

1 Developing and validating modular surveys for vector-borne diseases: a study protocol

2

3 Skyler Finucane^{1†}, Alexandria Renault², Mary H. Hayden³, Kacey Ernst^{2*}, Sarah Yeo^{4†}

4

5

6 ¹Department of Entomology and Insect Science, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, United
7 States of America

8

9 ²Mel and Enid Zuckerman College of Public Health, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona,
10 United States of America

11

12 ³Lyda Hill Institute for Human Resilience, University of Colorado, Colorado Springs, United
13 States of America

14

15 ⁴The University of Arizona Cancer Center, Tucson, Arizona, United States of America

16

17

18 *Corresponding author

19 Email: kernst@arizona.edu (KE)

20

21

22 [†]These authors contributed equally to this work

23

24

25

26

27 **Abstract**

28 Vector-borne diseases are an increasing threat to human health and well-being in the United
29 States. Understanding public perception and practices taken to reduce vector abundance and
30 vector-human contact can guide effective interventions that can mitigate health risks.
31 Nevertheless, vector-borne disease surveys, which are widely used in the field to understand
32 public perception and practices, are often inconsistent in terms of structure and implementation.
33 This protocol is designed to provide guidance for public health professionals and researchers in
34 the development of future KAP studies by ensuring uniformity in design and structure. This
35 manuscript describes a rigorous three-phase protocol for the development of standardized vector-
36 borne disease survey modules that can be used throughout the United States to generate data that
37 are comparable across diverse regions. During phase one, a workshop with subject matter experts
38 and a comprehensive literature review will be conducted to identify survey domains and generate
39 items of interest. Survey items will also be mapped based on two theoretical frameworks, the
40 Health Belief Model and the Risks, Attitudes, Norms, Abilities and Self-Regulation framework,
41 to help gauge individual perceptions of risk severity and self-efficacy. During phase two, a group
42 of expert judges will evaluate survey items based on content relevance, representativeness, and
43 technical quality. During the final phase, cognitive interviews and surveys with target audience
44 groups will be conducted to ensure the face validity of the modules. Participants will be drawn
45 from a diverse range of educational and geographic locations, and computer-assisted personal
46 interviewing will be implemented. The surveys developed through this protocol will be available
47 to researchers aiming to gain deeper insights into the public's knowledge, attitudes, and practices
48 concerning vector-borne diseases, facilitating the collection of more comparable data across
49 various regions in the United States.

50 **Introduction**

51 Vector-borne diseases (VBDs) are an increasing threat to human health and well-being in the
52 United States (US). Over the past two decades, transmission of tick-borne diseases has doubled,
53 while outbreaks of mosquito-borne diseases persist across the continental US and its territories.
54 This increase is associated with shifting seasonal patterns of transmission and the wider spread of
55 disease vectors and their pathogens [1, 2]. Engaging the public in prevention and control
56 measures is crucial to mitigating these risks. Understanding public perception and practices taken
57 to reduce vector abundance and vector-human contact can guide effective interventions.
58
59 Knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) surveys are one of the most common assessment
60 tools used to understand public health issues in a community [3]. These surveys have been
61 widely used within the context of VBDs. Knowledge questions seek to understand respondents'
62 level of understanding about a VBD topic [3, 4]. This could include questions related to
63 knowledge of vectors and their presence, disease transmission and symptoms, and prevention
64 strategies including vector control and personal protection. Attitude questions relate to the
65 emotional, motivational, perceptive, and cognitive beliefs that influence the behaviors of an
66 individual [4]. For VBDs, these questions could pertain to people's attitudes about recommended
67 practices and guidelines regarding the disease, and their perception of risk and disease severity.
68 Practice questions ask about the current actions of an individual, such as the measures
69 undertaken to reduce VBD risk at individual, household, and community levels [4]. In general,
70 KAP surveys are easy to design, quick to implement, easy to interpret, produce quantifiable data,
71 and often allow for generalizations of small sample results to larger populations [5]. Ideally,
72 these surveys use an underlying theoretical framework of behavioral theory, such as the Health

73 Belief Model or the Risk, Attitudes, Norms, Abilities, and Self-Regulation framework. These
74 underlying constructs are important to understand where efforts must be focused to enhance the
75 adoption of prevention and control methods [6, 7]. These studies set baseline values for
76 subsequent evaluations, evaluate the efficacy of health education initiatives, and inform localized
77 and culturally contextualized intervention approaches [8].

