

Study on Admission Motivation and Institution Selection Intention of Elderly Residing in Long-Term Care Institutions

Yun-Jeong Kim¹, Boo Hwan Ahn², Kyong Ja Im²

¹Professor, Department of Health, Counseling and Welfare, Hanseo University, Republic of Korea,

²Doctor Course, Department of Elderly Welfare, Hanseo University, Republic of Korea

Abstract

Background/Objectives: The purpose of this study was to investigate the significant factors related to admission motivation and institution selection, in elderly residing in long-term elderly care institutions.

Methods/Statistical analysis: The study analyzed the data of 381 resident elderly among the data of ‘validation of long-term care institutions (institution salary) evaluation’ by Kim et al. The frequency analysis, t-test, oneway ANOVA, and multiple regression analysis were applied using SPSS21.0.

Findings: First, main determinants of institution admission were to review the children, including the son/daughter-in-law and daughter/son-in-law, rather than the individual or spouse, and the institution was determined taking into account the level and accessibility of the services as available for the elderly person requiring those services for care. Second, for institution admission motivation, it was found that the higher the ‘institution preference,’ the higher the institution recommendation intention and institution reselection intention. In other words, institution admission motivation was high in ‘family relations,’ but it was found that the present institution should have the ‘preference for institution’ as noted for the current institution, if it is to be recommended to another elderly person or is to be readmitted.

Improvements/Applications: The most important consideration of the service quality of the caregiver is the core of the operation of long-term elderly care institutions rather than the size, credibility and location of the institution.

Keywords: Long-term care institutions, Admission motivation, Institution recommendation intention, Institution reselection intention, Institution preference, Service quality

Introduction

As the elderly long-term care insurance system in Korea has been implemented for more than 10 years, the social endeavors to support the surge of elderly residing in long-term care institutions, the expansion of the day-care institution and the short-term care institution for deinstitutionization, and the rapid increase in community care are all different variables to be considered as these issues are being repeated.

In Korean culture, it is known that many elderly people prefer to live at home until death. This is because the meaning of ‘home’ for the elderly is its own domain, and it refers to the identity of the person ^[1] as a place to communicate with friends and neighbors. Therefore, the advent of institution admission due to the movement of the place of residence does not only mean the movement of the settlement, but also the interpersonal relationship which has been lived in the past, and also the separation with life. For this reason, there is still a negative perception of institution admission for an elderly person in society^[1]. Although socially long-term elderly care institutions are spreading, for the elderly, institution admission is a shame, and therefore resistance is high ^[2-5]. Above all, the elderly individuals are more likely to experience negative life circumstances

Corresponding Author:

Boo Hwan Ahn,

E-mail: daebart@daum.net

regarding their ability to care for themselves before institution admission. Migration from home to long-term elderly care institutions can be the most negative event experienced by the elderly [6-8].

Therefore, the purpose of the study is to analyze the minute details on why and who decided on the admission to which institution, the intentions to recommend the current institution to other elderly individuals who may require similar types of care, and the reasons for readmission if one had left and returned, even with the negative perception of elderly residence movement. The purpose of this study was to investigate factors related to admission motivation and institution selection in elderly residing in long-term elderly care institutions.

Method

1. Data

The data of resident elderly among the data of 'verification of effectiveness of long-term care institutions evaluation' by Kim et al., [9] was analyzed. In this case, after being recommended the elderly who can be surveyed from the institution, when the elderly allowed the questionnaire, the study conducted face-to-face questionnaires. Finally, the resulting data of 385 subjects were used for analysis.

2. Measurement Tools

Admission motivation : The admission motivation consisted of 8 items with reference to previous studies related to institution admission motivation. It was used in analysis through 3 sub-variables including family relations, need of care, and institution preference.

Institution selection intention and related factors : Institution selection intention was divided into institution recommendation intention and institution reselection intention. It was composed of a 3 point Likert scale with the 2 questions.

3. Characteristics of Subjects

In this study, the participants were noted that 71.7% were females and 28.3% were males, and the average age was 79.54 years old with most participants being 80 or older. There were generally no spouses (79.8% no spouses), 70.3% attended school, and 29.7% did not attend school.

4. Data Analysis Method

In this case, the frequency analysis, t-test, oneway ANOVA, and multiple regression analysis were applied using SPSS win 21.0.

