



Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Guo, S;Davis, E;Armstrong, R;Yu, X;Naccarella, L

Title:

A pilot study of adolescent health literacy research in Melbourne: Implementation and reflections

Date:

2021-02-01

Citation:

Guo, S., Davis, E., Armstrong, R., Yu, X. & Naccarella, L. (2021). A pilot study of adolescent health literacy research in Melbourne: Implementation and reflections. *Health Promotion Journal of Australia*, 32 (S1), pp.128-132. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hpja.425>.

Persistent Link:

<https://hdl.handle.net/11343/264447>

Article type: Brief Report

Short title: A school-based health literacy pilot study

A Pilot Study of Adolescent Health Literacy Research in Melbourne: Implementation and Reflections

Shuaijun Guo^{*1,2,3}, Elise Davis², Rebecca Armstrong², Xiaoming Yu⁴, and Lucio Naccarella²

¹*Centre for Community Child Health, Murdoch Children's Research Institute, Royal Children's Hospital, Melbourne, Australia*

²*Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, University of Melbourne, Australia*

³*Department of Pediatrics, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia.*

⁴*Institute of Child and Adolescent Health, School of Public Health, Peking University, China*

*** Corresponding Author:**

Shuaijun Guo, Centre for Community Child Health, Murdoch Children's Research Institute, Royal Children's Hospital, Level 2 East Building, 50 Flemington Road, Parkville, Victoria, Australia, 3052. Email: gshj1986@gmail.com

Acknowledgement: This work was supported by the Victorian Government's Operational Infrastructure Support Program. We would like to acknowledge school principal who gave the consent to access the school, and all school representatives and teachers who helped organise the online survey procedure, and we also thank all the teachers and participants who were involved in the online survey.

Conflict of Interest Statement: None.

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as [doi: 10.1002/HPJA.425](https://doi.org/10.1002/HPJA.425)

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

DR SHUAIJUN GUO (Orcid ID : 0000-0001-5737-4765)

DR LUCIO NACCARELLA (Orcid ID : 0000-0001-7163-3022)

Article type : Special Issue Article

ABSTRACT

Issues addressed: While adolescent health literacy research has gained momentum, there is little evidence regarding its implementation and data collection in school settings. This study explored the feasibility of collecting health literacy data from Australian secondary schools and piloted three health literacy instruments.

Methods: A cross-sectional study was designed to recruit four government secondary schools in Melbourne. Active, opt-in consent was obtained from parents and students in Years 7-9, and an online survey was conducted. Three health literacy instruments were used: the 8-item Health Literacy Assessment Tool (HLAT-8), the Newest Vital Sign (NVS), and the 47-item Health Literacy Survey (HLS-47).

Results: A total of 120 students (age 12-15 years) were finally recruited from one school, whereas the other three schools declined due to busy educational commitment or no interest in research. Learnings and reflections on data collection included: a shared perspective of health literacy evaluation between school and researchers; the feasibility of online data collection; and the possibility of obtaining passive, opt-out consent. About one-quarter (23.7~32.2%) of students were likely to have poor health literacy.

Conclusions: Although the recruitment was challenging, this pilot study indicates the feasibility of large-scale online health literacy survey in future school-based research.

So what? Measuring and monitoring adolescent health literacy is essential to achieve the aim of the Australian Curriculum of Health and Physical Education. More implementation research is needed with representative samples to validate health literacy instruments and examine the impact of health literacy on health promotion outcomes in Australian adolescents.

Keywords: health literacy; schools; adolescents; pilot studies; implementation; Australia

Author Manuscript

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Adolescent health literacy, defined as an individual's ability to find, understand and use health
3 information to maintain and promote good health (1, 2), has gained increasing attention over
4 the last decade. Compared with adult health literacy, adolescent health literacy has six unique
5 characteristics (i.e. 6'D'): demographic patterns (adolescents are particularly vulnerable to
6 social and health inequalities), differential epidemiology (some disease and health risks are
7 highly age-specific to adolescents), developmental change (e.g. biological, cognitive,
8 psychological), dependency (on parents and peer groups), democratic citizenship (adolescents
9 are social actors within their own right) and digitalisation (digital media are an integral
10 component of their daily lives) (3). National and international studies show that poor adolescent
11 health literacy is associated with a range of adverse health outcomes (e.g. smoking, obesity,
12 and poor health status) (4-6). From a health promotion perspective, improving health literacy
13 at an earlier age is cost-effective to reduce health inequities (7).