78

79 This study aims to create standardized modular surveys for the general public, enabling data
80 comparison across various geographical regions and projects undertaken by public health
81 professionals and researchers in the US. Three phases will be implemented to achieve this goal:
82 1) identifying survey domains and items; 2) developing modules; and 3) evaluating modules.

83 This manuscript outlines the detailed protocol to create these modular surveys, which will cover
84 the most prevalent VBDs found in the US as follows:

- 85 • General mosquito-borne disease module
- 86 • Specific mosquito-borne disease modules
 - 87 ○ Dengue
 - 88 ○ Zika
 - 89 ○ West Nile
 - 90 ○ St. Louis Encephalitis
- 91 • General tick-borne disease module
- 92 • Specific tick-borne disease modules
 - 93 ○ Lyme disease
 - 94 ○ Rocky Mountain Spotted Fever

95

96 **Methods**

97 **Study Design**

98 Modular survey development is based on the knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) model
99 [3, 4]. The development process consists of three phases, following the methodologies delineated
100 by Hinkin and Boateng (Fig1) [9, 10]. Ethical approval was obtained through the University of
101 Arizona Institutional Review Board in July 2023.

102 Fig 1. An overview of the three protocol phases.

103 **Phase One: Domain Identification and Item Generation**

104 In this initial phase, a workshop with subject matter experts and a comprehensive literature
105 review will be conducted to identify survey items used in previous studies. The workshop and
106 literature review will be implemented to identify domains and generate items of interest.

107

108 **Solicitation of Expert Panel for Key Domains**

109 An initial workshop will be conducted to identify primary domains of knowledge, attitudes, and
110 practices that are considered necessary for the control and prevention of mosquito-borne and
111 tick-borne diseases. Approximately 20-30 experts will be drawn from applied public health,
112 vector control agencies, and academic researchers conducting applied research related to VBDs.

113 An asynchronous method, Idea Flip, will be used to solicit initial key domains. A follow-up
114 workshop will bring participants together to identify additional themes and prioritize themes for
115 tick-borne and mosquito-borne diseases.

116

117 **Literature Review and Assessment of Existing Scales**

118 The goal of the literature review is to identify and analyze existing surveys and develop a set of
119 domains and items to be used throughout the modular surveys. This is the first step in developing
120 sound measures and ensuring content validity [9]. The literature review will be conducted in
121 several stages. Initially, a scoping review will be undertaken using specific search strategies.
122 Search criteria will include “KAP,” “KAB,” or “KAPP” combined with “AND” followed by
123 specific mosquito and tick-borne diseases using Boolean searching (S1 Appendix).

124

125 This review will assess current practices regarding the utilization of KAP surveys, the themes
126 addressed, and the way questions are formulated. The research team will contact the authors to
127 obtain survey tools when KAP surveys are not readily accessible within the manuscript. The
128 following data will be retrieved from the KAP surveys using a data extraction form: the first
129 author’s name, publication year and title, diseases, vectors, region and country, study design and
130 sample size, how the survey/tool/scale was developed, and sources referenced, how the
131 survey/tool/scale was validated, and the number of items included. Further solicitation of survey
132 tools will be made from applied public health departments using personal networks to identify
133 potentially unpublished tools. Items will be extracted and included in a master database that will
134 be used to determine potential items for the draft modules.

135

136 Subsequently, public-facing materials such as guidelines, posters, and fact sheets will be
137 collected from selected state health departments and the Centers for Disease Control and
138 Prevention and World Health Organization websites. The selection of state health departments
139 will be based on the severity of the mosquito-borne and tick-borne diseases based on the
140 incidence rates and reported cases in the health department jurisdiction. Relevant data will be

141 collected according to a predefined data extraction format, which includes reference, source,
142 format (e.g., poster, fact sheet), vector, disease, domain (Knowledge, Attitude, or Practice), and
143 sub-domain (e.g., symptom, transmission).

