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Introduction

Psychosocial preferences (e.g., type and amount of social contact, activities, control and independence, caregiver characteristics, and routines) make up the quality of daily life but are not assessed systematically or comprehensively in long-term care. This project builds upon the development of the Preference for Everyday Living Inventory (PELI) with cognitively intact community elders. The PELI includes 55 items that relate to the preference domains: Caregivers and Care (10 items), Instrumental Activities (10 items), Growth Activities (14 items), Social Dominion (16 items), and Social Contact (10 Items).

This poster presents the results of three separate pilot studies examining psychosocial preferences. The aim of the first study was to examine the feasibility of using the PELI with cognitively intact community elders. The second study examined the content validity of the PELI from the perspective of long-term care experts. The aim of the third study was to extend the assessment of the PELI to include satisfaction with personal preference identification in the NH context.

Methods

Preference Identification Study

- The PELI was piloted on 29 residents with mild to moderate dementia in a single nursing home (NH)
- Research assistants interviewed residents using the PELI
- Participant profiles were generated and provided to residents in follow-up focus interviews and nursing home staff in focus groups.

Preference Identification Sample (N=23 NH residents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>High Score</th>
<th>Mean (sd)</th>
<th>Low Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>24.96 (3.56)</td>
<td>12.17 (1.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.96 (3.56)</td>
<td>12.17 (1.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>24.96 (3.56)</td>
<td>12.17 (1.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (yrs) (Range: 52-100)</td>
<td>24.96 (3.56)</td>
<td>12.17 (1.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>24.96 (3.56)</td>
<td>12.17 (1.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>24.96 (3.56)</td>
<td>12.17 (1.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preference Fulfillment Study

- Examined level of preference fulfillment in a new sample of 23 nursing home residents with and without cognitive impairment in a suburban NH in Philadelphia, PA and in a Western NY VA Community Living Center.
- Research assistants at both sites interviewed residents using a PELI modified to include a rating of satisfaction with preference fulfillment over the past two weeks.

Preference Fulfillment Sample (N=23 NH residents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>High Score</th>
<th>Mean (sd)</th>
<th>Low Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>24.96 (3.56)</td>
<td>12.17 (1.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.96 (3.56)</td>
<td>12.17 (1.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>24.96 (3.56)</td>
<td>12.17 (1.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (yrs) (Range: 71-100)</td>
<td>24.96 (3.56)</td>
<td>12.17 (1.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>24.96 (3.56)</td>
<td>12.17 (1.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>24.96 (3.56)</td>
<td>12.17 (1.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content Validity Study

Resident preference responses appear to be shaped by...

- Need to belong to the NH
- Feeling of safety
- Statement of confidence in profile (friend, clinician)
- "That’s pretty much me"
- "My life is an open book"

Staff Reactions to resident preference profiles

- Regarding Administration: Who will give it to the NH? What if the NH can’t answer the question?
- Can family members access the data as proxies for NH?
- What happens if if changes both by NH?
- How will this information get communicated to staff other disciplines, or other NHs?
- Who will take responsibility for fulfilling these preferences?
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Pref Fulfillment Study (cont)

Content Validity Study (cont)

- Established beyond the 0.05 level of significance when a proportion of experts agreed only those preferences that a NH resident reported as strongly held preferences.
- Established beyond the .05 level of significance when a proportion of experts agreed on the strongly endorsed "2" (Likes A Lot) minus preference fulfillment of "2" for all item (appearance is very important here)
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- NH residents with and without cognitive impairment can report their personal preferences using the PELI
- Preference profiles are face valid and provide useful information about individual preferences
- Experts rate the PELI as relevant to the NH setting
- NH residents have a wide range in number of strongly held preferences
- Over 75 percent of strongly held preferences are reported to be somewhat to mostly satisfied
- PELI is a promising tool for comprehensive & robust assessment of personal preference identification
- Future work is needed to examine feasibility, reliability, and application of personal preferences to guide person-centered intervention and quality improvement efforts.

Conclusion

- Further study is needed to examine preference fulfillment results by long-term care setting.