14
15 While the term 'health literacy' is widely used in research and practice (8-10), few studies have
16 been conducted with Australian adolescents. The 2006 national survey showed that 67.6% of
17 15-19 year-olds had poor health literacy (11). Although the Australian Curriculum of Health
18 and Physical Education (hereafter refers to National Curriculum) is committed to developing
19 students' health literacy to promote their health and wellbeing (12), there is little evidence
20 regarding health literacy levels and the implementation process of health literacy data
21 collection in schools. One possible reason is the lack of appropriate health literacy instruments
22 for use within this population. In our previous systematic review (1), we identified 29 health
23 literacy instruments in children and adolescents. However, half of these instruments measured
24 health literacy on a single domain (e.g., the ability to read and understand), not capturing the
25 multi-dimensional nature. Besides, the measurement properties of most included instruments
26 were unknown, due to either poor methodological quality of studies or a lack of reporting.

27
28 Schools are the most common places where adolescents spend most of their daytime and are
29 critical venues for improving health literacy through school health curricula (13, 14).
30 Investment in child and adolescent health, including their health literacy, is crucial to reduce
31 health inequities now and for future generations (1, 3). Given the 6 'D' unique characteristics
32 mentioned above, adolescent health literacy measurement requires considering its context-and-
33 content-specific nature with a particular research purpose (1, 3). In the present study, we piloted
34 three frequently-used health literacy instruments and reported the implementation process and

35 challenges to inform future health literacy practice in school settings. The three health literacy
36 instruments were selected based on our systematic review findings and their extensive use (1,
37 4, 5). Besides, using multiple tools to measure health literacy in a single study provided
38 different views of students' health literacy and would enhance the rigour of findings.

39

40 **2 PROJECT BACKGROUND**

41 This pilot study was part of a PhD research project, which aimed to understand and measure
42 health literacy in secondary students in Beijing and Melbourne (15). The PhD project consisted
43 of four studies: 1) a systematic review that examined psychometric properties of health literacy
44 instruments used among children and adolescents (1); 2) a validation study that tested the
45 psychometric properties of the 8-item Health Literacy Assessment Tool (HLAT-8) in Beijing
46 adolescents (2), based on findings from the first study; 3) a cross-sectional study that
47 investigated the mediating role of adolescent health literacy in the relationship between its
48 antecedents and health outcomes in Beijing adolescents; and 4) a pilot study that explored the
49 feasibility of health literacy data collection from Australian secondary schools. A common
50 thread that ran through these four studies was health literacy measurement, which was a starting
51 point of examining health literacy disparities and informing next-step interventions. Ethics
52 approval was obtained from the University of Melbourne and the Victorian Department of
53 Education and Training.

54

55 **3 PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION**

56 **3.1 School recruitment**

57 A cluster convenience sampling method was used to recruit students from four government
58 secondary schools in Melbourne, Australia. First, five areas in Victoria where many Chinese-
59 born migrants lived (i.e., Inner Melbourne, Whitehorse, Monash, Boroondara and Manningham)
60 were identified from the Social Health Atlas of Australia. Second, four government secondary
61 schools located in these areas were identified based on the location's socioeconomic status
62 (SES) (two in high SES district and two in low SES district), students' language backgrounds
63 ($\geq 50\%$ of students speaking English as a second language), and school enrolment size (≥ 100
64 students). We then contacted four school principals by email, and only one principal replied
65 and had an interest. To learn why the other three school principals did not respond, we gave
66 each school principal a follow-up call one week after sending the email. The other three school
67 principals declined to participate either due to a busy educational timetable, or because they
68 had no interest in the research. Finally, only one school in the high SES district participated.

69

70 **3.2 Participant recruitment**

71 All students (n=918) in Years 7 to 9 in the pilot school were invited to participate in the health
72 literacy survey. Students were approached using recruitment strategies shown in Figure 1. First,
73 following the ethics approval, we got the support from the school principal by email. The
74 school principal introduced researchers to school representatives. A research protocol was sent
75 to school representatives, and a face-to-face meeting was arranged to discuss details of the data
76 collection procedure. Second, parental consent forms and plain language statements were sent
77 to parents via the school online system Compass by the school information technology team.
78 Parents were invited to complete an online consent form. Finally, all students in Years 7 to 9
79 were invited to participate in an online survey via the Survey Monkey. With support from health
80 and physical education teachers, an online consent form and a plain language statement were
81 also sent to each student before data collection. All students who gave their consent completed
82 the online survey when participating in the first health and physical education class in the third
83 school term (July and September 2016).

