

The effect of in-service education on nurses' preference for the ventrogluteal site in intramuscular injection implementation

By Zehra Göçmen Baykara



8

International

Journal of Human Sciences

ISSN:2458-9489

Volume 14 Issue 4 Year: 2017

The effect of in-service education on nurses' preference for the ventrogluteal site in intramuscular injection implementation

Deniz Öztürk¹
Zehra Göçmen Baykara²
Ayşe Karadağ³
Evrimeyikara⁴

Abstract

Purpose: This study conducted to determine the effect of in-service education on nurses' preference for the ventrogluteal site in intramuscular injection implementation.

Method and materials: In this intervention study, the sample comprised 45 clinic nurses, where intramuscular injection practice is frequently applied. In-service education was conducted with regards to applying intramuscular injection to the ventrogluteal site. In the content of the planned education, the transmission of theoretical information on the subject, the demonstration on the manikin and video were included. Then, the nurses carried out the intramuscular injection implementation on the manikin under the supervision of the researchers. The data were collected at 2014 through the use of the "Nurses' VG Site Injection Preference Status Form". The data collection form was applied before the in-service education and two months after the in-service education.

Results: The results showed that 71.11% of the nurses did not receive education on intramuscular injection implementation in the ventrogluteal site in basic nursing education. In basic nursing education, 84.44% of the nurses used the dorsogluteal site and 22.22% the ventrogluteal site for intramuscular injection. The number of intramuscular injection implementations of the nurses in the ventrogluteal site was increased from 2.18 to 9.04 after the in-service education ($p = 0.001$). The nurses stated that, they felt more comfortable during ventrogluteal injection implementation, after the in-service education,

Conclusion: After the in-service education of the nurses, it was determined that the number of IMI implementations in the ventrogluteal site increased.

Key words: in-service education; injection; intramuscular; nursing; ventrogluteal site

¹RN, PhD, Assistant Professor, Başkent University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Nursing Department, deniz_genc@hotmail.com

²RN, PhD, Instructor, Gazi University, Faculty of Health Science Department of Nursing, gocmenzehra@yahoo.com

³RN, PhD, Professor, Koc University, Faculty of Nursing, ayisekaradag@gmail.com

⁴RN, Research Assistant, Gazi University, Faculty of Health Science Department of Nursing, evrimeyikara@gmail.com

1. Introduction

An average of 12 billion parenteral drug implementations are performed worldwide per year (Gittens and Bunnell, 2009). One of the most common parenteral drug implementations is intramuscular injection (IMI) (Nicoll and Hesby, 2002). IMI can be applied to different sites of the

16 body where muscle tissue is involved. However, the site that nurses use frequently is the
17 dorsogluteal (DG) site (Engstrom et al., 2000; Farley et al., 1986; Güneş et al., 2009). In fact, in the
18 DG site, the sciatic nerve passes close to the injection site, and it is known that the anatomical
19 location of the sciatic nerve differs from person to person. For this reason, IMI is reported to be
20 safer in the ventrogluteal (VG) site than in the DG site to prevent possible complications (Ogston-
21 Tuck, 2014).

22 The VG site comprises gluteus medius and gluteus minimus muscles. The VG site is safe
23 for use during injections because its muscle tissue is thick, and it is remote from large blood vessels
24 and nerves. For these reasons, serious injuries are unlikely to occur as a result of injections into the
25 VG site. Because less subcutaneous fat tissue is in the VG site, the possibility of injecting into
26 subcutaneous tissue is low (Kozier et al., 2000: 748-808). In addition, complications, such as
27 fibrosis, nerve damage, abscess, tissue necrosis, muscle contraction, gangrene and pain, are less
28 likely to develop in the VG site. For this reason, it is stated that this site can easily be used in
29 infants, children or adults for the injection of irritating and oily solutions (Nicoll and Hesby, 2002).

