Nursing home residents' ADL status, institution-dwelling and association with outdoor activity: a cross-sectional study

Anne Marie Sandvoll [Corresp., 1] , **Ellen Karine Grov** [2] , **Morten Simonsen** [3]

[1] Department of health and caring sciences, Western Norway University of Applied Sciences, Førde, Norway

[2] Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of nursing and health promotion, Oslo Metropolitan University, Oslo, Norway

[3] Department of Environmental Sciences, Western Norway University of Applied Sciences, Sogndal, Norway

Corresponding Author: Anne Marie Sandvoll
Email address: annemsa@hvl.no

Introduction. The Norwegian regulations for nursing homes consider access to meaningful activities to be an indicator for the quality of nursing homes. Activities of daily living (ADL) provide important basic self-care skills for nursing home residents. Due to the physical changes caused by ageing and comorbidities, nursing home residents may experience functional decline over time, which may affect their ability to perform meaningful ADL, such as outdoor activity, which is considered a valuable and meaningful activity in Norwegian culture. This study aimed to investigate the association between ADL status, institution-dwelling and outdoor activity among nursing home residents.

Methods. This cross-sectional study included 784 residents aged >67 years living in 21 nursing homes in 15 Norwegian municipalities between November 2016 and May 2018. The Barthel Index was used to assess the nursing home residents' ADL status. Other variables collected were age, gender, body weight and height, visits per month, institution, ward, and participation in weekly outdoor activities. Descriptive statistics were used to provide an overview of the residents' characteristics. A Poisson regression model was used to test the association between the outdoor activity level as the dependent variable and ADL score, institution, and other control variables as independent variables.

Results. More than half (57%) of the nursing home residents in this sample did not go outdoors. More than 50% of the residents had an ADL score <10, which indicates low performance status. Further, we found that residents' ADL status, institution, ward, and number of visits had an impact on how often the residents went outdoors.

Discussion. The nursing home residents in this study rarely went outdoors, which is interesting because Norwegians appreciate this activity. Differences in the number of visits might explain why some residents went outdoors more often than other residents did. Our findings also highlight that the institutions impact the outdoor activity. How the institutions are organized and how important this activity is considered to be in the institutions determine how often the activity is performed.

Conclusion. The low frequency of the outdoor activities might be explained by a low ADL score. More than 50% of the residents had an ADL score <10, which indicates low performance status. Despite regulations for nursing home quality in Norway, this result suggests that organizational differences matter, which is an important implication for further research, health policy and practice.

1 **Nursing home residents' ADL status, institution-**

2 **dwelling and association with outdoor activity: a**

3 **cross-sectional study**

4 Anne Marie Sandvoll[1]   Ellen Karine Grov[2]   Morten Simonsen[3]

[1] Assosiate Professor, Department of health and caring sciences, Western University of Applied Sciences, Førde, Norway

[2] Professor, Department of nursing and health promotion, Faculty of Health Sciences, Oslo Metropolitan University, Oslo, Norway

[3] Assosiate Professor, Department of Enviromental Sciences, Western University of Applied Sciences, Sogndal, Norway

Corresponding author:
Anne Marie Sandvoll, Western University of Applied Sciences, P.O.Box 523, 6803 Førde, Noway
Email: annemsa@hvl.no

ABSTRACT

Introduction. The Norwegian regulations for nursing homes consider access to meaningful activities to be an indicator for the quality of nursing homes. Activities of daily living (ADL) provide important basic self-care skills for nursing home residents. Due to the physical changes caused by ageing and comorbidities, nursing home residents may experience functional decline over time, which may affect their ability to perform meaningful ADL, such as outdoor activity, which is considered a valuable and meaningful activity in Norwegian culture. This study aimed to investigate the association between ADL status, institution-dwelling and outdoor activity among nursing home residents.

Methods. This cross-sectional study included 784 residents aged >67 years living in 21 nursing homes in 15 Norwegian municipalities between November 2016 and May 2018. The Barthel Index was used to assess the nursing home residents' ADL status. Other variables collected were age, gender, body weight and height, visits per month, institution, ward, and participation in weekly outdoor activities. Descriptive statistics were used to provide an overview of the residents' characteristics. A Poisson regression model was used to test the association between the outdoor activity level as the dependent variable and ADL score, institution, and other control variables as independent variables.

Results. More than half (57%) of the nursing home residents in this sample did not go outdoors. More than 50% of the residents had an ADL score <10, which indicates low performance status. Further, we found that residents' ADL status, institution, ward, and number of visits had an impact on how often the residents went outdoors.

Discussion. The nursing home residents in this study rarely went outdoors, which is interesting because Norwegians appreciate this activity. Differences in the number of visits might explain why some residents went outdoors more often than other residents did. Our findings also highlight that the institutions impact the outdoor activity. How the institutions are organized and how important this activity is considered to be in the institutions determine how often the activity is performed.

Conclusion. The low frequency of the outdoor activities might be explained by a low ADL score. More than 50% of the residents had an ADL score <10, which indicates low performance status. Despite regulations for nursing home quality in Norway, this result suggests that

42   organizational differences matter, which is an important implication for further research, health

43   policy and practice.

Introduction

46 Norway is an example of the Nordic welfare model and its welfare state is characterized by

47 public funding and service provision (Esping-Andersen et al. 2002). Norwegian nursing homes

48 are publicly financed, and the municipalities are responsible for providing this service. Access to

49 meaningful activities is a reference for the quality of nursing homes as highlighted in Norwegian

50 regulations for nursing homes (Forskr kvalitet i pleie- og omsorgstjenestene 2003). This

51 regulation, with its specific recommendations, can be used as an indicator to assess the quality of

52 care in nursing homes (Kirkevold & Engedal 2006). The regulations require the municipalities to

53 ensure that each resident is offered varied and customised activities in line with other

54 fundamentals of care (Forskr kvalitet i pleie- og omsorgstjenestene 2003).

55   The availability of activities for nursing home residents may contribute to their well-being and

56 dignity (Björk et al. 2017; Lampinen et al. 2006b; Slettebø et al. 2016). By contrast, according to

57 Nåden et al. (2013), the lack of participation in activities in nursing homes may be explained by

58 the residents' physical impairments, e.g., some residents need to use wheelchairs. Up to 80% of

59 nursing home residents experience cognitive impairment (Selbaek et al. 2007), which may also

60 limit their ability to participate in activities such as playing cards, bingo and reading groups

61 (Strøm et al. 2016).