144

145 **Development of the draft survey tools**

146 The data systematically collected from the scoping review of peer-reviewed papers on KAP
147 related to VBDs, along with prevention and control guidelines, will serve as the foundation for
148 developing the modules.

149

150 **Underlying theoretical frameworks**

151 As the goal of KAP surveys for VBD prevention and control is to identify areas to focus efforts
152 that motivate action, survey items will be mapped to the components of two theoretical
153 frameworks for health behavior, the Health Belief Model (HBM) and the Risks, Attitudes,
154 Norms, Abilities and Self-Regulation framework (RANAS) [6, 7]. Employing the HBM as a
155 theoretical framework in survey development can be beneficial. This model helps gauge
156 individual perceptions of risk severity as well as self-efficacy, or an individual's belief in their
157 ability to take meaningful action to mitigate risk [6]. Given that risk perception is intrinsically
158 aligned with motivating behavior change, these elements are essential in gauging the likelihood
159 of success of an intervention. The RANAS framework complements the HBM by addressing
160 societal norms, an aspect absent in the HBM, thus emphasizing the importance of tailoring and
161 contextualizing specific behaviors/behavior changes within a population [7].

162

163 **Phase Two: Content Validity through the Delphi**

164 During phase two, content validity will be measured through the Delphi process. A group of
165 expert judges will evaluate each item for content relevance, representativeness, and technical
166 quality [10]. These expert judges will be comprised of representatives from multiple groups
167 including:

- 168 1. Vector control personnel
- 169 2. Health department personnel
- 170 3. Academic VBD researchers

171
172 Expert opinions will be solicited via email. The initial recruitment will be among 30-50
173 individuals with an anticipated response of 70%. Those who agree to participate will engage in
174 two rounds as part of the Delphi process. Strategies to keep participants engaged will be
175 employed, including personalized survey invitations and periodic reminders. Three follow-up
176 reminders will be sent every two weeks following the initial distribution. One phone call
177 reminder will be conducted as needed for the second round to ensure a 70% follow-up for round
178 two.

179
180 During round one, the expert panel will receive a link to a web-based Delphi questionnaire,
181 which will include a consent form, background information, instructions for the survey, a short
182 demographic survey, and the modules. A content validity ratio (CVR) will be employed as a
183 measurement consensus for items. Each item will be scored using a 4-point scale: 4=Highly
184 Relevant, 3= Highly Relevant But Needs Rewording, 2=Somewhat Relevant, 1=Not Relevant,
185 and the CVR will be calculated [11]. The members of the panel will be able to suggest
186 rephrasing, provide rationales for their choices through a comment box attached to each item,

187 and suggest missing or new items. This study will involve at least 20 experts, so a minimum
188 CVR value of 0.42 will be used [12]. Items that fall below this threshold will be removed.

189

190 Responses from round one will be analyzed and summarized into one feedback report, which
191 will include summary statistics including the standard deviation and means for each item, the
192 level of consensus, coefficient variation, participants' feedback and comments, and the decision
193 regarding item selection based on predefined consensus level using the CVR. The feedback
194 report will be sent back to the expert panel with the introductory material for the second round.
195 During round two, experts will be asked to review the feedback report and re-evaluate items.
196 Once a consensus has been met for all items, results will be sent out to the panel.

197

198 **Phase Three: Face Validity through Cognitive Interviews and** 199 **Survey**

200 During phase three, cognitive interviews and surveys with target audience groups will be
201 conducted to ensure the face validity of the modules. End users will judge whether the items are
202 appropriate to the targeted construct and assessment objectives [10]. Given the target of the
203 survey modules are adults who reside in areas with mosquito-borne disease and tick-borne
204 disease activity, participants will be drawn from a diverse range of educational backgrounds and
205 geographic locations (i.e. urban, suburban, and rural).