30 Although the use of the VG site for IMI has been proposed for many years (Cocoman and
31 Murray, 2010; Gülnar and Çalışkan, 2014; Walsh and Brophy, 2011), the frequency of use among
32 nurses is low (Small, 2004). In the research with 219 nurses that Engstrom et al. (2000) conducted,
33 it was found that most of the nurses (81.5%) preferred the DG site during IMI implementations
34 and preferred the VG site at a low level (4.5%). Similarly, in the research with 264 nurses that
35 Walsh and Brophy (2011) conducted, it was reported that although nurses were aware of the
36 possible complications of injecting into the DG site, they preferred the DG site primarily. In the
37 same research, nurses stated that they feel comfortable when they identify the injection site and that
38 they prioritise knowledge from the existing literature later. Cocoman and Murray (2010) stated that
39 nurses know the importance of the VG site but do not prefer the site due to difficulties in
40 identifying the site anatomically. They also emphasised that nurses should be informed about the
41 current literature to increase their usage rate of the VG site. In the survey with 283 nurses that Gülnar
42 and Çalışkan (2014) conducted, it was reported that 85.9% of the nurses used the DG site most
43 frequently, whereas 34% of the nurses did not have knowledge about the VG site injection, and this
44 issue was not emphasised very well in their basic education.

45 Engstrom et al. (2000) stated the most important reasons why nurses do not prefer the VG
46 site for IMI: Education programs do not comprise sufficient injecting implementations in the VG
47 site, and nurses cannot identify the VG site. In another study that Tuğrul and Denat (2014)
48 conducted with 85 nurses, 48.2% of the nurses stated they always use the DG site during their IMI
49 implementations, and 38.8% stated they never use the VG site. In the same study, it was
50 determined that 72.9% of the nurses do not have sufficient knowledge related to the VG site, and
51 44.7% are worried, as they have not used this site at all. Gülnar and Çalışkan (2014) stated that
52 the majority of the nurses prefer the DG site and do not use the VG site because they are not
53 accustomed to it. As can be understood from the concerned literature, reasons such as the relatively
54 difficult detection of the VG site and the VG site's low usage rate may cause nurses to be reluctant
55 to use this site (Engstrom et al., 2000; Wynaden et al., 2006). In this context, it can be argued that in
56 IMI implementations, it is difficult for nurses to adapt to injecting into an area to which they are
57 not accustomed (Alannah and Floyd, 2007).

58 The above mentioned studies demonstrate that nurses need in-service education, which will
59 contribute to their preference for the VG site, a safer and recommended site for IMI
60 implementation. Although the advantages of using the VG site during IMI implementation are
61 explained in the existing literature, a limited number of studies will enable nurses to prefer the VG
62 site and increase their knowledge on this subject. It is thought that in-service education that will
63 enable nurses to prefer the VG site in IMI will contribute to this field.

64

65 2. Purpose

66 The research was conducted to determine the effect of in-service education on nurses'
67 preference for the VG site in IMI implementation.

68

69 3. Method and material

70

71 3.1. Population and sample selection

72 The research was conducted with nurses working in emergency department, general surgery,
73 urology, cardiovascular surgery, plastic surgery, orthopedics and anesthesia reanimation clinics,
74 where IMI implementation is frequently applied at a 1037-bed university hospital in a metropolis in
75 Turkey. The total number of nurses working in these clinics was 95, and the implementation was
76 performed with 45 nurses volunteering to participate in the research. In this research, the
77 participation rate of the nurses was 47%.

78

79 3.2. Type of study

80 An intervention design was used in this study.

81

82 3.3. Data collection tools

83 The data were obtained using the "Nurses' VG Site Injection Preference Status Form" that
84 the researchers developed based on the literature. The form is composed of two parts. In the first
85 part are six questions addressing the nurses' age, education status, clinical experience, clinic in which
86 they work, the site they use for IMI. In the second part of the form are seventeen questions
87 regarding the IMI implementation of nurses in the VG site.