Results

1.General Tendency of Variables

First, the institution admission determiner was found to be primarily determined as the responsibility of the son/daughter-in-law. When choosing an institution, they considered the level of service and the accessibility of the institution. In this instance, the service level was noted at 35.2%, and the institution accessibility was 35.0%. In the case of admission costs, it is unlikely that these factors will be taken into consideration, since the rates for long-term care institutions nationwide are similar in scope.

In these cases, according to institution use experience, 64.1% of people were in the first institution, and when transferred, they were transferred mainly from other nursing homes. Generally speaking, the reasons for the transfer seemed to be a preference for the new institution rather than the inconvenience of service or accessibility, and institution selection was somewhat different from the consideration.

In addition, 75.5% of the respondents answered that they would like to recommend admission to other elderly people, and that this is positive, and the reason is because the service is considered to be of good quality. Also, 76.2% of the respondents answered that there is an intention to return to the current institution and choose again, because the service is of good quality.

Next, the institution admission motivation was 4.209 for 'family relations', 3.220 for 'need for care,' and 3.437 for 'institution preference,' and it was found they chose the current institution as family members were close to where the institution was or through family recommendation.

2. Difference of Admission Motivation and Institution Selection Intention

Among the admission motivations, 'family relations' was significantly different according to age, marital status, and economic status of the elderly. That being said, the elderly in their 70s were choosing an institution for 'family relations' compared to elderly in their 60s,

and elderly people who were married rather than those who had divorced, widowed, or parted ways with their spouses, who were in general households selected institution because of ‘family relations.’ ‘Institution preference’ was significantly different according to gender and economic status of the elderly. In other words, elderly women compared to elderly men, and the elderly in the general household were more likely to adhere to the institution than a person considered to be in the category of welfare household elderly. However, the specific ‘need for care’ according to sociodemographic characteristics of resident elderly was not significant [Table 1].

In the case of institution recommendation intention in the selection of the institution, the difference according to the education level and economic condition of the elderly was considered to be shown as significant. The

institution recommendation intention of the elderly with education was higher than the institution recommendation intention of the elderly with no education, and for this reason the institution recommendation intention of the elderly in general households was higher than that of the elderly in welfare households. By way of explanation, the institution reselection intention in the selection of institution was significantly different according to the marital status and education level of the elderly. Taking this result into account, the institution reselection intention of the elderly with no spouse was higher than the institution reselection intention of the elderly with spouse, and the institution reselection intention of the elderly with education was higher than the institution reselection intention of the elderly without education [Table 2].

Table 1. Difference in motivation for facility entrance

Variables		Admission Motivation									
		Family relation			Need of care			Institution preference			
		M	S.D	t/F	M	S.D	t/F	M	S.D	t/F	
Sex	male	4.158	1.072	-.621	3.133	0.955	-.835	3.138	1.054	-2.744**	
	female	4.230	0.932		3.255	0.949		3.561	0.802		
Age	60'	3.848	1.016	6.950**	3.088	0.974	.189	3.098	1.229	1.477	
	70'	4.477	0.835		a	3.233		1.009	3.527		0.890
	over 80	4.117	1.010		ab	3.229		0.944	3.425		0.850
Marital status	married	4.399	0.597	2.564*	3.284	0.874	.527	3.289	0.874	.604	
	other	4.158	1.047		3.200	0.973		3.472	0.908		
Education level	No education	4.136	0.909	-.879	3.279	0.989	.580	3.267	0.825	-1.653	
	With education	4.238	0.998		3.194	0.935		3.502	0.924		
Economic status	Ordinary	4.411	0.820	6.211***	3.194	0.970	-.527	3.546	0.885	2.642**	
	Basic supply	3.582	1.139		3.268	0.915		3.181	0.896		

** p<.01, *** p<.001,

Table 2. Difference in intention to select facilities

<N=381>

		Intention to Select					
		Institution recommendation intention			Institution reselection intention		
		M	S.D	t/F	M	S.D	t/F
Sex	Male	2.673	.582	-1.290	2.730	.505	-.195
	female	2.756	.472		2.740	.454	
Age	60'	2.783	.422	.765	2.739	.449	.082
	70'	2.684	.536		2.723	.503	
	over 80	2.749	.501		2.744	.457	
Marital Status	married	2.747	.496	.277	2.737	.471	1.932*
	other	2.729	.509		2.827	.415	
Education level	No education	2.649	.566	-1.952*	2.720	.479	-2.800**
	With education	2.768	.475		2.631	.521	
Economic status	Ordinary family	2.779	.465	2.755**	2.788	.437	1.382
	Basic supply family	2.589	.598		2.762	.451	