206

207 **Cognitive Interviews**

208 To assess the extent to which questions reflect the domain of interest and answers produce valid
209 measurements, we will conduct cognitive interviews with the target population [13]. The

210 cognitive interview process will use think-aloud and verbal probes to identify how participants
211 process and respond to items within the surveys [13]. There will be two groups of interviewees:
212 one group will review all mosquito modules (n=20), and one group will review all tick modules
213 (n=20). With the final target of the public residing in areas with mosquito and tick-borne disease
214 risk in mind, interviewees will be chosen to represent urban and rural areas and varying
215 educational levels. Interviewees with experience conducting qualitative research will ask each
216 survey question to the participant. After the interviewee answers the question, probing questions
217 will be asked to obtain feedback and allow participants to verbalize their thought processes.
218 Example probes will include, “can you explain what [key term] means in your own words?”, “I
219 noticed you hesitated, can you tell me more?”, “did you find this question easy to answer?” and
220 overall questions, “did you find any of these questions difficult to answer?”, “which questions
221 were hard to answer”. Items will be modified based on the feedback for improved clarity [10].

222

223 **Survey Administration**

224 Computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI) using an online survey tool will be conducted to
225 ensure that the surveys can collect data with minimum measurement errors and discriminate
226 between audiences who are knowledgeable and have good practices versus those who may not
227 [10]. In-person interviews will also be conducted (n=50) to delineate differences in how questions
228 should be asked during in-person interviews when online tools are not used. Scale items will be
229 evaluated with three sample groups that reflect and capture the range of the target population.
230 These groups are individuals involved in the control and prevention of VBDs (Group 1, n=75),
231 public health personnel not affiliated with VBD programs (Group 2, n=75), and the general public
232 (Group 3, n=800). English-speaking adults 18 and older will be eligible to participate, excluding

233 incarcerated individuals. It is anticipated that this will represent three levels of knowledge,
234 attitudes, and practices around VBDs, with Group 1 exhibiting the highest level of knowledge and
235 engagement in prevention activities, Group 2 having a moderate level of knowledge and
236 participation, and Group 3 having the least and most variable knowledge and participation.
237 Participants for Group 1 will be identified by extending invitations through collaborative networks
238 such as the American Mosquito Control Association, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
239 Centers of Excellence for Vector-borne Diseases and Regional Training and Evaluation Centers
240 (TECs) and other known networks. Group 2 will be recruited through public health organizations
241 such as National Association of County and City Health Officials (NACCHO), current author
242 connections with public health agencies. Snowball sampling will be conducted for both Group 1
243 and 2, whereby individuals can refer others who should take the survey at the end of their survey.
244 The investigative team will then invite those individuals. Group 3 will be recruited using a public
245 survey panel. As one of the goals is to assess how knowledge, attitudes, and practices differ based
246 on age, gender, residential area, and occupation recruitment, goals will be stratified by these
247 variables.

248

249 Sample sizes per group will be conservatively determined based on comparisons between Group
250 1 and Group 2 given these are more specialized populations with a much smaller target population
251 than the general population. We estimate that a meaningful difference in proportions is 20% or
252 more between the vector control population and those in general public health practice. Sample
253 size estimates for a one-sided difference in proportion (20% vs. 40%) with standard ($\alpha = 0.05$, $\beta =$
254 0.80) are 64 per group; this increases to 74 per group (30% vs. 50%). A wide range of differences
255 in proportion is anticipated given the survey will intentionally include more common and more

256 rare knowledge and practice items to facilitate discrimination between populations. The higher
257 sample size in Group 3 (general public) will allow internal comparisons among demographic sub-
258 groups including individuals from differing education and income levels.

259

260 **Analysis Plan**

261 Descriptive statistics will be computed for participant demographics including age, gender,
262 educational attainment, and residential setting (urban or rural). The levels of knowledge, attitudes,
263 and practices across demographic variables such as age groups, gender, occupation, and education
264 levels will be analyzed to identify vulnerable populations with limited understanding and
265 suboptimal practices. This analysis aims to detect statistically significant differences among these
266 groups (Groups 1, 2, and 3). Further analysis will be conducted as needed including Cronbach's
267 alpha to assess the reliability and factor analysis to refine the survey by removing items with low
268 loadings.