84

85 **3.3 Questionnaire**

86 The online health literacy survey was designed based on Manganello's health literacy
87 framework (7), which included information on intrapersonal factors, interpersonal factors,
88 environmental factors, health literacy and health-related outcomes. With a focus on health
89 literacy, here we only reported three measures used in this pilot study: the HLAT-8, the 6-item
90 Newest Vital Sign (NVS) and the 47-item Health Literacy Study (HLS-47). The HLAT-8 and
91 the HLS-47 were self-report instruments that measured an individual's ability to access,
92 understand, evaluate, and communicate health information in everyday life (16, 17). While
93 these two measures were comprehensive in terms of measurement domains, they might bring
94 about self-report bias. The NVS was a performance-based measure for reading comprehension
95 and numeracy (18). Although it was an objective measure, it was limited in the single
96 measurement domain. We included three instruments in a single study to provide an overall
97 picture of students' health literacy levels. The total score range of each instrument was 0-37,
98 0-6 and 0-50, respectively, with higher scores indicating higher health literacy levels. Scores
99 of 0-3 for the NVS and scores below 33 for the HLS-47 indicated poor health literacy.

100

101 **3.4 Statistical analysis**

102 All statistical analyses were conducted using STATA 16.1. Descriptive statistics were
103 conducted to examine participants' socio-demographics and health literacy scores. Spearman
104 correlation analysis was used to examine correlations between scores of different health
105 literacy instruments.

106

107 **4 RESULTS**

108 In total, 120 students participated in the online survey, resulting in a low response rate (13.1%,
109 120/918). The mean age of students was 13.63 ± 1.03 (age range: 12-15). Table 1 shows the
110 distribution of students' socio-demographics and health literacy levels. About one-quarter of
111 students had poor health literacy: 32.2% (38/118) when using the NVS and 23.7% (28/118)
112 when using the HLS-47. Spearman correlation analysis showed that the HLAT-8 was
113 moderately correlated with the HLS-47 ($r=0.58$, $p<0.01$). However, the NVS was neither
114 correlated with the HLAT-8 ($r=0.03$, $p=0.76$), nor correlated with the HLS-47 ($r=0.08$, $p=0.39$).

115

116 **5 DISCUSSION**

117 We conducted a pilot study that explored the feasibility of health literacy data collection from
118 Australian secondary schools. There were three main learnings and reflections on health
119 literacy research in practice. First, there was a shared perspective on health literacy evaluation
120 between the pilot school and researchers. School representatives had an interest in this project
121 because they would like to learn about students' health literacy levels and use the findings to
122 inform school-based health curricula designing. However, this was not a common interest for
123 the other three schools who declined. Although "health literacy" is explicitly included in the
124 aim of the National Curriculum, this term has been less frequently used in school settings
125 compared to other terms such as "mental health prevention". One possible way to improve
126 response rate is to advocate the importance of "health literacy" in the National Curriculum and
127 raise school principals' awareness by using successful programs like the HealthLit4Kids in
128 Tasmania (14). Meanwhile, as shown in previous successful school health programs in the
129 USA (19), assistance with school recruitment is also necessary from state or local health
130 education sectors.

131

132 Second, online data collection was feasible and resource-saving in practice. All students in the
133 pilot school used laptops or tablets in class, thus making the data collection process time-
134 efficient and less expensive. However, 211 students who received parental consent did not
135 complete the survey because some teachers did not provide time in class. Given that the first

136 class of health and physical education in the third semester was the only available survey time
137 in the pilot school, future implementation research may consider using the Ophelia principles
138 for better collaborations (20). For example, two principles (co-design approach and driven by
139 local wisdom) are particularly important for the successful implementation process.
140 Researchers need to co-design all activities (e.g. time, resources, technical support) from data
141 collection, interpretation and allow local teachers to provide ideas in response to potential
142 challenges (20).

143
144 Finally, obtaining informed consent from parents was challenging, with only 36.1% (331/918)
145 of students having parental consent. Opt-in consent is deemed ethically more defensible
146 because it provides assurance that a parent has read, understood and signed the consent form
147 (21). However, it limits participation and introduces bias into studies (22). One possible way
148 to increase consent rate is to have passive, opt-out consent. Although the term ‘opt-out consent’
149 is not explicitly mentioned in the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research,
150 the Statement (i.e. Section 4.2.10 to 4.2.12) implies that an opt-out form of consent could occur
151 in school settings (21). An opt-out methodology is generally acceptable in low-risk studies and
152 provides more representative data. Compared with opt-in consent, opt-out consent is also less
153 costly and less burdensome to teachers and students (22). On the contrary, it is ethically risky
154 because it relies on inattention rather than fostering personal autonomy (21). Therefore, it is
155 incumbent upon researchers and ethics committee to ensure the information provided is simple,
156 detailed and easily understood.