* p<.05, ** p<.01

2. The Effects of Institution Admission Motivation of Resident Elderly on Institution Selection Intention

Particularly important in order to investigate the effect of resident elderly’s institutional admission motivation on institution recommendation intention and institution reselection intention, the study conducted a hierarchical regression analysis of institution recommendation intention and institution reselection intention using independent variables for stage 1 control variables (sociodemographic characteristics) and stage 2 admission motivation [Table 3, Table 4].

[Table 3] shows the results of the hierarchical regression with the dependent variable as the institution recommendation intention. In effect, the Model II was significant, but Model I with only control variables was shown to not be significant. The Durbin-Watson value was 1.639 and the independence of the residuals was secured. It is important to realize that the control variables accounted for 4.1% of institution recommendation intentions and admission motivation accounted for 12.1% of institution recommendation intentions, and a

total of 8 variables accounted for 16.2% of institution recommendation intentions of resident elderly. Of the 8 variables, only the influence of institution preference was considered to be significant, and institution recommendation intention was higher when admission was preferred.

[Table 4] shows the results of the hierarchical regression, with the dependent variable being the institution reselection intention. As a result, Model II was significant, but model I with only control variables was not significant. The Durbin-Watson value was 1.844 and the independence of the residuals was secured. However, to sum up the results, the control variables accounted for 4.5% of the institution recommendation intention, and admission motivation explained 4.9% of the institution recommendation intention, and a total of eight variables accounted for 9.4% of resident elderly’s institution reselection intention, and the model’s explanatory power seems to be low. Of the 8 variables, only the influence of institution preference was shown to be significant, and institution reselection intention was higher when admission was preferred.

Table 3 . The effect of entrance motivation on elderly resident’s facility recommend intention

Institution Recommendation Intention							
		Model I			Model II		
		B	Beta	t	B	Beta	t
Constant		2.434		6.014***	2.095		4.705***
Control variables	Sex (1=male)	-.083	-.080	-.896	.005	.005	.052
	age	.004	.064	.769	.004	.059	.737
	Presentation of spouse (1=yes)	.124	.106	1.193	.162	.139	1.641
	Education level (1=none)	-.169	-.165	-1.945*	-.093	-.091	-1.114
	Economic status (1=general home)	.066	.061	.766	.057	.052	.629
Admission motivation	Family relation	-.040			-.079	-.164	-1.598
	Need of care	-.081			-.944		
	Institution preference	.225 .434			4.647***		
		F =1.312 R2=.041			F =3.639** △R2 =.121 R2=.162		

p<.01, *p<.001

Table 4. The effect of entrance motivation on elderly resident’s reselection intention

		Institution Reselection Intention					
		Model I			Model II		
		B	Beta	t	B	Beta	t
Constant		2.459		5.635***	2.283		4.564***
Control variables	Sex (1=male)	-.111	-.099	-1.113	-.050	-.045	-.498
	age	.003	.041	.489	.002	.032	.383
	Presentation of spouse (1=yes)	.053	.042	.471	.081	.065	.734
	Education level (1=none)	-.139	-.125	-1.481	-.086	-.078	-.914
	Economic status (1=general home)	.167	.144	1.802	.176	.151	1.745
Admission motivation	Family relation	-.017			-.072	-.139	-1.303
	Need of care	-.032			-.363		
	Institution preference	.156 .278			2.860**		
		F =1.142 R2=.045			F =1.957** ΔR2 =.049 R2=.094		