269

270 **Discussion**

271 This manuscript describes a protocol for the development of standardized VBD survey modules
272 that can be used throughout the US to generate data that are comparable across diverse regions.
273 Based on our literature review, VBD KAP surveys are widely used in the field, but they are
274 inconsistent in terms of structure and implementation. Two of the most pressing issues were
275 inconsistencies with the structure and wording of questions, and the reliability and validity of
276 questions. Among the reviewed surveys, the classification of knowledge, attitudes and practices
277 questions was not uniformly applied across all studies. For example, items listed in the practices
278 section of one survey were listed in the attitudes section of another survey, and vice versa. There

279 were also instances when different research teams were trying to obtain the same information,
280 but because their survey questions were asked differently, they were not comparable. Key areas
281 in which questions differed included:

- 282 • Use of dichotomous vs. Likert scales for frequency or intensity of actions, perceptions
283 and/or knowledge
- 284 • Time scales of reference (seasonal vs. past week vs. past year, vs. ever)
- 285 • Inclusion or exclusion of additional context in inquiring about actions (i.e. no context
286 vs. when you are outside vs. when you are being bitten by mosquitoes)
- 287 • Differences in pre-text – provision of additional information about the next questions
- 288 • Order of questioning, though many proceeded from knowledge to attitudes, to
289 practices
- 290 • Use of a behavioral theory as an underlying theoretical framework

291

292 Furthermore, it was often unclear how research teams developed their surveys because
293 references, theoretical frameworks, and sources for question derivation were not
294 provided. Findings differed based on how questions were asked and the answer choices that were
295 allocated, impeding the comparability of results across different surveys.

296

297 This protocol is designed to provide guidance for public health professionals and researchers in
298 the development of future KAP studies. By ensuring uniformity in KAP survey design and
299 structure across geographical regions, the current lack of comparability can be addressed.

300 Establishing a three-phase process that incorporates a comprehensive literature review, a
301 rigorous process for content validation, and testing for face validity, modular surveys can be

302 designed for broader dissemination and use. This is particularly important in areas where vectors
303 and/or pathogens are newly emerging so that patterns of disease transmission can be compared
304 across geographic regions. This will aid in the development and implementation of practical and
305 sustainable interventions to reduce the burden of disease. The surveys developed via this
306 protocol will be available for use by research teams that are interested in better understanding the
307 knowledge, attitudes, and practices of the general public regarding VBDs. This protocol process
308 does not include survey development for Spanish-speaking populations. However, after the
309 initial modules have been finalized, future development will expand to include these populations.

