table 11: An overview of the second element CFA model's fit statistic indices

Models	X^2	Df	P	C_{mindf}	RMSEA	CFI	TLI	GFI	P/estimates
HIT	213.807	72	0.000	2.872	0.053	0.967	0.961	0.932	(0.61–0. 79)
HIQ	56.5	17	0.001	2.184	0.084	0.931	0.927	0.885	(0.84–0.71)
HP	616.771	203	0.000	3.004	0.055	0.921	0.888	0.884	(0.68–0.93)

Table 12 :AVEs and CRs.

	AVEs	CRs
HIT	0.696	0.957
HIQ	0.717	0.868
HP	0.514	0.94

Table 13: Statistics for fitting the whole SEM model

Models	Df	RMSEA	CFI	X^2	GFI	P	GFI	P/estimates
Fit statistics for QHIT, HIQ and HP Model	734	0.063	0.801	2460.834	0.866	0.000	0.866	(0.75–0.94)

Table 14: Analysing the relationships between the constructions' causes.

Dependent element	Impact	Independent element	Direct effect results (β)
HP	<---	HIT	0.22***
HP	<---	HIQ	0.5***
HIQ	<---	HIT	0.69***
Indirect impact			

CONCLUSION

The results of the impact validation of the HITs model indicate that it is a credible tool for analyzing performance indicators in healthcare settings such as hospitals. Our model shows that high-quality HITs have a considerable, beneficial impact on healthcare outcomes and data. The quality of both clinical and administrative choices and procedures relies heavily on the quality of health information. Studies have shown that hospitals and clinics that use HITs see significant productivity gains. Although several studies have investigated the extent to which HITs have clinical or non-clinical benefits for healthcare institutions, significantly less focus has been placed on how HITs affect working conditions and process orientation. Our intention is that the reliable measuring technique utilized here will pave the way for future studies examining how HITs might be used to enhance working conditions or business process direction, particularly in high-stakes, complicated settings.

REFERENCES

1. Fortin, J., Gagnon, M. and Lamothe, L. (2019) Evaluation of Health Care Information and Communication Technologies: A Framework to Support Decision Making. Proceedings of the IADIS International Conference e-Society, Avila, 16-19 July 2004, 517-525.
2. Viitanen, J.A. (2019) User-Centred Approach to Healthcare ICT Development. Helsinki University of Technology, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Espoo, 93 p. http://www.soberit.hut.fi/T-121/shared/thesis/lic_thesis_Viitanen.pdf
3. Marrow, P. (2018) An Industrial Perspective on Future ICT in Hospitals. http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/computing/research/cseg/projects/ideal/workshop/MarrowPaper.pdf
4. Gagnon, M., Légaré, F., Labrecque, M., et al. (2020) Interventions for Promoting Information and Communication Technologies Adoption in Healthcare Professionals. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, No. 1, CD006093. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD006093.pub2
5. Institute of Medicine: Committee on Quality of Health Care in America (IOM):: Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century. 2021, Washington, DC: National Academy Press
6. Chaudhry B, Wang J, Wu S, Maglione M, Mojica W, Roth E, Morton SC, Shekelle PG: Systematic Review: Impact of Health Information Technology on Quality, Efficiency, and Costs of Medical Care. Ann Intern Med. 2016, 144 (10): 742-752.
7. Amarasingham R, Plantinga L, Diener-West M, Gaskin DJ, Powe NR: Clinical Information Technologies and Inpatient Outcomes: A Multiple Hospital Study. Arch Intern Med. 2009, 169 (2): 108-114. 10.1001/archinternmed.2018.520.
8. Parente ST, McCullough JS: Health Information Technology and Patient Safety: Evidence from Panel Data. Health Aff. 2019, 28 (2): 357-360. 10.1377/hlthaff.28.2.357.
9. McCullough JS, Casey M, Moscovice I, Prasad S: The Effect of Health Information Technology on Quality in U.S. Hospitals. Health Aff. 2017, 29 (4)): 647-654.
10. Himmelstein DU, Wright A, Woolhandler S: Hospital Computing and the Costs and Quality of Care: A National Study. Am J

Med. 2019, 123 (1): 40-46. 10.1016/j.amjmed.2009.09.004.

11. Mollon B, Chong JJR, Holbrook AM, Sung M, Thabane L, Foster G: Features predicting the success of computerized decision support for prescribing: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. Medical Informatics and Decision Making. 2019, 9: 11-10.1186/1472-6947-9-11.
12. Encinosa WE, Bae J: Health Information Technology and Its Effects on Hospital Costs, Outcomes, and Patient Safety. Inquiry. 2021, 48 (4): 288-303. 10.5034/inquiryjrnl_48.04.02.
13. Barsness ZI, Shortell SM, Gillies RR, Hughes EFX, O'Brien JL, Bohr D, Izui C, Kravolec P: The Quality March: National Survey of Hospital Quality Improvement Activities. Hospital and Health Networks. 2017, 67 (23): 52-55.

Corresponding Author

Ahmed Shoaib Ibrahim Faqiri*

Naqah Hospital in Riyadh, Health Informatics, Specialist