62   The outdoor lifestyle traditionally holds a prominent position in Norwegian culture (Gurholt

63 & Broch 2019) and is considered as a valuable and meaningful activity. Unfortunately, recent

64 inspections undertaken by the authorities in nursing homes in Norway show a lack of activity

65 offerings (Helsetilsynet 2018a; Helsetilsynet 2018b; Helsetilsynet 2018c). The limited activity

66 options indicate that the government's current policy and new regulations to increase the level of

67 activities in Norwegian nursing homes have not yet succeeded (Helsetilsynet 2018a; Kjøs &

68 Havig 2016; Sandvoll et al. 2020; Sandvoll et al. 2012).

69   Despite the new regulations, changing nursing home practices is difficult (Sandvoll et al.

70 2012). According to Palacios-Cena et al. (2015), nursing homes should strive to develop

71 meaningful activities for residents to occupy their time and to provide residents with a

72 meaningful sense of purpose. However, low levels of activities of daily living (ADL) among the

73 residents can affect their ability to participate in activities (Bürge et al. 2012). ADL are an

74 important basic self-care skill for the general population as well as for nursing home residents.

75 Because of physical changes associated with ageing and comorbidities, nursing home residents

76 may experience functional decline over time (Drageset et al. 2011; Liu et al. 2015). Reduced

77 ADL status may impair the ability to perform activities and can impact quality of life, social

78 contact and loneliness (Liu et al. 2014b).

79   Physical activity, rehabilitation or exercise may improve independence and prevent the

80 decline in ADL in elderly residents in long-term care facilities (Bürge et al. 2012; Crocker et al.

81 2013; Liu et al. 2014b). It is unclear which interventions are most appropriate for slowing the

82 decline in ADL (Crocker et al. 2013), but it has been suggested that health professionals should

83 promote physical activities with the aim of improving ADL performance among older adults

84 (Bürge et al. 2012). The loss of ADL independence is the strongest predictor of the need for

85 institutionalization of the elderly (Gaugler et al. 2007).

86   Several factors might influence nursing home residents' ADL status. Previous research has

87 investigated the importance of ADL related to different aspects, such as loneliness, less

88 participation in activities and depression. (Drageset 2004) has shown that dependence in ADL

89 status is associated with a high level of social loneliness. (Drageset et al. 2011) later showed that

90 greater dependence in ADL was associated with more symptoms of depression. Poor balance,

91 incontinence, impaired cognition, low body mass index (BMI), impaired vision, no daily contact

92 with proxies, impaired hearing and the presence of depression were significant risk factors for

93 nursing home residents who experienced a decline in ADL status (Bürge et al. 2012).

94   Few studies have focused on the relationships between ADL status and participation in

95 different activities among nursing home residents. One study investigated physical and social

96 aspects of residents' mobility level and reported that nursing home residents dependent on a

97 wheelchair or elevator during care were less involved in physical and social activities compared

98 with more-mobile residents (Kjøs & Havig 2016). This study suggests that reduced mobility

99 might influence participation in different activities offered in the nursing homes. The need for

100 activities and engagement in nursing home residents is well known (Björk et al. 2017; Kjøs &

101 Havig 2016; Lampinen et al. 2006a; Palacios-Ceña et al. 2015; Theurer et al. 2015). More

102 research is needed on residents' ADL status and its relationship with participation in different

103 activities, such as going outdoors.

104   Despite Norwegian regulations (Forskr kvalitet i pleie- og omsorgstjenestene 2003), the

105 frequency and content of activities are very much up to each nursing home. Previous studies

106 have shown differences between privately owned and government-owned facilities (Liu et al.

107   2014a). Furthermore, previous studies have shown variations in practice regarding activities in

108   Norwegian nursing homes (Isaksen et al. 2018). To the best of our knowledge, however, little is

109   known on differences between institutions regarding their outdoor activities.

110   The aim of this study was to investigate the association between nursing home residents ADL

111   status, institution-dwelling and outdoor activity. The following research question was

112   formulated: *To what extent are nursing home residents' ADL status and the institution they live*

113   *in associated with outdoor activity?*

Methods

115   A cross-sectional design was used.

Setting

117   The data were collected by first-year nursing students during their placement in nursing homes

118   between November 2016 and May 2018. The placement was either during the autumn semester,

119   i.e., 8 weeks from the middle of October until the middle of December, or 8 weeks during the

120   spring semester, from the middle of April until the middle of June. The data were collected

121   during the daytime by means of a study manual, which the students had been presented in

122   lectures at the university. For standardized instruments and questionnaires, we used the

123   connected manual, procedure or protocol. The process of data collection was supervised by the

124   university teacher and the nurses working at the different nursing homes. Each patient was

125   registered once.

126   Our responses were collected from 21 different nursing homes. These institutions differ

127   because they have different combinations of ward types and may have different attitudes towards

128   outdoor activity. All nursing homes in this study except for one are financed and operated by the

129   municipality. The single private nursing home is not run by a commercial actor, but by the parish

130   associated with the Bergen Cathedral in Bergen, the second largest city and municipality in

131   Norway. Nursing homes all share the same national financing system.

132

Participants

134   The study included 784 residents aged >67 years living in 21 nursing homes in 15 Norwegian

135   municipalities. The inclusion criteria were all residents aged >67 years living in the selected

136   nursing homes, while the exclusion criteria were residents receiving palliative care, related to

137   ethical considerations, to protect them from harm related to the completion of questionnaires in

138   their presence. In addition, residents in the palliative phase may be unable to take part in the

139   outdoor activities described in this paper. Five of the nursing homes were located in rural areas,

140   while others were located in small villages. The nursing homes were not selected completely at

141   random because the selection was partially determined by what nursing homes the nursing

142   students attended during their practice period.

143

144   **Variables**

145   We expected increasing levels of outdoor activities, e.g., making trips outside the nursing home,

146   with increasing *ADL score* because ADL is a measurement of physical capability (higher scores

147   mean better capabilities).We observed the residents by using the method described in the Barthel

148   Index for measuring performance in ADL, as translated and revised by Saltvedt et al. (2008).

149   Each performance item is rated on this scale with a given number of points assigned to each

150   level, related to how dependent or independent the resident is, with maximum of 20 points (20 =

151   totally dependent). The Barthel Index is a standardized, validated and psychometric-tested

152   instrument widely used in the context of elderly care (Liu et al. 2015; Mahoney & Barthel 1965).

