

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

A novel scale for assessing caregiving competence in family caregivers of persons with dementia

Ippei Suganuma^{1*}, Noriyuki Ogawa¹, Kenji Kamijou², Aki Nakanishi³, Ippei Kawasaki¹,
Keisuke Itotani⁴, Shinichi Okada³

¹ Department of Occupational Therapy, Faculty of Health Sciences, Kyoto Tachibana
University, Kyoto, Japan

² Department of Rehabilitation, Faculty of Wakayama Health Care Sciences, Takarazuka
University of Medical and Health Care, Wakayama, Japan

³ Graduate School of Human Life and Ecology, Osaka Metropolitan University, Osaka, Japan

⁴ Department of General Rehabilitation, Faculty of Allied Health Sciences, Yamato
University, Osaka, Japan

* Corresponding author

E-mail: suganuma-i@tachibana-u.ac.jp (IS)

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

23 **Abstract**

24 The aging of family caregivers and the challenges of long-distance caregiving
25 attributed to the increase in the number of elderly individuals living alone have raised
26 concerns about dementia caregiving in Japan. Additionally, with the shifts in family
27 dynamics due to declining birth rates and an extended average lifespan, adapting support
28 strategies for family caregivers is necessary. Thus, it is necessary to measure the caregiving
29 competence of family caregivers early and effectively. However, a comprehensive caregiving
30 competence scale tailored to dementia, including aspects such as caregiving burden,
31 affirmation, and coping, is lacking. Therefore, this study aimed to develop a Caregiving
32 Competence Scale for Dementia (CCSD) for primary family caregivers caring for individuals
33 with dementia. This study focused on primary family caregivers caring for individuals with
34 cognitive impairment and various degrees of dementia. The initial version of the CCSD was
35 developed, and a questionnaire survey was conducted to validate its structural validity and
36 reliability. A total of 150 participants were included in the analysis. The exploratory factor
37 analysis identified five factors with 27 items: Factor 1: “Positive Emotions and Awareness,”
38 Factor 2: “Presence or Absence of Consultation Partners and Family Support,” Factor 3:
39 “Caregiving Burden and Coping Skills,” Factor 4: “Dementia Literacy,” and Factor 5:
40 “Engagement and Emotional Control.” The confirmatory factor analysis revealed a good
41 model fit (comparative fit index = 0.905 and root mean square error of approximation =
42 0.072). The overall Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the scale was 0.892. The CCSD,
43 comprising 27 items covering five factors, has been successfully developed as a measurement
44 scale. Measuring caregiving competence contributes to developing targeted support strategies
45 for primary family caregivers and facilitating appropriate interventions.

46 **Introduction**

47 According to the World Health Organization, over 55 million people worldwide
48 have dementia, with approximately 10 million new cases reported each year [1]. Dementia
49 has profound physical, psychological, social, and economic impacts, affecting not only
50 individuals with dementia but also their caregivers, families, and society as a whole [1]. In
51 Japan, with a population of approximately 120 million, the elderly population rate is 29.1%
52 (about 36 million) [2], and the prevalence of dementia is estimated to be 20% (about 7
53 million) by 2025 [3]. Moreover, dementia is the leading cause of needing caregiving
54 assistance (18.0%) among individuals aged 65 years and older [4]. With the aging population
55 in Japan, the number of caregivers for persons with dementia is expected to increase.

56 The burden on dementia caregivers has been reported to be significantly higher
57 than that on other caregivers, leading to lower levels of self-efficacy, subjective well-being,
58 and physical health [5]. This burden is influenced by various factors, such as behavioral and
59 psychological symptoms of dementia (BPSD) [6-9], physical dependence in activities of daily
60 living [10], and background factors, including the caregiver–patient relationship [6], living
61 arrangements [6,11], caregiver gender [12,13], kinship [11], and social support [13].

62 Recently, in the context of family caregivers in Japan, issues related to aging
63 caregivers and long-distance caregiving attributed to the increase in the number of elderly
64 individuals living alone have been emphasized [14]. Additionally, changes in family
65 dynamics due to the aging population and extended average lifespan have altered household
66 situations and the characteristics of primary family caregivers [14]. Thus, primary family
67 caregivers must flexibly address challenges that arise in their daily lives while striving to
68 coordinate and construct a home caregiving environment.