310

311 **Acknowledgments**

312 We wish to thank Joshua Arnbrister for his support during the early stages of this project.

313 **References**

- 314 1. Rosenberg R, Lindsey NP, Fischer M, Gregory CJ, Hinckley AF, Mead PS, et al.
315 Vital Signs: Trends in Reported Vectorborne Disease Cases - United States and
316 Territories, 2004-2016. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2018;67(17):496-501. Epub
317 20180504. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm6717e1. PubMed PMID: 29723166; PubMed
318 Central PMCID: PMC5933869.
- 319 2. Hayden MH, P.J. Schramm, C.B. Beard, J.E. Bell, A.S. Bernstein, A. Bieniek-
320 Tobasco, N. Cooley, M. Diuk-Wasser, Michael K. Dorsey, K.L. Ebi, K.C. Ernst, M.E.
321 Gorris, P.D. Howe, A.S. Khan, C. Lefthand-Begay, J. Maldonado, S. Saha, F. Shafiei, A.
322 Vaidyanathan, O.V. Wilhelmi, Crimmins, A.R., C.W. Avery, D.R. Easterling, K.E. Kunkel,
323 B.C. Stewart, and T.K. Maycock, Eds. *National Climate Assessment: Ch 15 Human*
324 *Health.* National Academies Press. 2023:1-470.
- 325 3. WHO. *A Guide to Developing Knowledge, Attitude and Practice Surveys.* 2008.
- 326 4. Macías Y, Glasauer P. *Guidelines for assessing nutrition-related Knowledge,*
327 *Attitudes and Practices.* Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. 2014.
- 328 5. Patel P. KAP Survey: Does It Really Measure Knowledge, Attitudes and
329 Practices? <https://njcmindiacom/indexphp/file>. 2022;13(5):271-3. doi:
330 <https://njcmindia.com/index.php/file/article/view/2063>.
- 331 6. Rosenstock I. Historical Origins of the Health Belief Model. *Health Education*
332 *Monographs.* 1974;2(4):328-35. doi: 10.1177/109019817400200403.
- 333 7. Mosler HJ. A systematic approach to behavior change interventions for the water
334 and sanitation sector in developing countries: a conceptual model, a review, and a
335 guideline. *Int J Environ Health Res.* 2012;22(5):431-49. Epub 20120131. doi:
336 10.1080/09603123.2011.650156. PubMed PMID: 22292899.
- 337 8. USAID. *The KAP Survey Model (Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices).* 2011.
- 338 9. Hinkin T. A Review of Scale Development Practices in the Study of
339 Organizations. *Journal of Management.* 1995;21(5):967-88. doi:
340 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0149-2063\(95\)90050-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0149-2063(95)90050-0).
- 341 10. Boateng GO, Neilands TB, Frongillo EA, Melgar-Quinonez HR, Young SL. Best
342 Practices for Developing and Validating Scales for Health, Social, and Behavioral
343 Research: A Primer. *Front Public Health.* 2018;6:149. Epub 20180611. doi:
344 10.3389/fpubh.2018.00149. PubMed PMID: 29942800; PubMed Central PMCID:
345 PMC6004510.
- 346 11. Streiner DL, Norman GR, Cairney J. *Health Measurement Scales: A practical*
347 *guide to their development and use.* Oxford Academic. 2014. doi:
348 <https://doi.org/10.1093/med/9780199685219.001.0001>.
- 349 12. Lawshe C. A Quantitative Approach to Content Validity. *Personnel Psychology.*
350 1975;28(4):563-75. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1975.tb01393.x>.
- 351 13. Willis GB, Artino AR. What Do Our Respondents Think We're Asking? Using
352 Cognitive Interviewing to Improve Medical Education Surveys. *Journal of Graduate*
353 *Medical Education.* 2024;5(3):353-6. doi: 10.4300/JGME-D-13-00154.1.


354

355 **S1 Appendix. Supplementary Table**

356 Supplementary Table. Search criteria used during the literature review.

| Theme | Search Terms |
|-------|---|
| | "KAP" OR "KAB" OR "KAPP" AND "west nile" OR "west nile virus OR dengue OR zika OR chikungunya OR malaria OR lyme OR "Rocky Mountain Spotted Fever" OR "Arbovirus Infections" OR Borrelia OR "Borrelia burgdorferi" OR "Powassan virus" OR "Rickettsiaceae Infections" OR "Tick-Borne Diseases" OR "saint louis ecephalitis" OR SLE OR "tickborne diseases" OR "mosquito-borne diseases" OR "vectorborne disease" OR VBD OR anaplasmosis OR "Powassan virus disease" OR ehrlichiosis OR babesiosis OR mosquitoborne OR vector-borne OR tick-borne OR mosquito-borne |

357



- Virtual workshop with experts (n=20-30)
- Literature review of existing surveys and educational materials
- 20 experts will provide feedback on the modules (2 rounds), content validity ratio will be calculated.
- Cognitive interview (n=40)
- Survey using computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI) (n=875)

Phase 1. Domain Identification and Item Generation

Phase 2. Measuring Content Validity through the Delphi

Phase 3.
Measuring Face Validity

- Virtual workshop with experts (n=20-30)
- Literature review of existing surveys and educational materials
- 20 experts will provide feedback on the modules (2 rounds), content validity ratio will be calculated.
- Cognitive interview (n=40)
- Survey using computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI) (n=875)