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Discussion

Results First, the main determinants of institution admission were children, including the son/daughter-in-law and daughter/son-in-law, rather than from the individual or spouse, and the institution was determined taking into account the level and accessibility of the services for the elderly person requiring care. Most of the elderly are shown to be living in the institution that they currently reside in, and recommending the institution that they are living in to other elderly people has high intention and high intention to reselect. This implies that the satisfaction of the elderly residing in the institution is high, but on the other hand, it can be predicted that there is no alternative but to live in care facilities or formal elderly care institutions. In other words, if the admission determinant was ‘self’ rather than ‘children, daughter-in-law, and relative’s, it was shown that the adaptation was higher^[8], and if admission was made by the recommendation of a child or relatives, skepticism and self-esteem about life were low and psychological depression and anxiety was high^[10]. Considering this, the main determinants of institution admission are as determined from the elderly’s ‘children,’ and it is difficult to interpret the answer only positively that the elderly will recommend and reselect the institution in which they live. Therefore, active policies are needed

to improve the quality of life of elderly people who are going to live the rest of their days in an institution.

Second, in institution admission motivation, it was found that the higher the ‘institution preference,’ the higher the institution recommendation intention and institution reselection intention was measured in these cases. In other words, institution admission motivation is noted as being high in ‘family relations,’ but if the institution in which the resident is present recommends it to other elderly people, or if these individuals leave for some reason and then return, the ‘preference for institution’ for the current institution needs to be present. In addition, it is necessary to integrate the fact that perceptions related to service was the reason for institution selection, reason for institution recommendation intention, and noted as the reason for institution reselection intention in the previous analysis. The suitability between the type of service and the needs of the elderly will lead to institution preference, and will also be reselected and recommended to elderly people in similar situations.

Conclusion

Consequently, the most important consideration of the service quality of the caregiver is the core of the

operation of long-term elderly care institutions rather than the size, credibility and location of the institution. Under these circumstances, it is important to improve the quality of life of elderly people by improving the service quality, which is an important issue in the elderly welfare policy. At present, the core staff of the available service provision for the elderly patients is the care worker. In these cases, support for care workers may be one of the ways that can be reviewed to find new initiatives to improve service quality, and such support may include increasing the number of care workers per elderly person, and an effort to consider managing the improvement of labor conditions of care workers.

Ethical Clearance: Not required

Source of Funding: Self

Conflict of Interest: Nil

References

1. Heliker D, Scholler-Jaquish A. Transition of new residents to long-term care: basing practice on residents' perspective. *Journal of Gerontological Nursing*. 2006 Sep;32(9):34-32.
2. Lee GE. A Grounded Theory Approach to the Adjustment Process of the Institutionalized Elderly : The Control of Reluctance. *Journal of Korean Academy of Nursing*. 2002; 32(5):624-632.
3. Chenitz WC. Entry into a nursing home as status passage : A theory to guide nursing home practice. *Geriatric Nursing*. 1983 Mar-Apr. ;4(2):92-97
4. Morton A. Leiberman, Sheldon S. Tobin. *The experience of old age : stress, coping and survival*. New York : Basic Books. 1983. Available from :<https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000315388>
5. Manion PS, Rantz MJ. Relocation Stress Syndrome: A Comprehensive Plan for long-term care admissions. *Geriatric Nursing*. 1995 May-Jun;16(3):108-112. Available from : <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0197457205800394>
6. Mirotznik J, Kamp LL. Cognitive status and relocation stress: a test of the vulnerability hypothesis. *The Gerontologist*. 2000 Oct;40(5):531-539.
7. Lee D, Woo J, Mackenzie A. A review of older People's experiences with residential care placement *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 2002 Jan; 37(1):19-27. Available from : <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2002.02060.x>
8. Jung KH, Jo HS. Factors affecting adaptation for elders in Long-term care facilities. *The Journal of the Korea Contents Association*. 2012 Nov; 12(11):215-224. Available from : <https://doi.org/10.5392/JKCA.2012.12.11.215>
9. Kim YJ, Kim YJ, Lee SJ. Verification of effectiveness of evaluation of long-term care institution. *Journal of The Convergent Society Among Humanities, Sociology, Science, and Technology*. 2019 9(5):781-791. Available from : <http://www.riss.kr/link?id=A106221641>
10. Hong GH, Kang GW, Park JH. A Phenomenological Analysis of mild Dementia Elderly's adjustment to Nursing Facility in L.A and Decision Makers. *Journal of Korean Society of Gerontological Social Welfare*. 2017 72(3):371-394. Available from : <http://kmbase.medric.or.kr/KMID/1023720170720030371>.