88

89 3.4. Procedures

90 The "Nurses' VG Site Injection Preference Status Form" was applied to nurses who
91 volunteered to participate in the research after they were informed about the research. Then,
92 trainings were conducted for nurses to apply IMI to the VG site. The in-service education content
93 consisted of three parts. The first part of the education covered theoretical information about the
94 anatomy of the VG site, the injection site of the VG site, the size of the needle to be used, the
95 amount of the drug to be administered and so on. Then, the nurses viewed a video showing IMI
96 implementation in the VG site as performed on a real patient, and IMI implementation was
97 demonstrated on a manikin. Following practical training with theoretical knowledge, the nurses
98 engaged in IMI implementation in the VG site on the manikin. The nurses performed their
99 implementations under the supervision of the researchers. In addition, all of the questions were
100 answered during the implementation, and it was ensured that the site was personally determined
101 and that the injections were made. The in-service education program featured two sessions lasting
102 three hours in total on the same day, with both theoretical knowledge and implementation covered.

103 During the two months following the completion of the in-service education, the nurses
104 were supported in performing IMIs into the VG site in their clinics. The researchers made weekly
105 visits to the clinics and answered questions about the nurses' IMI implementations. In addition,
106 counseling was provided to the nurses who needed it and demanded it by phone. Two months
107 after the completion of the in-service education, the 'Nurses' VG Site Injection Preference Status
108 Form' was applied for the second time.

109

110 3.5. Limitations of study

111 The limitedness of the research is constituted by the fact that it was conducted in a university
112 hospital and with a limited number of nurses.

113

114 3.6. Research ethics

115 Ethical committee permission from the Gazi University Clinical Research Ethics Committee
116 (Application 25901600-1734) and written permission from the Chief Physician of the Health

117 Research and Application Centre at Gazi University were obtained for the research. Verbal
118 permission to participate in the research was also obtained from the nurses.
119

120 3.7. Evaluation of data

121 Data were evaluated using SPSS (17.0) software (SPSS, Inc., 2007). The Shapiro-Wilk test
122 was used because of the unit numbers during the investigation of the normal distribution of
123 variables. A chi-square analysis was applied when the relations between groups of nominal variables
124 were examined. Fisher's exact test was used when the expected values in the cells on the 2x2 tables
125 did not have sufficient volumes, and the Pearson chi-square analysis was applied on RxC tables
126 with the help of a Monte Carlo simulation. While examining the variance between the two
127 dependent variables, the Wilcoxon test was used because the variables do not come from the
128 normal distribution. While interpreting the results, 0.05 was used as the significance level; when it
129 was $p < 0.05$, it was stated that a significant relation existed, and when it was $p > 0.05$, it was stated
130 that no significant relation existed.
131

132 4. Results

133 A total of 71.11% of the nurses who participated in the research each have a bachelor's
134 degree. The average age of the nurses is $\bar{X} = 31.66 \pm 7.93$, and 57.78% of them each have more
135 than six years of clinical training. A total of 71.11% of the nurses stated that they did not receive
136 education on IMI into the VG site in their basic nursing education. A total of 84.44% of the nurses
137 stated that they used the DG site for IMI and 22.22% the VG site in their basic nursing education.
138 The most significant reasons why nurses do not prefer IMI implementation in the VG site are that,
139 in nursing education, injection into the VG site was not taught (60%), and detection of the DG site
140 is easy (48.89%) (Table 1).
141

142 **Table 1. Descriptive characteristics of nurses**

Characteristics	Categories	n	%
Last completed education program	Undergraduate formal education	32	71.11
	Undergraduate remote	5	11.11
	Medical vocational high school	3	6.67
	Associate degree	2	4.44
	Post graduate	3	6.67
Total clinical training in nursing	0-5 years	19	42.22
	6 years or more	26	57.78
Education on IMI implementation in the VG site in nursing education	Did not receive	32	71.11
	Receive	13	28.89
Site used for IMI in basic nursing education	DG	38	84.44
	Deltoid	18	40
	Vastus lateralis	14	31.11
	Rectus femoris	14	31.11
Site frequently preferred for IMI implementation	VG	10	22.22
	DG	35	77.78
	VG	8	17.78
Reasons for not preferring the VG site	Rectus femoris	6	13.33
	Deltoid	5	11.11
	Vastus lateralis	3	6.67
	It was not taught how to inject into the VG site in nursing education.	27	60
Age average	Detection of the DG site is easy.	22	48.89
	Patients do not prefer injection implementation in the VG site.	6	13.33
	$\bar{X} = 31.66 \pm 7.93$		

