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The Development and assessment of reliability and validity of a questionnaire to measure Concordance to ‘pressure relief’ regimen for pressure injury prevention in seated spinal cord injury

Background:
To develop and test reliability, and validity of a questionnaire to evaluate concordance to ‘pressure relief’ for pressure injury prevention in people with spinal cord injury

Method:
The first phase of the study determined the questionnaire's content and face validity. The original questionnaire included 37 items and was grouped into 5 domains: concordance (7 items), perceived necessity (9 items), concerns about of pressure-relief (4 items), practical barriers to performing pressure-relief (9 items) and perceptions of pressure injury (8 items). Subsequently, the internal reliability consistency and construct validity were demonstrated using 38 completed questionnaires. The test-retest reliability was assessed in ten participants who completed the questionnaires in two weeks intervals.

Results/Discussion:
As a whole, the questionnaire showed good internal consistency (Cronbach's α = .78). The internal consistency reliability for 5 domains were very good (Cronbach's α = .70-.87); Pearson correlation coefficient on a test-retest of the same subjects yielded significant correlations in adherence $r = .91$, $p = .005$, concern $(r = .98, p < .0001$, practical issue $(r = .93, p=.002)$ and perceptions of pressure injury $(r = .85, p=0.02)$.

Conclusion:
The questionnaire that assesses concordance to ‘pressure relief’ regimen demonstrated good reliability and validity and met stringent psychometric standards. Future interventional study to evaluate changes with education is warranted. Such a questionnaire could be a promising assessment tool for use in research or practice to promote concordance to ‘pressure relief’ advice in people living with spinal cord injury.