RUSH UNIVERSITY

Background

- Interpersonal relationships (family, friends, co-workers, strangers, etc.) assist to build one's confidence and maintain physical, mental and psychological wellness.
- Factors such as: less social support, smaller social networks, and negative social interactions have been linked to depression, poorer immune functioning, lower self-rated health,
- increase incidence of disease, and higher mortality • Loneliness does not discriminate against age, race, economical status, etc.
 - Strong association between stress due to loneliness and sleep problems
- Increased elderly population \geq 65 years old and higher life expectancy
 - From technology and research
 - Mental and psychological health needs improvement
- Social isolation could be more noticeable in elderly hospitalized for long periods of time
- Social interactions may decrease or be limited
- COVID 19 associated deaths worldwide are among the highest in long-term care (LTC) residents

Purpose

To prospectively evaluate changes of loneliness, sleep quality, and quality of life in elderly in-patients (\geq 65 years) admitted to a skilled care unit

Methods

Setting

• A skilled care unit at a midwestern Magnet® recognized hospital

Sample/Participants

Inclusion criteria:

- 65 years old and older
- Admitted to skilled care unit
- Able to read and write in English
- Exclusion criteria:
- Discharge within three days of admission to the skilled care unit Patients with dementia

Non-verbal

- Instruments/Measures
- PSQI
- Self-report questionnaire that assesses sleep quality over a 1month time interval. The measure consists of 19 individual items, creating 7 components that produce one global score, and takes 5-10 minutes to complete.

UCLA Loneliness scale (version 3)

- A 20-item scale designed to measure one's subjective feelings of loneliness as well as feelings of social isolation using a 4point rating scale (1=never; 2=rarely; 3=sometimes; 4=always)
- QLI scale version 3,
- Measures quality of life, defined as "a person's sense of wellbeing that stems from satisfaction and importance regarding various aspects of life. The QLI produces five scores: quality of life overall, health and functioning, psychological/spiritual, social and economic, and family.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: Center for Clinical Research and Scholarship at Rush University Medical Center; Rush Nurse Research Fellowship program; Hugh Vondracek MSc, ØBK

Examining Loneliness, Sleep, and Quality of Life in Elderly Hospitalized Patients Requiring Skilled Care Through the Lens of COVID-19 Hector D. Castillo BSN, RN; Mary Heitschmidt PhD, APRN, CCRN-K, FAHA; Louis Fogg PhD

Methods, contd. Procedures Study initiated February 2020 and completed August 2020 March 12th, 2020: full state lockdown and no-visitor restrictions enacted Subjects completed a demographic survey, the Pittsburg Sleep Quality Index (PSQI), UCLA Loneliness scale (version 3), Ferrans and Powers Quality of Life Index (QLI) Nursing Home version III at admission and once a week until discharge. Analysis Descriptive statistics and repeated measures ANOVA (SPSS for windows version 16) were used to determine effect sizes, Cohen D, at baseline and weekly until discharge with the level of significance p < 0.05 for all analyses Results **Demographics (n=12)** n (%) Age, M (SD) 77 (1.3) 26 Length of stay in days, M Sex Female 10 (84) Marital Status 5 (42) Married 3 (26 Widowed Single 2 (16) Divorced 2 (16 Level of Education 10 (84) College High School 2 (16) Race 10 (84) White African American 2 (16) Sleep patterns during admission 6 (50) Sleep Aids Non-Sleep Aids 6 (50) Mobility Ambulatory 9 (75) Bed-ridden 3 (25) Weight on admission 9 (75) Normal-range Obese 3 (25) Family Support 9 (75) Present Not Present 3 (25) Subjects enrolled during COVID restrictions 9 (75)

86 patients who qualified were invited to join the study and 12 patients agreed to participate and signed consent

 Lockdown and the unknown about COVID 19 affected my recruitment process

• All subjects completed follow-up during the no-visitor restrictions placed due to the pandemic

Results, contd.