153   *Outdoor activity* is the dependent variable in our analysis. In this study, the residents either

154   walked on their own or with assistance from staff or visitors. Some residents went outdoors with

155   a walker or in a wheelchair. Some of the residents had an electric wheelchair and went outside on

156   their own. However, the purpose was still the same: outdoor activity. The level of this activity

157   was measured and documented as the number of times the activity was performed during a week.

158   Further, we introduce *nursing homes* as random effects to allow for the fact that not all types of

159   nursing homes are included. These effects will tell us whether activity levels vary between

160   institutions. We included a dummy variable for residing in a short-term/rehabilitation ward and

161   one for residing in a dementia ward. Long-term ward residents are expected to be older, frailer

162   and in need of more care; thus, we expected these residents to have the lowest levels of making

163   trips outside the nursing home.

164   The *number of visits* (per week) is interpreted as a proxy for less social isolation (Drageset

165   2004). We expected that more visits would lead to higher levels of outdoor activities. More visits

166   may also mean that relatives engage in this activity, which increases the level of ADL.

167 Further, we expected decreasing levels of activity with increasing *age* (Feng et al. 2017).

168 The gender dummy variable was coded as 1 for men and 0 for women. We had no specific

169 expectations for a gender effect on making trips outside the nursing home.

170   *BMI* is an indication of the general health condition. A low BMI indicates that residents are

171 not eating enough (or that they fail to maintain their body weight). We expected that low BMI

172 would be associated with fewer trips outside the nursing home.

173   All variables were registered in a form and documented in Excel version 16.16.19 (Microsoft,

174 Redmond, WA, USA).

175

176 **Bias**

177 There are some limitations in using this approach. The sample is not completely randomized

178 since the nursing homes were not selected at random, neither were the residents in the nursing

179 homes. The students may also understand the concept differently or they did not apply it

180 consistently. However, a detailed protocol was provided to the students so that their observations

181 were made consistently. For instance, what date format should be used, and age and length of

182 stay should be integer numbers. We could not eliminate ambivalence in the data collection

183 completely.

184 **Statistical methods**

185   Descriptive statistics were used to give an overview of the demographic and clinical

186 characteristics of the participants, including age, gender, BMI, ADL status, institution and the

187 prevalence of residents' outdoor activities. We sorted the informants into different groups

188 according to the quartiles from the distribution of ADL scores. We then analysed the levels of

189 the outdoor activities between these groups. To further examine the association between ADL

190 score and outdoor activity, we included age, BMI, gender, visits per month, type of ward and

191 ADL score as well as institutions in a multivariate Poisson regression model. The data were

192 analysed using the SAS GLIMMIX procedure with a Poisson log-link function. The two-sided

193 significance level was set to 0.05.

194   We designed a model with outdoor activity as the dependent variable and ADL status as an

195 explanatory variable affecting the level of this activity. In addition, we controlled for several

196 other explanatory variables that may have an influence on both activity level and ADL scores,

197   thereby eliminating possible spurious factors. We also included institutions as an independent

198   variable, assuming they are random effects, which allows the coefficients to vary between

199   institutions.

200   We assume that institutions (nursing homes) represent several unmeasured characteristics that

201   vary between them. These characteristics may be different service quality, different

202   organizations, different informal routines established among staff, different efficiency in using

203   resources, or different resident characteristics. These characteristics are not measured and

204   probably cannot be measured. Institutions are clusters therefore we include them as random

205   effects in the regression model to account for these variations. On the other hand, the impacts of

206   different ward types are fixed effects since ward types have the same definition for all nursing

207   homes and therefore do not measure any latent characteristics. The model is estimated as random

208   intercept model, each institution has an individual- specific random effect in addition to the fixed

209   effects of all other independent variables (SAS Institute 2019). A mixed model with both fixed

210   and random effects that is designed to capture variations between clusters is called a conditional

211   model (Muff et al. 2016).

212   The model allowed us to control for other regressors when assessing the effect of ADL score

213   or institutions on outdoor activity. Thus, we could compare activity level between residents in

214   the same ward and with the same age, gender, number of visits per month and BMI, but with

215   different ADL scores in different institutions.

216   Clustering occurs when entities are distributed on several levels. When this is the case, error

217   terms within a cluster will not be independently distributed of error terms in another cluster

218   (Trutschel et al. 2017). In our design, this means that error terms between nursing homes will be

219   biased if they are not accounted for in the regression model. We have already considered

220   different ward types because the chance of a resident performing the activity may be affected by

221   the ward type in which the resident lives. Nursing homes (institutions) and ward types are two

222   cluster types; therefore, we should also consider differences between nursing homes in the

223   regression model.

224

225   The table A1 (appendix A) shows the goodness-of-fit values for the regression model with

226   trips outside the nursing home in the preceding week as the dependent variable. The dispersion

227   criteria χ^2/df has a value <2. Therefore, we assumed no overdispersion in the model.

228   Further, we computed the intraclass correlation (ICC1) from the estimated model. This was
229   performed by using a function in R, since SAS does not provide this statistic (Lüdecke 2020a).
230   The correlation is calculated as the random effect variance divided by the sum of this variance
231   plus the residual variance. The conditional ICC1 takes the fixed effects into consideration as well
232   as the random effects (Lüdecke 2020b). The estimated conditional ICC1 is 0,145 which means
233   the cluster effects account for almost 15% of the variation in dependent variable making trips
234   outdoors. The model estimated in R (function glmer) gives the same results as with the
235   GLIMMIX procedure in SAS using the Laplace maximum likelihood method.
236   Except for the ICC1, all statistical analyses were performed using SAS software (University
237   Edition; SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA).

Ethics

239   The Regional Medical Ethics Committee (REK West), University of Bergen (2015/2030 REK
240   WEST, University of Bergen) and the Norwegian Social Science Data Services (46303)
241   approved the study, which was endorsed by all nursing homes. Voluntary, written informed
242   consent was obtained from all participants. In situations where the resident was not able to give
243   consent related to e.g., dementia or cognitive impairment, either the resident's relatives or the
244   department manager gave consent.