69 Considering the challenges family caregivers face in Japan, developing a
70 measurement scale for the caregiving competence of family caregivers of persons with

71 dementia and mild cognitive impairment (MCI) is necessary for providing early and
72 appropriate support to family caregivers. Although there is no consistent definition for
73 caregiving competence, in caregiving practice, negative emotions, such as caregiver burden,
74 coexist with positive emotions, such as self-efficacy [15], facilitating appropriate caregiving
75 responses to the care recipient [16,17]. Therefore, in developing the scale for caregiving
76 competence, it is crucial to define the core concept of “caregiving competence” by
77 encompassing both positive and negative emotions and coping strategies in caregiving
78 situations.

79 Although no scales have been developed for measuring caregiving competence,
80 an Empowerment Evaluation Scale for caregivers has been developed as a comprehensive
81 measure of caregiving abilities [18,19]. The scale developed by Wu [18] includes various
82 aspects, such as caregiving autonomy, consciousness, and relationships with care recipients,
83 but it is not specialized for dementia caregiving. The scale developed by Sakanashi et al. [19]
84 is specific to family caregivers of persons with dementia. However, this scale does not
85 include stress, coping, and family relationships, giving the impression of inadequacy in
86 capturing the multifaceted nature of caregiving competence. Therefore, this study aimed to
87 develop a new scale for measuring caregiving competence in primary family caregivers of
88 persons with dementia or MCI by reexamining the elements that constitute “caregiving
89 competence.”

90

91 **Materials and methods**

92 **Operational definition of caregiving competence**

93 In this study, the operational definition of caregiving competence was “the
94 ability to provide continuous care for persons with dementia or MCI at home by adjusting to

95 the environment (family, local residents, use of caregiving services, etc.), addressing BPSD,
 96 and providing physical care related to activities of daily living, including supervision.”

97 **Development of the CCSD**

98 Based on the operational definition, items from previous studies on
 99 caregiving-related assessment scales [18,19], caregiving survey reports [20], and interviews
 100 with family caregivers were considered. Responses to questions were rated on a 5-point scale,
 101 with 5 indicating “Strongly agree (always or frequently),” 4 indicating “Somewhat agree
 102 (often or somewhat),” 3 indicating “Neither agree nor disagree (Neither always nor rarely or
 103 Neither frequently nor rarely),” 2 indicating “Somewhat disagree (rarely or not much),” 1
 104 indicating “Strongly disagree (never).” The higher the scores, the higher the care competence
 105 (reverse scoring for negative emotions or situations). As a result, 45 items were generated,
 106 covering caregiving burden, caregiving affirmation, self-efficacy for knowledge, availability
 107 of a confidant, resources, coping skills, and balancing caregiving with work. The generated
 108 items were reviewed for face validity with 15 family primary caregivers of persons with MCI
 109 or dementia. After face validity confirmation, the content validity was reviewed by five
 110 experts (university faculty and medical professionals specializing in dementia care and
 111 welfare), resulting in the creation of the “Caregiving Competence Scale for Dementia
 112 Prototype (CCSD-P)” (Table 1).

113 **Table 1. Caregiving Competence Scale for Dementia Prototype (CCSD-P).**

Items		Response options	Scores
01	There are times when I feel restless ^a	Strongly agree–	1–2–3–4–5
02	Sometimes I feel irritated when I am around the care recipient ^a	Somewhat agree– Neither agree nor	1–2–3–4–5
03	There are times when I feel down because I	disagree–	1–2–3–4–5

	cannot interact well with the person receiving care ^a	Somewhat disagree–	
04	I feel anxious about taking care of the person for an extended period in the future ^a	Strongly disagree	1–2–3–4–5
05	I find myself troubled by the behaviors of the care recipient at times ^a		1–2–3–4–5
06	Feeling stressed due to caregiving taking up time and having no personal time for oneself ^a		1–2–3–4–5
07	Feeling financial burden such as caregiving expenses ^a		1–2–3–4–5
08	Sometimes I feel that the caregiving I am doing is not rewarded ^a		1–2–3–4–5
09	I want to elicit positive responses from the care recipient (such as facial expressions and reduced anxiety) through my caregiving		5–4–3–2–1
10	It is important to work toward enabling the care recipient to have new roles		5–4–3–2–1
11	I can gather information about the knowledge and skills you feel are lacking in your caregiving		5–4–3–2–1
12	I have knowledge about the illness called dementia		5–4–3–2–1
13	I have knowledge about the social resources (such as care services) necessary for individuals		5–4–3–2–1