143 DG, dorsogluteal; IMI, intramuscular; VG, ventrogluteal

144 A total of 52.63% of the nurses have worked for 0-5 years, and 11.54% of those who have
145 worked for more than six years each stated that in their basic vocational education, they received
146 education about IMI implementation in the VG site ($p = 0.008$). A total of 42.11% of the nurses
147 working for 0-5 years stated that they prefer the VG site for IMI implementation, and this ratio is
148 7.69% among those working for more than six years each ($p = 0.010$) (Table 2).

149 **Table 2. Statuses of IMI implementation in the VG site regards to clinical training year**

Statements of nurses	0-5 years		6 years or more		Total		P
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
I received education for IMI implementation in the VG site in my vocational education.	10	52.63	3	11.54	13	28.89	0.008
I applied IMI to the VG site	8	42.11	2	7.69	10	22.22	0.010*

151 *Fisher's exact test

152 IMI, intramuscular; VG, ventrogluteal

153

154 Whereas the number of IMI implementations of nurses in the VG site was $\bar{X} = 2.18 \pm 5.14$
155 before education, it was $\bar{X} = 9.04 \pm 16.19$ after education. The number of IMI implementations of
156 nurses in the VG site showed a statistically significant increase after education ($p = 0.001$) (Table 3).

157

158 **Table 3. Statuses of IMI implementation in the VG site for nurses before and after education**

Number of injection implementation	Mean	SS	P
Before education	2.18	5.14	0.001**
After education	9.04	16.19	

159 ** Wilcoxon test

160 IMI, intramuscular; VG, ventrogluteal

161

162 Before education, 40% of the nurses stated they would be excited to apply IMI, but this rate
163 decreased to 22.22% after education. In addition, 31.11% of the nurses stated they could easily
164 apply IMI to the VG site before education, and this ratio increased to 53.33% after education. A
165 total of 22.22% of the nurses before education and 55.56% after education stated they applied IMI
166 implementation in the VG site (Table 4).

167

168 **Table 4. Opinions of nurses about IMI implementation in the VG site**

Statements of nurses	Before education		After education	
	n	%	n	%
I get excited when I apply IMI to the VG site	18	40	10	22.22*
I comfortably apply IMI to the VG site	14	31.11	24	53.33
I applied IMI to the VG site	10	22.22	25	55.56*

169 *Fisher's exact test

170 IMI, intramuscular; VG, ventrogluteal

171

172 5. Discussion

173 This research was conducted to determine the effect of in-service education on nurses'
174 preference for the VG site in IMI implementation. Forty-five nurses participated in this study,
175 which was conducted as intervention research.

176

177 It was determined that most of the nurses who participated in the study had been working in
178 nursing for at least six years (57.78%) and that most of them (71.11%) did not receive education on
179 IMI implementation in the VG site during their nursing education (Table 1). In Turkey, IMI skill is
180 generally taught in the first year of undergraduate programs and within the scope of the
181 Fundamentals of Nursing course. Until recently, textbooks indicated that the sites used in IMI