Results

246   The sample (*n* = 784), included more women (69%) than men (31%), , which is consistent with
247   the population distribution in this age group (Statistisk Sentralbyrå 2016). Most residents in our
248   sample (55%) resided in a long-term facility, 26% resided in a dementia ward and 19% resided
249   in a short-term ward. The mean ADL score was 10.1. We distributed residents into groups
250   according to their ADL score using the quartiles from the ADL distribution, which resulted in
251   about the same number of residents in each group. Twenty-eight per cent of the residents had an
252   ADL score of 0–6 points as measured by the Barthel Index, 24% had an ADL score of 7–10
253   points, 26% had an ADL score of 11–14 points and 23% had an ADL score >15 points.
254   Table 1 shows descriptive statistics for the dependent variable, trip outdoors last week. Table
255   2 shows descriptive statistics for the continuous independent variables while Table 3 shows
256   descriptive statistics for categorical independent variables.

257   Nursing homes are used as cluster variables for estimating random effects. The range is from
258   5 to 123 registrations per nursing home. The average was 37 registrations while the standard
259   deviation was 31, suggesting high variation in registrations. The nursing homes also vary
260   considerably in size which explains some, but not all of this variation

261   Table 4 show the results of the model estimation with outdoor activities in the preceding week
262   as the dependent variable. The table shows the fixed effects in the model. The random effects are
263   available in appendix B (table A2). These are obtained by using a random intercept model, one
264   for each nursing home, which implies that the fixed effects are assumed to be constant over all
265   nursing homes. Long-term ward type is the reference case for ward types and its effect is
266   measured by the model's general intercept.

267   The ADL score has a significant impact on the activity. An increase in the ADL score of 1
268   was expected to give an increase in the rate of activity level of 1.05. We show this effect by
269   considering two residents, both women aged 85 years, living in a long-term ward, receiving 6
270   visits per month and having a BMI of 23.8 kg/m^2 (the last two numbers are median values). Both
271   women live in institution number 1. Resident A had an ADL score of 10, while resident B had an
272   ADL score of 15. From our model, we expected resident A to take 0.43 trips outside the nursing
273   home in the preceding week and resident B to take 0.56 trips. Accordingly, we expected that 16
274   days would be needed for resident A to take one trip outdoors and 13 days would be needed for
275   resident B. Had the two residents lived in institution number 7, the expected number of trips
276   would have been 1.3 and 1.7 trips outdoors, assuming values for age, number of visits, BMI and
277   gender stay the same and ADL score is 10 and 15, respectively, as above. In other words, both
278   residents A and B would have three times more outdoor activities if they had been living in
279   institution 7 instead of 1. This result shows that institutions have an impact on activity level. This
280   is confirmed by estimation of institutional random effects (table A2) where eight institutions
281   have significant effects, four of them are positive.

282   Table 4 also shows that age, visits per month and ward type had significant effects on the
283   number of outdoor activities during the week. All effects were as expected: i.e., increasing age
284   was associated with a lower activity level, whereas an increasing number of visits were
285   associated with more trips outside the nursing home. The relative risk factor for age shows that a

286   resident with 80 years is assumed to have 0.8 less trips outdoors previous week compared to a

287   resident with 70 years, assuming all other variables are held constant and that they reside in the

288   same institution. Also, with the same assumptions, a resident receiving 10 visits per month is

289   expected to have 1.3 more trips outdoors compared to a resident receiving only one visit per

290   month.

291   The effects of short-term wards were negative, indicating that residents in that ward type took

292   significantly fewer trips outside the nursing home than did residents in the long-term ward. On

293   the other hand, residents in dementia wards took significantly more trips outdoors than residents

294   in long-term wards. Based on the assumptions outlined above, the risk factors show that a

295   resident in the dementia ward had almost 1.6 more trips outdoors in the previous week compared

296   to a resident in the long-term ward. A resident in the short-term ward had 0.7 less trips. Gender

297   and BMI had no significant effect on the number of outdoor activities.

298   **Discussion**

299   Our findings show that institutions are important predictors for the level of trips made outdoors

300   by residents. Age and BMI index had significant effects, both negative since increasing age and

301   BMI led to fewer trips outdoors. Visits per month had a significant positive effect, more visits

302   led to more trips outdoors. In addition, ADL-score had a significant effect on the activity, the

303   lower the score, the lower the activity level.

304   Further, our findings show that 57% of the nursing home residents in this sample did not go

305   outdoors. This is consistent with other studies showing that the activities offered in nursing

306   homes are limited (Kjøs & Havig 2016) and that the residents often are inactive (Harper Ice

307   2002). Recent inspections of nursing homes undertaken by the Norwegian authorities confirm

308   the lack of activity offerings (Helsetilsynet 2018a; Helsetilsynet 2018b; Helsetilsynet 2018c).

309   The findings of our study might be explained by the residents' ADL score, which was low:

310   i.e., 50% of the residents had an ADL score between 0 and 10. These low ADL scores indicate

311   that these residents had a low ability to go outdoors. This is consistent with national health

312   policies in Norway, which emphasize that the frailest elderly should receive care in nursing

313   homes. It is also in line with previous research that shows that the frailest residents might not be

314   able to go outdoors because of their old age, fatigue, frailty or illness (Nåden et al. 2013).

315   However, Björk et al. (2017) performed a similar study in Sweden and reported that 60% of

316   the nursing home residents had gone outdoors during the data collection period (November

317   2013–September 2014). The differences in going outside the nursing home in these similar

318   studies from the Scandinavian health-care context are interesting. Weather and the need for

319   appropriate clothing or equipment can impede the ability of residents to go outdoors. If Björk et

320   al. (2017) collected data during the summer, it might explain some of these differences. Our data

321   were collected either during autumn or spring. In Norway the temperature and weather

322   conditions often are warmer and contain less rain during July and August, and the residents are

323   more likely to go outdoors. This might explain why the residents in the Swedish study went

324   outside more often (Björk et al. 2017). Further, our data were collected in the western part of

325   Norway which has more rain compared to the eastern parts of Norway where most people live.

326   In addition, these residents might not have proper clothing like raincoats, warm jackets,

327   appropriate shoes or hats suitable for the different weather conditions. The British Broadcasting

328   Corporation (BBC 2018) has shown how the use of a rickshaw with a roof and cover may be an

329   alternative for helping frail elderly people to perform outdoor activities despite their loss in ADL

330   status. The concept of outdoor life, in particular hiking, has a prominent position in the

331   Norwegian culture (Gurholt & Broch 2019). In addition, most of the older population in Norway

332   grew up after the last world war; therefore, many have received basic socialization in outdoor life

333   and have maintained their association with outdoor activities throughout their lives (Odden

334   2008).