157

158 **6 CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS**

159 Although it was challenging to recruit schools and students, this pilot study provided useful
160 insights into future large-scale health literacy surveys in Australian schools. Measuring and
161 monitoring adolescent health literacy is an integral part of designing and delivering health
162 promotion programs that address health inequities and improve health outcomes (1). Evidence
163 has shown that there is a social gradient in adolescent health literacy (23, 24), which in turn
164 leads to health promotion outcomes. Adolescents with high health literacy levels are more
165 likely to have health-promoting behaviours, communicate effectively with health professionals,
166 and perceive their health status as good (4, 5, 24). Due to the small sample size, we did not test
167 the reliability and validity of the three health literacy instruments and did not investigate the
168 relationship between adolescent health literacy and health outcomes. More empirical evidence

169 is needed to better understand and translate health literacy research into practice, thus
170 contributing to a vision of health literate schools in Australia.

171

172 Meanwhile, given that most students in the pilot school had higher socioeconomic status, the
173 prevalence of poor health literacy was probably much higher in the general population. Future
174 research with more representative samples is needed to examine the psychometric properties
175 of these health literacy instruments. In practice, there remain challenges about how to best
176 measure adolescent health literacy (e.g. considering the 6'D' characteristics, comprehensive
177 measurement domains, feasibility, cultural sensitivity) in school settings (1, 3, 23). However,
178 using a single measure of health literacy and integrating it as part of students' health
179 questionnaires would be more cost-effective and less time burden.

180

181 REFERENCES

- 182 1. Guo S, Armstrong R, Waters E, Sathish T, Alif SM, Browne GR, et al. Quality of health
183 literacy instruments used in children and adolescents: a systematic review. *BMJ Open*.
184 2018;8(6):e020080.
- 185 2. Guo S, Davis E, Yu X, Naccarella L, Armstrong R, Abel T, et al. Measuring functional,
186 interactive and critical health literacy of Chinese secondary school students: reliable, valid and
187 feasible? *Global Health Promotion*. 2018;25(4):6-14.
- 188 3. Bröder J, Okan O, Bollweg TM, Bruland D, Pinheiro P, Bauer U. Child and Youth
189 Health Literacy: A Conceptual Analysis and Proposed Target-Group-Centred Definition.
190 *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2019;16(18):3417.
- 191 4. Choudhry FR, Ming LC, Munawar K, Zaidi STR, Patel RP, Khan TM, et al. Health
192 literacy studies conducted in Australia: a scoping review. *International Journal of*
193 *Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2019;16(7):1112.
- 194 5. Sansom-Daly UM, Lin M, Robertson EG, Wakefield CE, McGill BC, Girgis A, et al.
195 Health literacy in adolescents and young adults: an updated review. *J Adolesc Young Adult*
196 *Oncol*. 2016;5(2):106-18.
- 197 6. Fleary SA, Joseph P, Pappagianopoulos JE. Adolescent health literacy and health
198 behaviors: a systematic review. *Journal of Adolescence*. 2018;62:116-27.
- 199 7. Manganello JA. Health literacy and adolescents: a framework and agenda for future
200 research. *Health Education Research*. 2008;23(5):840-7.
- 201 8. Nutbeam D. Building health literacy in Australia. *Medical Journal of Australia*.
202 2009;191(10):525.

