Implementation of a complex intervention to improve participation in older people with joint contractures living in nursing homes:

A process evaluation of a cluster-randomised pilot trial

Table of Contents

Figure A1 Logic model of the Participation Enabling CAre in Nursing Intervention	2
Table A1 Self-assessed preparedness for the role as facilitator after the workshop	3
Table A2 Nursing care of residents with joint contractures	4

What? How? One-day facilitators' Information on the workshop phenomenon of joint contracture and its consequences Flyer for therapists, relatives and physicians Information on the risk of develop joint contractures Training on the use of a risk assessment Peer-mentoring including telephone counselling for the facilitators Information and training on Reminders (posters and considering residents' other materials) for residents participation goals in and staff individual care planning Peer-mentor-visit for facilitators Information and training on methods of interprofessional cooperation Information session for approaches residents, nurses, physicians, in nursing homes therapists, social workers Information and training Written commitment to the on the use of ICF intervention (declaration) biopsychosocial model in identifying barriers and facilitators of residents' participation Coordination of implementation measures regarding aspects of care on organizational level Information and training on with the nursing home

peer counselling methods

Mechanisms of impact **Health Outcome** Attitude Positive attitude of nurses to the objectives and components of the intervention consider residents' participation goals in their daily work incorporate the biopsychosocial perspective in their daily care routines Subjective Norm Nurses are aware of the importance of the intervention and its goals in their daily routine by being attentive regarding the impact of joint contractures on the independence of the residents acknowledging the meaning of resources-oriented mobility enhancement and the role of environmental factors for the participation of home residents being convinced of the appropriate balance between costs and benefits of the measures Improved participation of residents Perceived behaviour Nurses feel capable of making a systematic risk assessment regarding contractures considering participation goals of residents in individual care planning initiating and coordinating interprofessional care identifying and overcoming individual barriers of participation Intention Implementation of the Participation Enabling CAre in Nursing (PECAN) Process-influencing factors · Time resources of the person responsible Experience and training of the facilitators

for the implementation of the intervention

Change management culture in the institution

Extent of already existing interprofessional cooperation

· Size of institution

Figure A1 Logic model of the Participation Enabling CAre in Nursing Intervention adapted from Saal et al. (2018)

manager

Position of facilitators in the team

Extent of support by superiors

Residents' health status

Nursing home staffing

 Table A2 Self-assessed preparedness for the role as facilitator after the workshop

	n=14
Competence to use a biographical approach while planning measures. ¹	
Excellent / good	11
Less / not at all	3
Competence to encourage residents for activities. ¹	
Excellent / good	12
Less / not at all	2
Competence to enable the residents to participate without restrictions. ¹	
Excellent / good	12
Less / not at all	2
Competence to identify barriers and initiate changes in the nursing home. ¹	
Excellent / good	9
Less / not at all	4
Competence to be active in the adaptation of care plans. ¹	
Excellent / good	13
Less / not at all	1
Competence to review needs for technical and medical aids together with a therapist. ¹	
Excellent / good	11
Less / not at all	3
Confidence in the own performance of the role as facilitator ²	
Excellent / good	7
Average	7
Less / not at all	0

¹Based on a 4-Point-Likert-Scale (1=excellent, 2=good, 3=less, 4=not at all)

²Based on a 5-Point-Likert-Scale (1=excellent, 2=good, 3=average, 4=less, 5=not at all)

 Table A2 Nursing care of residents with joint contractures

	Baseline 6-month follow-up												
Do you agree with the	Intervention (Co	Control Total			Intervention Control			ntrol	Total		
following statements?	(n=	(n=51) (n=21) (n=72) (n=45)		=45)	(n=36)		(n=81)						
	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	
We often discuss how to improve the care of residents with joint contractures to enable them to													
participate in social life in	n the best	t possibl	e wa	ay.									
Agree	22	(43)	8	(38)	30	(41)	30	(67)	17	(47)	47	(58)	
Neutral	13	(25)	6	(29)	19	(26)	10	(22)	12	(33)	22	(27)	
Disagree	13	(26)	6	(29)	19	(26)	4	(9)	7	(19)	11	(14)	
Don't know	3	(6)	1	(5)	4	(6)	1	(2)	0		1	(1)	
There are regular team m	neetings t	o discus	s th	e care	of r	eside	nts wit	h or at r	isk of	joint			
contractures.													
Agree	18	(36)	8	(38)	26	(36)	32	(71)	15	(41)	47	(59)	
Neutral	11	(22)	3	(14)	14	(19)	3	(7)	12	(33)	15	(19)	
Disagree	19	(37)	10	(48)	29	(41)	8	(18)	9	(25)	17	(21)	
Don't know	3	(6)	0		3	(4)	2	(4)	0		2	(2)	
Individual biography and	interests	of resid	lent	s with	join	t con	tractur	es are co	onside	ered w	vhen		
planning activities and pa	articipatio	on.											
Agree	33	(65)	14	(67)	47	(65)	35	(77)	28	(78)	63	(78)	
Neutral	6	(12)	4	(19)	10	(14)	7	(16)	4	(11)	11	(14)	
Disagree	10	(20)	3	(15)	13	(18)	2	(4)	3	(8)	5	(6)	
Don't know	2	(4)	0		2	(3)	1	(2)	1	(3)	2	(2)	
Independent action and	mobility o	of reside	nts	with j	oint	contr	acture	s is more	imp	ortant	than	the	
completion of a certain v	vorkload.												
Agree	22	(43)	9	(43)	31	(43)	30	(67)	24	(67)	54	(67)	
Neutral	8	(16)	6	(29)	14	(19)	8	(18)	6	(17)	14	(17)	
Disagree	13	(26)	4	(19)	17	(23)	6	(13)	4	(11)	10	(12)	
Don't know	7	(14)	2	(10)	9	(13)	1	(2)	1	(3)	2	(2)	
Missing	1	(2)	0		1	(1)	0		1	(3)	1	(1)	
Residents with joint cont	ractures a	are enab	oled	to pa	rticiį	pate ii	n indivi	idual dai	ly act	ivities	like		
cooking, gardening or wa	alking.												
Agree	27	(53)	12	(57)	39	(54)	32	(71)	13	(36)	45	(56)	
Neutral	10	(20)	3	(14)	13	(18)	6	(13)	10	(28)	16	(20)	
Disagree	9	(18)	6	(28)	15	(21)	7	(15)	10	(27)	17	(21)	
Don't know	4	(8)	0		4	(6)	0		3	(8)	3	(4)	
Missing	1	(2)	0		1	(1)	0		0		0		
The collaboration with th	ne residen	nts' ther	apis	ts wo	rks o	ut we	ell.						
Agree	44	(86)	16	(76)	60	(84)	33	(73)	21	(58)	54	(67)	
Neutral	5	(10)	2	(10)	7	(10)	8	(18)	8	(22)	16	(20)	
Disagree	2	(4)		(15)	5		2	(4)	4	(12)	6	(8)	
Don't know	0		0		0	-	2	(4)	3	(8)	5	(6)	