335   Our findings highlight that institutions have an impact on how often residents go outdoors.

336   These findings suggest that organizational differences impact outdoor activity. How the

337   institutions are organized and the importance they give this activity obviously determine how

338   often it is performed. These findings are in line with Isaksen et al. (2018), who found that only

339   four of 17 nursing homes had activity plans for the wards. Further, they found variations in staff

340   who had participated in training program regarding activities for the residents (Isaksen et al.

341   2018). Even if the service going outdoor is regulated by national regulations (Forskr kvalitet i

342   pleie- og omsorgstjenestene 2003), there is considerable room for adaption in each nursing

343   home. The variation in service provision between nursing homes comes from different cultures,

344   organizational practices and plainly the priority the service gets when set against other services

345   the nursing homes are obliged to provide (Nakrem 2015). To increase the level of activity,

346   students should be given more information about the benefits of the activity for nursing home

347   residents as well as the legal rights of this activity.

348   Physical activity is important for mental well-being among elderly people (Lampinen et al.

349   2006b). However, our findings show that increasing age was associated with lower activity

350   levels, which is also in line with Feng et al. (2017). This might imply a natural change from

351   being active to being less active and in need for assistance, which corresponds with the process

352   of disengagement described by Cumming and Henry in 1961 (Daatland & Solem 2011). When

353   people get older, it is natural for them to gradually withdraw from their social roles and the

354   activities they used to perform. This is in line with Adams et al. (2011), who found that activity

355   participation in late life changed from an active social life with creative activities to an increased

356   participation in passive social and spiritual activities. Nursing homes must consider this and meet

357   their residents' individual needs and interests. According to the Norwegian quality regulations,

358   nursing home residents should be offered varied and customized activities (Forskr kvalitet i

359   pleie- og omsorgstjenestene 2003). Nursing homes need to facilitate activities that are suitable

360   for each resident's ADL status and individual wishes. For example, it might be important for

361   residents to have their own personal things near their own chair. A nearby table might contain

362   personal important objects, such as magazines, books, newspapers or medicines (Board &

363   McCormack 2018). Nursing home residents who are no longer capable or do not want to go

364   outside might appreciate a nice view (Eijkelenboom et al. 2017). Activities are a basic need and

365   participation in activities might contribute to the well-being and dignity experienced by nursing

366   home residents (Björk et al. 2017; Lampinen et al. 2006b; Slettebø et al. 2016). Such activities

367   should be organized by the staff in close co-operation with relatives because they are familiar

368   with the residents' needs (Sandvoll et al. 2012).

369   Previous research shows that nursing home staff are committed to routines, such as helping

370   residents with personal care, practical help, nutrition and toileting (Harnett 2010; Sandvoll et al.

371   2012), but do not always take a person-centred approach (McCormack 2016) in terms of their

372   activities. Nursing homes often lack the opportunity and time to offer activities for all residents

373   and their staff recognize that some residents may spend time sitting alone even though staff

374   members know that they might have preferred to join in activities (Sandvoll et al. 2015). Could

375   the lack of staff explain our study results? Our findings show that visits per month and ward type

376   had a significant effect on number of outdoor activities during the week. An increasing number

377   of visits were associated with more trips outside the nursing home. This shows that the visits

378   (from family or volunteers) have an impact on resident's level of activities regarding outdoor

379   activity. In Norway, the government has addressed new ideas to solve the staff challenges and

380   suggests that voluntary contributions by relatives and organizations should be included as a way

381   of providing activities for nursing home residents (Det kongelige kulturdepartement 2018; Helse-

382   og omsorgsdepartementet 2013).

383    A reform to improve elderly care was introduced in a recent white paper from the Norwegian

384   government. One of the main areas that need improvement in elderly care is activities for elderly

385   people living in nursing homes and the white paper suggests that they should participate in one

386   hour of activity every day (Helse- og omsorgsdepartementet 2018). To provide more activities

387   for nursing home residents, particularly outdoor activities, nursing home staff should be given

388   resources to organize individual, person-centred and customized activities for all residents and to

389   co-ordinate voluntary contributions (e.g., from family members and elderly that want to

390   participate in activities). This is consistent with a recent study by Skinner et al. (2018), who

391   found that the voluntary, unpaid contribution took place within cultural, social and other

392   activities aimed at promoting mental stimulation and well-being. Furthermore, they suggested

393   that the staff in government nursing homes should consider voluntary contributions when they

394   plan the care of residents in long-term care (Skinner et al. 2018). To offer a variety of activities

395   for nursing home residents, activities should be offered both inside and outside the nursing home.

396   We also encourage the national authorities to specify in white papers that activities for

397   Norwegian nursing home residents should take place both indoors and outdoors. For residents

398   who are unable to go outdoors on their own, rickshaws might serve as an alternative way of

399   enabling them to go outdoors. Our findings show that nursing home residents rarely engage in

400   outdoor activities, even though the need for activities and engagement for nursing home residents

401   is well known internationally (Björk et al. 2017; Kjøs & Havig 2016; Lampinen et al. 2006a;

402   Palacios-Ceña et al. 2015; Theurer et al. 2015). Therefore, a greater focus on activities for

403   elderly nursing home residents should be increased and customized in line with each resident's

404   individual needs and wishes. Finally, our results show that the institution that the residents live in

405   has an important association with outdoor activity. This implies that organizational differences in

406   nursing homes might have an impact on outdoor activity, which is an important implication for

407   further research, health policy and practice.

Strengths and weaknesses

409   The strength of this study is the systematic use of standardized, psychometric-tested instruments

410   and measures (Mahoney & Barthel 1965). One weakness is related to the nursing students'

411   observations used to rate ADL. One obligation of research is not to harm participations; i.e., even

412   though self-report is recommended as the gold standard for gathering data (Polit & Beck 2017),

413   self-report was considered to be inappropriate for assessing the ADL of these residents. The

414   students' involvement in research might contribute to mutually strengthening research and

415   education. The students used a predefined manual or standardized protocol to assess data, which

416   is an advantage, particularly since the lecture was given immediately before clinical placement.

417   The data collection was supervised by the university teacher and nurses working at the different

418   nursing homes. This might, on the other side, be a bias in this study because the involvement

419   might serve as a Hawthorne effect (Polit & Beck 2017). The participants represent a convenient

420   sample from clinical placements where the university has contracts educating students. In such a

421   way, it might be limited possibilities for generalization of the results to all nursing homes.