-
- 203 9. Smith JA, Ireland S. Towards equity and health literacy. *Health Promotion Journal of*
204 *Australia: Official Journal of Australian Association of Health Promotion Professionals.*
205 2020;31(1):3.
- 206 10. Peralta LR, Rowling L. Implementation of school health literacy in Australia: A
207 systematic review. *Health Education Journal.* 2018;77(3):363-76.
- 208 11. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Australian Bureau of Statistics. 4233.0-Health Literacy,
209 Australia, 2006 Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics; 2008 [cited 2020 Feb 02]. Available
210 from:
211 <http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DetailsPage/4233.02006?OpenDocument>.
- 212 12. Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA). Health and
213 Physical Education Sydney, Australia: ACARA; 2008 [cited 2020 Feb 02]. Available from:
214 [https://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/f-10-curriculum/health-and-physical-](https://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/f-10-curriculum/health-and-physical-education/aims/)
215 [education/aims/](https://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/f-10-curriculum/health-and-physical-education/aims/).
- 216 13. Peralta L, Rowling L, Samdal O, Hipkins R, Dudley D. Conceptualising a new
217 approach to adolescent health literacy. *Health Education Journal.* 2017;76(7):787-801.
- 218 14. Nash R, Elmer S, Thomas K, Osborne R, MacIntyre K, Shelley B, et al. HealthLit4Kids
219 study protocol; crossing boundaries for positive health literacy outcomes. *BMC Public Health.*
220 2018;18(1):690.
- 221 15. Guo S. Understanding and measuring health literacy among secondary students in
222 Beijing and Melbourne. Melbourne, Australia: The University of Melbourne; 2018.
- 223 16. Abel T, Hofmann K, Ackermann S, Bucher S, Sakarya S. Health literacy among young
224 adults: a short survey tool for public health and health promotion research. *Health Promotion*
225 *International.* 2015;30(3):725-35.
- 226 17. Sørensen K, Van den Broucke S, Pelikan JM, Fullam J, Doyle G, Slonska Z, et al.
227 Measuring health literacy in populations: illuminating the design and development process of
228 the European Health Literacy Survey Questionnaire (HLS-EU-Q). *BMC Public Health.*
229 2013;13(1):948.
- 230 18. Weiss BD, Mays MZ, Martz W, Castro KM, DeWalt DA, Pignone MP, et al. Quick
231 assessment of literacy in primary care: the newest vital sign. *The Annals of Family Medicine.*
232 2005;3(6):514-22.
- 233 19. Lytle LA, Johnson CC, Bachman K, Wambsgans K, Perry CL, Stone EJ, et al.
234 Successful recruitment strategies for school-based health promotion: experiences from
235 CATCH. *Journal of School Health.* 1994;64(10):405-9.

-
- 236 20. Beauchamp A, Batterham RW, Dodson S, Astbury B, Elsworth GR, McPhee C, et al.
237 Systematic development and implementation of interventions to OPTimise Health Literacy and
238 Access (Ophelia). *BMC Public Health*. 2017;17(1):230.
- 239 21. Spriggs M. *Understanding consent in research involving children: The ethical issues*.
240 Melbourne, Australia: Children's Bioethics Centre; 2010.
- 241 22. Lacy K, Kremer P, de Silva-Sanigorski A, Allender S, Leslie E, Jones L, et al. The
242 appropriateness of opt-out consent for monitoring childhood obesity in Australia. *Pediatric*
243 *Obesity*. 2012;7(5):e62-e7.
- 244 23. Guo S, Yu X, Davis E, Armstrong R, Riggs E, Naccarella L. Adolescent Health
245 Literacy in Beijing and Melbourne: A Cross-Cultural Comparison. *International Journal of*
246 *Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2020;17(4):1242.
- 247 24. Paakkari L, Torppa M, Mazur J, Boberova Z, Sudeck G, Kalman M, et al. A
248 Comparative Study on Adolescents' Health Literacy in Europe: Findings from the HBSC Study.
249 *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2020;17(10):3543.

250

Author Manuscript

Table 1. Students' socio-demographics and health literacy levels in the pilot school (n=120)

Participant characteristic	Mean ± SD or frequency (%)
Gender	
Male	73 (60.8)
Female	47 (39.2)
Year level	
Year 7	32 (26.7)
Year 8	35 (29.2)
Year 9	53 (44.2)
Country of birth	
Australia	84 (70.0)
Mainland China/Hong Kong/Macao/Taiwan	13 (10.8)
Other countries	23 (19.2)
Years of living in Australia* (n=36)	7.56 ± 3.95
First language spoken at home	
English	85 (70.8)
Chinese	20 (16.7)
Other languages	15 (12.5)
Family structure	
Living with both biological parents	105 (87.5)
Other types of families (e.g. living with a single parent)	15 (12.5)
Socio-economic status	
Low	2 (1.7)
Medium	28 (23.3)
High	90 (75.0)
Health literacy	
HLAT-8	28.25 (6.00)
NVS	4.13 (1.73)
HLS-47	37.72 (8.40)

HLAT-8, the 8-item Health Literacy Assessment Tool; HLS-47, the 47-item Health Literacy Study; NVS, the 6-item Newest Vital Sign; SD, Standard Deviation.




Figure 1: Flowchart of recruitment for secondary schools and students