indential information i			
	to baseline (SD)		
	0.000 (0.440)		
			Participant Conditions with S
	0.671 (6.364)		
	0.000 (-1.044)		
	· · · · ·		
	0.000 (-1.128)		
			C .
otal 3 (n=9)			
otal 4 (n=4)	0.193 (65.619)		
otal 5 (n=2)	- 0.020 (46.31549)		
ealth & Function 2 (n=12)	0.184 (80.060)		
ealth & Function 3 (n=9)	0.150 (58.873)		
ealth & Function 4 (n=4)	0.724 (20.7605)		
ealth and Function5 (n=2)	0.581 (12.3744)		
ocioeconomic 2 (n=12)	0.304 (21.684)		
ocioeconomic 3 (n=9)	0.025 (35.318)		
ocioeconomic 4 (n=4)	-0250 (20.543)		
ocioeconomic 5 (n=2)	-0.059 (29.6985)		
sych/Spiritual 2 (n=12)	0.400 (28.733)		PSych/Spiniuarz
sych/Spiritual 3 (n=9)	0.095 (39.7815)		The everell improvement in
sych/Spiritual 4 (n=4)	0.172 (17.4475)	•	
sych/Spiritual 5 (n=2)	-0.589 (10.253)	was a $d=.184$. For the loneliness scale	
amily 2 (n=12)	0.007 (15.401)	the week 1-2 effect was very small and this was similar for the PSQI	
	-0.687 (14.537)		
	-0.784 (18.414)		
amily 5 (n=2)	-0.634 (18.7383)		
	Condition (Items) UCLA scale Deliness (Week 2) $(n=12)$ Deliness (Week 3) $(n=9)$ Deliness (Week 4) $(n=4)$ Deliness (Week 5) $(n=2)$ Ieep Quality Index waking up early or in the hiddle of the night $(n=12)$ bathroom $(n=12)$ too cold $(n=12)$ pain $(n=12)$ too cold $(n=12)$ pain $(n=12)$ too cold $(n=12)$ pain $(n=2)$ cold 2 $(n=12)$ Datal 3 $(n=9)$ Datal 4 $(n=4)$ Datal 5 $(n=2)$ ealth & Function 2 $(n=12)$ ealth & Function 3 $(n=9)$ ealth & Function 4 $(n=4)$ ealth and Function5 $(n=2)$ ocioeconomic 3 $(n=9)$ ocioeconomic 3 $(n=9)$ ocioeconomic 5 $(n=2)$ sych/Spiritual 2 $(n=12)$ asych/Spiritual 5 $(n=2)$ amily 2 $(n=12)$ amily 3 $(n=9)$ amily 4 $(n=4)$	UCLA scaleoneliness (Week 2) (n=12) $0.020 (8.419)$ oneliness (Week 3) (n=9) $-0.054 (8.514)$ oneliness (Week 4) (n=4) $-0.367 (6.481)$ oneliness (Week 5) (n=2) $0.671 (6.364)$ leep Quality Index $0.000 (-1.044)$ waking up early or in the hiddle of the night (n=12) $0.000 (-1.044)$ bathroom (n=12) $0.000 (-1.044)$ too cold (n=12) $0.000 (-1.243)$ pain (n=12) $0.000 (-1.128)$.ife Index $0.000 (-1.128)$ tife Index $0.000 (-1.128)$ tife Index $0.000 (-1.128)$ tife Index $0.000 (-1.128)$ tal 2 (n=12) $0.283 (121.681)$ otal 3 (n=9) $0.028 (104.3609)$ otal 4 (n=4) $0.193 (65.619)$ otal 5 (n=2) $-0.020 (46.31549)$ ealth & Function 2 (n=12) $0.184 (80.060)$ ealth & Function 3 (n=9) $0.150 (58.873)$ ealth & Function 4 (n=4) $0.724 (20.7605)$ ealth and Function5 (n=2) $0.034 (21.684)$ ocioeconomic 3 (n=9) $0.025 (35.318)$ ocioeconomic 3 (n=9) $0.025 (35.318)$ ocioeconomic 5 (n=2) $-0.059 (29.6985)$ sych/Spiritual 3 (n=9) $0.095 (39.7815)$ sych/Spiritual 3 (n=9) $0.095 (39.7815)$ sych/Spiritual 5 (n=2) $-0.589 (10.253)$ amily 2 (n=12) $0.007 (15.401)$ amily 3 (n=9) $-0.687 (14.537)$ amily 4 (n=4) $-0.784 (18.414)$	Effect sizes compared to baseline (SD)UCLA scaleOneliness (Week 2) (n=12) 0.020 (8.419)oneliness (Week 3) (n=3) -0.054 (8.514)oneliness (Week 5) (n=2) 0.071 (6.364)Ieep Quality Index 0.000 (-1.044)waking up early or in the iddle of the night (n=12) 0.000 (-1.044)bathroom (n=12) 0.000 (-1.128)jife Index 0.000 (-1.128)ife Index 0.000 (-1.128)jife Index 0.000 (-1.128)jife Index 0.028 (104.3609)total 2 (n=12) 0.283 (121.681)total 3 (n=9) 0.028 (104.3609)total 5 (n=2) 0.020 (46.31549)eatth & Function 2 (n=12) 0.184 (80.060)eatth & Function 3 (n=9) 0.025 (35.318)ocioeconomic 2 (n=12) 0.304 (21.684)ocioeconomic 4 (n=4) 0.724 (20.7605)eatth & Function 5 (n=2) 0.059 (29.6985)sych/Spiritual 2 (n=12) 0.400 (28.733)ocioeconomic 4 (n=4) 0.172 (17.4475)ocioeconomic 4 (n=4) 0.172 (17.4475)ocioeconomic 5 (n=2) 0.095 (39.7815)sych/Spiritual 5 (n=2) 0.007 (15.401)amily 2 (n=12) 0.007 (14.537)amily 4 (n=4) -0.784 (18.414)

• Improvements from baseline to week 2 were consistently positive for the QLI and ranged from small (d=.2), to medium (d=.5)

Discussion

- Healthy social relationships are important for maintaining mental and physical health in later life.
- of personal touch from families and friends
- Opportunities to decrease loneliness, improve sleep habits, and quality of life were identified
- this population
- Results from this study used to inform future interventional research aimed at decreasing loneliness for older patients requiring skilled care.



Loneliness and stressful feelings among this elderly population was noticeable and may be due to the lack

• Providers should consider objective assessment for loneliness, sleep, and QOL to promote optimal care for