422

Conclusions

424   More than half (57%) of the participants in this study did not go outdoors during the preceding

425   week. Their ADL status might explain this pattern because more than 50% of the residents had

426   an ADL score <10, which indicates low performance status. The institutions that the residents

427   live in have an impact on outdoor activity, which suggests that organizational differences matter.

428   This is an important implication for further research, health policy and practice. Planning for

429   nursing home residents' activities requires staff competence in assessing the capacity and needs

430   of all residents. Those residents with few family members or friends might benefit from visits

431   from volunteers taking on an important function in collaboration with the nursing staff in

432   managing different kind of activities, such as outdoor activities. Our findings show that residents

433   rarely engage in outdoor activities, even though the need for activities and engagement for

434   nursing home residents is well known. Therefore, a greater focus on activities for elderly nursing

435   home residents should be increased and customized in line with each resident's individual needs

436   and wishes.

References

437   **References**

438   Adams KB, Roberts AR, and Cole MB. 2011. Changes in activity and interest in the third and
439   fourth age: associations with health, functioning and depressive symptoms.
440   *Occupational Therapy International* 18:4. https://doi.org/10.1002/oti.304
441   BBC. 2018. Bury St Edmunds rickshaws aim to tackle loneliness. *Available at*
442   *https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/av/uk-england-suffolk-44363028/bury-st-edmunds-*
443   *rickshaws-aim-to-tackle-loneliness.*
444   Björk S, Lindkvist M, Wimo A, Juthberg C, Bergland Å, and Edvardsson D. 2017. Residents'
445   engagement in everyday activities and its association with thriving in nursing
446   homes. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 73:1884. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13275
447   Board M, and McCormack B. 2018. Exploring the meaning of home and its implications for
448   the care of older people. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 27:3070-3080.
449   https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.14495
450   Bürge E, von Gunten A, and Berchtold A. 2012. Factors favoring a degradation or an
451   improvement in activities of daily living (ADL) performance among nursing home
452   (NH) residents: A survival analysis. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics* 56:250-
453   257. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archger.2012.09.001
454   Crocker T, Young J, Forster A, Brown L, Ozer S, and Greenwood DC. 2013. The effect of
455   physical rehabilitation on activities of daily living in older residents of long-term
456   care facilities: systematic review with meta-analysis. *Age and Ageing* 42:682-688.
457   10.1093/ageing/aft133
458   Det kongelige kulturdepartement. 2018. Frivilligheita - sterk, sjølvstendig, mangfaldig. Den
459   statlege frivilligheitspolitikken [Volunteering - strong, independent, diverse. The
460   state Volunteer Policy]. *Available at*
461   *https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/meld.-st.-10-20182019/id2621384/*
462   (accessed 10th December 2019).
463   Drageset J. 2004. The importance of activities of daily living and social contact for
464   loneliness: a survey among residents in nursing homes. *Scandinavian Journal of*
465   *Caring Sciences* 18:65-71.
466   Drageset J, Eide GE, and Ranhoff AH. 2011. Depression is associated with poor functioning
467   in activities of daily living among nursing home residents without cognitive
468   impairment. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 20:3111-3118.
469   https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2702.2010.03663.x
470   Daatland SO, and Solem PE. 2011. *Aldring og samfunn : innføring i sosialgerontologi [Aging*
471   *and society: introduction to social gerontology]*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
472   Eijkelenboom A, Verbeek H, Felix E, and van Hoof J. 2017. Architectural factors influencing
473   the sense of home in nursing homes: An operationalization for practice. *Frontiers of*
474   *Architectural Research* 6:111-122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foar.2017.02.004
475   Esping-Andersen G, Gallie D, Hemerijck A, and Myles J. 2002. *Why we need a new welfare*
476   *state*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
477   Feng Z, Lugtenberg M, Franse C, Fang X, Hu S, Jin C, and Raat H. 2017. Risk factors and
478   protective factors associated with incident or increase of frailty among community-
479   dwelling older adults: A systematic review of longitudinal studies.(Research
480   Article)(Report). *PLoS ONE* 12:e0178383. 10.1371/journal.pone.0178383

481 Forskr kvalitet i pleie- og omsorgstjenestene. 2003. FOR 2003-06-27 nr 792: Forskrift om
482   kvalitet i pleie- og omsorgstjenestene for tjenesteyting etter lov av 19. november
483   1982 nr. 66 om helsetjenesten i kommunene og etter lov av 13. desember 1991 nr.
484   81 om sosiale tjenester m.v. [Regulations for quality of care in the municipalities].
485   *Available at* http://www.lovdata.no/cgi-wift/ldles?doc=/sf/sf/sf-20030627-0792.html
486   (accessed 10th December 2019).
487 Gaugler JE, Duval S, Anderson KA, and Kane RL. 2007. Predicting nursing home admission
488   in the U.S.: A meta-analysis. *BMC Geriatrics* 7. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2318-
489   7-13
490 Gurholt KP, and Broch TB. 2019. Outdoor life, nature experience, and sports in Norway:
491   tensions and dilemmas in the preservation and use of urban forest. *Sport in Society*
492   22:573-588. 10.1080/17430437.2017.1390938
493 Harnett T. 2010. Seeking exemptions from nursing home routines: Residents´everyday
494   influence attempts and institutional order. *Journal of Aging Studies* 24:292-301.
495   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaging.2010.08.001
496 Harper Ice G. 2002. Daily life in a nursing home: has it changed in 25 years? *Journal of Aging*
497   *Studies* 16:345. 10.1016/S0890-4065(02)00069-5NB
498 Helse- og omsorgsdepartementet. 2013. Meld. St. 29 (2012-2013) Morgendagens omsorg
499   [Tomorrow's Care]. Oslo, .
500 Helse- og omsorgsdepartementet. 2018. Meld. St. 15 (2017–2018) A full life - all your life —
501   A Quality Reform for Older Persons *Available at*
502   https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dokumenter/meld.-st.-15-20172018/id2599850/
503   (accessed 10th December 2019).
504 Helsetilsynet. 2018a. Rapport fra tilsyn med helse- og omsorgstjenester til beboere ved
505   Lødingen sykehjem 2018 [Report after inspection of care services for residents in
506   Lødingen nursing home]. *Available at*
507   https://www.helsetilsynet.no/tilsyn/tilsynsrapporter/nordland/2018/lodingen-
508   sykehjem-helse--og-omsorgstjenester-til-beboere-2018/ (accessed 10th December
509   2019).
510 Helsetilsynet. 2018b. Rapport fra tilsyn med tjenesten til eldre med behov for heldøgns
511   helse- og omsorgstjeneste ved Meråker helsetun, avd. sykehjemmet 2018 [Report
512   after inspection of care services for residents in Meråker nursing home]. *Available at*
513   https://www.helsetilsynet.no/tilsyn/tilsynsrapporter/trondelag/2018/meraaker-
514   helsetun-avdeling-sykehjemmet-tjenesten-til-eldre-med-behov-for-heldogns-helse-og-
515   omsorgstjeneste-2018/ (accessed 10th December 2019).
516 Helsetilsynet. 2018c. Rapport fra tilsyn med tjenesten til eldre med heldøgns helse- og
517   omsorgstjenester i Trondheim kommune, Dragvoll helse- og velferdssenter 2018
518   [Report after inspection of care services for residents in Trondheim municipality].
519   *Available at*
520   https://www.helsetilsynet.no/tilsyn/tilsynsrapporter/trondelag/2018/trondheim-
521   kommune-dragvoll-helse-og-velferdssenter-tilsyn-med-tjenesten-til-eldre-med-
522   heldoegns-helse-og-omsorgstjenester-2018/ (accessed 10th December 2019).
523 Isaksen J, Ågotnes G, and Fagertun A. 2018. Spenningsfeltet mellom standardisering,
524   variasjon og prioritering i norske sykehjem [Tensions Between Standardization in
525   Norwegian Nursing Homes]. *Tidsskrift for omsorgsforskning* 4:143-152.
526   10.18261/issn.2387-5984-2018-02-10