182 implementations are generally the DG site, VG site, deltoid muscle and vastus lateralis muscle, and
 183 their implementation patterns were detailed (Kozier et al., 2000: 748-808; Ramont and
 184 Niedringhaus, 2004: 517-518). However, in the current literature, information about how the sciatic
 185 nerve is close to the injection site in the DG site and how its position changes from person to
 186 person is strongly indicated. For this reason, it has been emphasised since the beginning of the
 187 2000s that the DG site should not be used in IMI implementation (Nicoll and Hesby, 2002; Potter
 188 and Perry, 2001: 945). However, the fact that nurses already perform IMI implementations in
 189 particular sites affects nurses' preference for the VG site in their IMI implementations. The
 190 majority of the nurses participating in the research each have a bachelor's degree, and when their
 191 age average is considered, they make up a relatively young group. The knowledge of the preference
 192 for the VG site in IMI implementations in Turkey has entered the main course books for the past
 193 decade. For this reason, nurses often prefer the DG site for IMI in their practices. In the research,
 194 it was found that only 11.54% of the nurses working for at least six years received education for
 195 IMI implementation in the VG site in their basic vocational education (Table 2). This situation
 196 reveals that the subject knowledge of nurses with more professional experience is incompatible
 197 with the current literature. Similarly, Walsh and Brophy (2011) stated that (n = 264) the site
 198 preferences of nurses during IMI implementation varied depending on the age. As a result of the
 199 study, younger nurses were more likely to administer IMI in the VG site compared with older
 200 nurses. In the same study, it was found that the preference rate for the VG site decreased as the
 201 years of vocational service of nurses increased.

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

Nurses participating in the research indicated that they preferred the DG site in a large
 proportion (77.78%) and the VG site in a low proportion (17.78%) (Table 1). Our findings run
 parallel with the literature. Floyd and Meyer (2007) stated that 99% of nurses use the DG muscle,
 whereas only nine percent of nurses use the VG site for the purpose of IMI. In the study that
 Güneş et al. (2009) (n = 110) conducted, 60% of the nurses stated that they have always applied
 IMI to the DG site, and 78.2% have never used the VG site. Similarly, Tuğrul and Denat (2014)
 reported in their study (n = 85) that 48.2% of the nurses use the DG site at all times, and 38.8%
 never use the VG site. In another study that Gülnar and Çalışkan (2014) conducted, 85.9% of the
 nurses use the DG site, and 63.3% of the nurses do not use the VG site at all. The results of this
 study reveal that nurses do not prefer the VG site primarily for IMI that in-service education is
 needed on this issue. It is necessary to prefer IMI implementation in the VG site not alternatively
 but primarily.

In our research, although the mean number of IMI implementations of the nurses was 2.18 ± 5.14 before the education, it was calculated as 9.04 ± 16.19 after the training ($p = 0.001$) (Table 3). Gülnar and Özveren (2016) determined in their study (n = 81) that the nurses were given a planned training program on IMI and that the ratio of the nurses' usage of the VG site increased after the training. For this reason, nurses' knowledge and skills about IMI should be updated with planned in-service education. Evidence-based implementations cannot be conducted unless the nurses' knowledge and skills are updated (Greenway, 2004; Small, 2004). The fact that an increase in the IMI implementation averages of the nurses in the VG site was detected in our study suggests that the nurses are interested in updating their knowledge and skills. For this reason, it is important that the nurses are informed about the current literature, the benefits of the training are given attention and the nurses' awareness of the subject is increased by organising continuous in-service education.

The excitement ratio of the nurses participating in the study when applying IMI to the VG site after in-service education decreased from 40% to 22.22%. In addition, the ratio of nurses who said they could easily apply IMI to the VG site increased from 31.11% to 53.33% (Table 4). Greenway (2004) stated that the nurses' knowledge and skills in the use of VG sites are not

adequate and that they lack the confidence to carry out the skills unaided. Therefore, they are reluctant to use this site. Alannah and Floyd (2007) stated that nurses have difficulty adapting to a different method that are not used to. The reason given for this was that the VG site is difficult to identify and that the use of the DG site in the nursing literature was recommended for a period of time starting in the 1960s. Walsh and Brophy (2011) reported that when the nurses (n = 264) select the site of IMI implementation, 85.2% of them select the site with which they are comfortable, whereas 15.2% of them act in parallel with the literature. Although the current literature recommends using the VG site in IMI implementation, nurses prefer injection implementation in this site at a lower level. Any kind of change can cause some resistance and anxiety in people. Especially in invasive interventions, it is important that nurses feel safe and comfortable when they perform implementations and that they do not have any anxiety. However, it is necessary that nurses keep pace with the new and current literature and that they learn new information/implementations (Walsh and Brophy, 2011). Knowledge, skills and experience need to be increased for a skill to be implemented safely.