527   Kirkevold Ø, and Engedal K. 2006. The quality of care in Norwegian nursing homes.
528   *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences* 20:177-183.
529   https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6712.2006.00396.x
530   Kjøs BØ, and Havig AK. 2016. An examination of quality of care in Norwegian nursing
531   homes–a change to more activities? *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences* 30:330-
532   339. https://doi.org/10.1111/scs.12249
533   Lampinen P, Heikkinen R, Kauppinen M, and Heikkinen E. 2006a. Activity as a predictor of
534   mental well-being among older adults. *Aging & Mental Health* 10 454-466
535   https://doi.org/10.1080/13607860600640962
536   Lampinen P, Heikkinen RL, Kauppinen M, and E. H. 2006b. Activity as a predictor of mental
537   well-being among older adults. *Aging & Mental Health* 10:454-466.
538   https://doi.org/10.1080/13607860600640962
539   Liu C, Feng Z, and Mor V. 2014a. Case-Mix and Quality Indicators in Chinese Elder Care
540   Homes: Are There Differences Between Government-Owned and Private-Sector
541   Facilities? *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 62:371-377. 10.1111/jgs.12647
542   Liu C-j, Shiroy D, Jones L, and Clark D. 2014b. Systematic review of functional training on
543   muscle strength, physical functioning, and activities of daily living in older adults.
544   *European Review of Aging and Physical Activity* 11:95-106. 10.1007/s11556-014-
545   0144-1
546   Liu WL, Unick JU, Galik EG, and Resnick B. 2015. Barthel Index of Activities of Daily Living.
547   Item Response Theory Analysis of Ratings for Long-Term Care Residents. *Nursing*
548   *Research* 64:88-99. https://doi.org/10.1097/nnr.0000000000000072
549   Lüdecke D. 2020a. Intraclass Correlation coefficient, R Documentation. *Available at*
550   *https://www.rdocumentation.org/packages/sjstats/versions/0.17.4/topics/icc*.
551   Lüdecke D. 2020b. Package 'performance'. *Available at https://cran.r-*
552   *project.org/web/packages/performance/performance.pdf*.
553   Mahoney FI, and Barthel DW. 1965. Functional evaluation: the Barthel index. *Maryland*
554   *State Medical Journal* 14:61-65.
555   McCormack B. 2016. Person-Centredness and Fundamentals of Care - Dancing with Beauty
556   Rather than Fighting Ugliness. *Nursing Leadership* 29:17-25.
557   10.12927/cjnl.2016.24642
558   Muff S, Held L, and Keller LK. 2016. Marginal or conditional regression models for
559   correlated non-normal data. *Ecology and Evolution* 7.
560   Nakrem S. 2015. Understanding organizational and cultural premises for quality of care in
561   nursing homes: an ethnographic study. *BMC Health Serv Res* 15:508.
562   10.1186/s12913-015-1171-y
563   Nåden D, Rehnsfeldt AW, Råholm M-B, Lindwall L, Caspari S, Aasgaard T, Slettebø Å,
564   Sæteren B, Lillestø B, Heggestad AKT, and Lohne V. 2013. Aspects of indignity in
565   nursing home residences as experienced by family caregivers. *Nursing Ethics*
566   20:748-761. https://doi.org/10.1177/0969733012475253
567   Odden A. 2008. Hva skjer med norsk friluftsliv?: En studie av utviklingstrekk i norsk
568   friluftsliv 1970-2004 [What happens to norwegian outdoor life? a study of
569   developments in Norwegian outdoor life 1970-2004] phd. Norges teknisk-
570   naturvitenskapelige universitet, Fakultet for samfunnsvitenskap og
571   teknologiledelse, Geografisk institutt.