247

248 6. Conclusion and recommendations

249 According to this study, most of the nurses did not gain proficiency in preferring the VG site
250 for IMI and performing implementations in this site during their basic education. For this reason,
251 they do not prefer the VG site in their professional implementations. Following the conducted in-
252 service education, it was determined that the number of injections that the nurses administered in
253 the VG site increased and that the nurses felt more comfortable when administering injections in
254 this site. There was also a decrease in their excitement statuses. In line with the research results, it
255 was suggested that the in-service education for the nurses should be done in larger groups and that
256 the education should be repeated periodically.

257

258 References

- 259 Alannah, M., & Floyd S. (2007). Intramuscular injections - what's best practice? why is there such
260 a gap between what is taught in nursing schools about the best sites and technique for
261 intramuscular injections and what actually happens in practice? two nurses decided to find
262 out. *Kai Tiaki: Nursing New Zealand*, 7(1): 25-31.
- 263 Cocoman, A., & Murray, J. (2010). Recognizing the evidence and changing practice on injection
264 sites. *British Journal of Nursing*, 19(18): 1170-1174.
265 <https://doi.org/10.12968/bjon.2010.19.18.79050>
- 266 Engstrom, J.L., Giglio, N.N., Takacs, S.M., Ellis, M.C., & Cherwenka, D.I. (2000). Procedures
267 used to prepare and administer intramuscular injections: a study of infertility nurses. *Journal*
268 *of Obstetric, Gynecologic, and Neonatal Nursing*, 29(2): 159-168.
269 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1552-6909.2000.tb02036.x>
- 270 Farley, H.F., Joyce, N., Long, B., & Roberts, R. (1986). Will that IM needle reach the muscle?
271 *American Journal of Nursing*, 86(12): 1327-1331.
- 272 Floyd, S., & Meyer, A. (2007). Intramuscular injections –what is best practice? *Nursing New*
273 *Zealand*, 13(6): 20-22.
- 274 Gittens, G., & Bunnell, T. (2009). Skin disinfection and its efficacy before administering
275 injections. *Nursing Standard*, 23(39): 42-44.
276 <https://doi.org/10.7748/ns2009.06.23.39.42.c7039>
- 277 Greenway, K. (2004). Using the ventrogluteal site for intramuscular injection. *Nursing Standard*,
278 18(25): 39-42. <https://doi.org/10.7748/ns2004.03.18.25.39.c3560>
- 279 Gülnar, E., & Çalışkan, N. (2014). Determination of knowledge level of nurses regarding
280 intramuscular injection administration to ventrogluteal site introduction. *Dokuz Eylül*
281 *Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu Elektronik Dergisi*, 7(2): 70-77.

- 282 Gülnar, E., & Özveren, H. (2016). An evaluation of the effectiveness of a planned training
283 program for nurses on administering intramuscular injections into the ventrogluteal site.
284 *Nurse Education Today*, 36: 360-363. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2015.09.001>
- 285 Güneş, Ü.Y., Zaybak, A., Biçici, B., & Çevik, K. (2009). The examination of the procedures
286 regarding to intramuscular injection used by the nurses. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Hemşirelik*
287 *Yüksekokulu Dergisi*, 12(4): 84-90.
- 288 Kozier, B., Erb, G., Berman, A.J., & Burke, K. (2000). Fundamentals of nursing concepts,
289 process, and practice. 6th ed. Multimedia edition; pp. 748-808.
- 290 Nicoll, L.H., & Hesby, A. (2002). Intramuscular injection: an integrative research review and
291 guideline for evidence-based practice. *Applied Nursing Research*, 15(3): 149-162.
292 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1053/apnr.2002.34142>
- 293 Ogston-Tuck, S. (2014). Intramuscular injection technique: an evidence-based approach. *Nursing*
294 *Standard*, 29(4): 52-59. <https://doi.org/10.7748/ns.29.4.52.e9183>
- 295 Potter, P.A., & Perry, A.G. (2001). Fundamentals of nursing. 5th ed. Mosby. pp. 945.
- 296 Ramont, R.P., & Niedringhaus, D.M. (2004). Fundamental nursing care. 6th ed. Upper Saddle
297 River NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall. pp. 517-518.
- 298 Small, S.P. (2004). Preventing sciatic nerve injury from intramuscular injections: literature review.
299 *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 47(3): 287-296. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2004.03092.x)
300 [2648.2004.03092.x](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2004.03092.x)
- 301 SPSS Inc (2007). SPSS Statistics Base 17.0 User Guides. SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL.
- 302 Tuğrul, E., & Denat, Y. (2014). Nurses' knowledge, opinion and practices regarding to injection
303 practices in ventrogluteal site. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu Elektronik*
304 *Dergisi*, 7(4): 275-284.
- 305 Walsh, L., & Brophy, K. (2011). Staff nurses' sites of choice for administering intramuscular
306 injections to adult patients in the acute care setting. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 67(5): 1034-
307 1040. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2010.05572.x>
- 308 Wynaden, D., Landsborough, I., McGowan, S., Baigmohamad, Z., Finn, M., & Pennebaker, D.
309 (2006). Best practice guidelines for the administration of intramuscular injections in the
310 mental health setting. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*, 15(3): 195-200.
311 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1447-0349.2006.00423.x>

The effect of in-service education on nurses' preference for the ventrogluteal site in intramuscular injection implementation

ORIGINALITY REPORT

7%

SIMILARITY INDEX

PRIMARY SOURCES

- 1 **Gülnar, Emel, and Hüsna Özveren. "An evaluation of the effectiveness of a planned training program for nurses on administering intramuscular injections into the ventrogluteal site", Nurse Education Today, 2016.** 55 words — 1%

Crossref
- 2 **internationaljournalofcaringsciences.org** 41 words — 1%

Internet
- 3 **www.internationaljournalofcaringsciences.org** 36 words — 1%

Internet
- 4 **www.healthmed.ba** 22 words — 1%

Internet
- 5 **www.wcetn.org** 18 words — < 1%

Internet
- 6 **Lorna Walsh. "Staff nurses' sites of choice for administering intramuscular injections to adult patients in the acute care setting : Sites of choice for intramuscular injections", Journal of Advanced Nursing, 05/2011** 16 words — < 1%

Crossref
- 7 **Sandra P. Small. "Preventing sciatic nerve injury from intramuscular injections: literature review", Journal of Advanced Nursing, 8/2004** 15 words — < 1%

Crossref
- 8 **docplayer.biz.tr** 14 words — < 1%

Internet

9	www.medsurgnursing.net Internet	13 words — < 1%
10	media.proquest.com Internet	9 words — < 1%
11	www.pafmj.org Internet	8 words — < 1%
12	Ozdemir, Leyla, Emine Pınarcı, Bengu Nisa Akay, and Aynur Akyol. "Effect of Methylprednisolone Injection Speed on the Perception of Intramuscular Injection Pain", <i>Pain Management Nursing</i> , 2013. Crossref	8 words — < 1%
13	Greenway, Kathleen. "Using the ventrogluteal site for intramuscular injection.(policy and practice)", <i>Nursing Standard</i> , March 3 2004 Issue Publications	8 words — < 1%
14	archive.org Internet	8 words — < 1%
15	journals.rcni.com Internet	8 words — < 1%
16	www.westernschools.com Internet	8 words — < 1%

EXCLUDE QUOTES ON
EXCLUDE BIBLIOGRAPHY ON

EXCLUDE MATCHES OFF