572 Palacios-Ceña D, Gómez-Calero C, Cachón-Pérez JM, Velarde-García JF, Martínez-Piedrola R,
573   and Pérez-De-Heredia M. 2015. Is the experience of meaningful activities
574   understood in nursing homes? A qualitative study. *Geriatric Nursing* 37:110-115.
575   http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gerinurse.2015.10.015
576 Polit DF, and Beck CT. 2017. *Nursing Research : generating and assessing evidence for*
577   *nursing practice*. Philadelphia: Wolters Kluwer.
578 Saltvedt I, Helbostad JL, Sveen U, Thingstad P, Sletvold O, and Wyller TB. 2008. Barthel
579   ADL-INDEKS Norwegian version based on Mahoney F.I. & Barthel D.W. (1965).
580   *Available at https://aldring-og-helse-*
581   *media.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/barthel010408_2.pdf*.
582 Sandvoll AM, Hjertenes A-M, and Board M. 2020. Perspectives on activities in nursing
583   homes. *International Practice Development Journal* 10:1-12.
584   https://doi.org/10.19043/ipdj.10Suppl.006
585 Sandvoll AM, Kristoffersen K, Grov EK, and Hauge S. 2015. When care situations evoke
586   difficult emotions inn nursing staff members: an ethnographic study in two
587   Norwegian nursing homes. *BMC Nursing* 14. 10.1186/s12912-015-0093-7
588 Sandvoll AM, Kristoffersen K, and Hauge S. 2012. New quality regulations versus
589   established nursing home practice- a qualitative study. *BMC Nursing* 11:14.
590   https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6955-11-7
591 SAS Institute. 2019. Introduction to Statistical Modeling with SAS/STAT Software. SAS
592   Institute.
593 Selbaek G, Kirkevold Ø, and Engedal K. 2007. The prevalence of psychiatric symptoms and
594   behavioural disturbances and the use of psychotropic drugs in Norwegian nursing
595   homes. *International Journal Of Geriatric Pshychiatry* 22:843-849.
596 Skinner MS, Sogstad MKR, and Tingvold L. 2018. Voluntary work in the Norwegian long-
597   term care sector: complementing or substituting formal services? *European Journal*
598   *of Social Work*:1-13. 10.1080/13691457.2018.1462767
599 Slettebø Å, Sæteren B, Caspari S, Lohne V, Rehnsfeldt AW, Heggestad AKT, Lillestø B, Høj B,
600   Råholm M-B, Lindwall L, Aasgaard T, and Nåden D. 2016. The significance of
601   meaningful and enjoyable activities for nursing home resident's experiences of
602   dignity. https://doi.org/10.1111/scs.12386
603 Statistisk Sentralbyrå. 2016. https://www.ssb.no/befolkning. *Available at*
604   *https://www.ssb.no/befolkning?rn=F&innholdstype=statistikk&de=Befolkningsframsk*
605   *rivinger#tittel*.
606 Strøm BS, Ytrehus S, and Grov E-K. 2016. Sensory stimulation for persons with dementia: a
607   review of theliterature. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 25:1805-1834.
608 Theurer K, Mortenson WB, Stone R, Suto M, Timonen V, and Rozanova J. 2015. The need for
609   a social revolution in residential care. *Journal of Aging Studies* 35:201-210.
610   10.1016/j.jaging.2015.08.011
611 Trutschel D, Palm R, Holle B, and Simon M. 2017. Methodological approaches in analysing
612   observational data: A practical example on how to address clustering and selection
613   bias. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*:36-44.
614   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2017.06.017
615
616

617

618

619

Descriptive statistics for dependent variable, trips outdoors last week

Table 1 shows descriptive statistics for the dependent variable, trip outdoors last week.

1   **Table 1 Descriptive statistics for dependent variable, trips outdoors last week**

Trips outdoors last week	
Min	0
25th percentile	0
Median	0
75th percentile	1
95th percentile	4
Max	14
Number of observations	784

Descriptive statistics for numeric independent variables

Table 2 shows descriptive statistics for the continuous independent variables

1   **Table 2 Descriptive statistics for numeric independent variables**

	Mean	Standard deviation	Number of observations
ADL score	10.1	5.2	787
Age	86.3	7.2	786
Visits per month	8.9	8.8	787
Body mass index	24.2	5	785

Descriptive statistics for categorical variables ward type and gender used as independent variables

Table 3 shows descriptive statistics for categorical independent variables

1   **Table 3 Descriptive statistics for categorical variables ward type and gender used as**

2   **independent variables**

	N	% of total
Ward type		
Short term/rehab	153	19.4
Long term	434	55.1
Dementia	200	25.4
Total	787	99.9
Gender		
Female	543	69
Male	244	31
Total	787	100

Model estimates of outdoor activities in the preceding week: Poisson regression

Table 4 show the results of the model estimation with outdoor activities in the preceding week as the dependent variable

1 **Table 4 Model estimates of outdoor activities in the preceding week: Poisson regression**

Effect	Estimate	Relative risk	Standard error	df	t value	Pr > |t|
Intercept	0.925		0.590	20	1.57	0.133
ADL	0.052	1.054	0.008	756	6.72	<.0001
Gender (1 = Male)	0.102	1.107	0.086	756	1.18	0.238
Age	-0.024	0.976	0.006	756	-4.18	<.0001
Visit Pr month	0.030	1.031	0.004	756	7.68	<.0001
BMI	-0.005	0.995	0.008	756	-0.60	0.548
Dementia	0.462	1.588	0.115	756	4.00	<.0001
Short-term rehabilitation ward	-0.309	0.734	0.135	756	-2.29	0.023
AIC	1973.25					
Variance random effect	0.1532					

Appendix A

Table A1 Model statistics for Poisson regression model

1 **Appendix A**

2 **Table A1 Model statistics for Poisson regression model for outdoor activities in the**

3 **preceding week as a dependent variable**

Goodness-of-fit criteria	df	χ^2	χ^2/df
Generalized chi-square	774	1216.3	1.57
Number of observations		784	

Appendix B

Table A2 Model estimates of outdoor activities in the preceding week - random effects

1 **Appendix B**

2 **Table A2 Model estimates of outdoor activities in the preceding week: random effects**

Institution	Estimate	Standard Error	df	t value	Pr > |t|
InstId 1	-0.430	0.1896	756	-2.27	0.0236
InstId 2	0.595	0.1793	756	3.32	0.0009
InstId 3	-0.247	0.1671	756	-1.48	0.139
InstId 4	-0.031	0.2164	756	-0.14	0.8872
InstId 5	-0.140	0.3083	756	-0.45	0.6499
InstId 6	-0.453	0.2255	756	-2.01	0.0451
InstId 7	0.689	0.1519	756	4.54	<.0001
InstId 8	-0.567	0.2713	756	-2.09	0.0371
InstId 9	0.099	0.2133	756	0.46	0.6441
InstId 10	-0.036	0.1487	756	-0.24	0.8068
InstId 11	0.630	0.3366	756	1.87	0.0615
InstId 12	0.420	0.1742	756	2.41	0.0161
InstId 13	0.155	0.2227	756	0.69	0.4881
InstId 14	-0.022	0.1521	756	-0.14	0.8866
InstId 15	-0.284	0.2389	756	-1.19	0.2343
InstId 16	0.472	0.2612	756	1.81	0.0713
InstId 17	-0.518	0.2509	756	-2.06	0.0395
InstId 18	0.146	0.243	756	0.6	0.5478
InstId 19	-0.372	0.3453	756	-1.08	0.2821
InstId 20	0.021	0.3065	756	0.07	0.9453
InstId 21	0.191	0.2434	756	0.79	0.4322