	with dementia		
14	I can evoke positive responses from the care recipient through verbal communication and caregiving		5-4-3-2-1
15	I can understand the care recipient's feelings of anxiety		5-4-3-2-1
16	I can respond flexibly to the care recipient's expressions and actions		5-4-3-2-1
17	I can provide care to the care recipient in a way that avoids causing discomfort		5-4-3-2-1
18	I find joy in caregiving at times		5-4-3-2-1
19	Caring for the individual sometimes uplifts and encourages me		5-4-3-2-1
20	Caring for the individual sometimes brings a sense of satisfaction		5-4-3-2-1
21	There are learning experiences through caregiving		5-4-3-2-1
22	I am providing care not out of a sense of obligation but because I genuinely want to		5-4-3-2-1
23	I feel happy when I see the person I am caring for enjoying something		5-4-3-2-1
24	Taking care of someone has given meaning to my life		5-4-3-2-1
25	I feel that the care recipient is grateful to me		5-4-3-2-1

26	My family and relatives understand my feelings, including the difficulty of caregiving		5-4-3-2-1
27	I can consult with healthcare and welfare professionals (care managers, doctors, etc.)		5-4-3-2-1
28	The preillness relationship with the care recipient was good		5-4-3-2-1
29	The current relationship with the care recipient is good		5-4-3-2-1
30	The family relationships with individuals other than the care recipient were good before the care recipient's illness		5-4-3-2-1
31	Currently, family relationships with individuals other than the care recipient are good		5-4-3-2-1
32	There are times when opinions clash with other family members or relatives regarding the caregiving approach ^a		1-2-3-4-5
33	Even when I feel angry, I can control my emotions		5-4-3-2-1
34	I can make time for hobbies, travel, and other leisure activities aside from caregiving		5-4-3-2-1
35	I find it challenging to balance caregiving and work ^a		1-2-3-4-5
36	find it challenging to balance caregiving and parenting ^a		1-2-3-4-5

37	I find it challenging to balance caregiving and household chores ^a		1-2-3-4-5
38	I have family members I can consult with	Always-Often-	5-4-3-2-1
39	I have relatives I can consult with	Neither always	5-4-3-2-1
40	I have friends or acquaintances I can consult with	nor rarely-	5-4-3-2-1
41	I have neighbors I can consult with	Rarely-Never	5-4-3-2-1
42	I am utilizing the necessary long-term care insurance services for the care recipient (day services, home nursing, short-stay, etc.)	Frequently-	5-4-3-2-1
43	I am utilizing the necessary community services for the care recipient (family meetings, dementia cafes, preventive care services, etc.)	Somewhat-	5-4-3-2-1
44	I collaborate with family members and share caregiving responsibilities	Neither	5-4-3-2-1
45	I consciously make an effort to take regular breaks and engage in activities to avoid caregiver fatigue	frequently nor rarely-Rarely- Never	5-4-3-2-1
	^a Reverse-coding items		

114

115 **Participants**

116 The survey targeted caregivers providing care for persons with MCI or
 117 mild-to-severe dementia for at least 25 min per day. The diagnosis of dementia was
 118 considered, even in cases where the specific type of dementia was unclear, but the caregiver

119 was informed by a medical professional about the presence of dementia symptoms. The
120 caregiving time criterion was based on the care required according to the Japanese Ministry
121 of Health, Labour and Welfare standards. Caregiving included both direct physical care and
122 supervision in daily life. Both cohabiting and noncohabiting caregivers were included.

123 **Instruments**

124 A questionnaire was administered to collect demographic information about
125 caregivers (age, gender, relationship with the care recipient, and education duration).
126 Previous studies have reported associations between education duration and caregiver grief
127 [21] and burden [22]. Thus, the education duration was included. Education duration was
128 categorized as “9 years or less,” “10–12 years” (up to high school graduation or equivalent),
129 and “13 years or more” (post-high school education). Additionally, in dementia caregiving,
130 depressive symptoms are frequently observed in caregivers [23]. Therefore, the Japanese
131 version of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) [24] was included
132 as a survey item to assess depressive symptoms. The CES-D is a self-rating scale for
133 depressive symptoms over the past week, comprising 20 items rated on a 4-point scale with a
134 total score of 60. A cutoff score of 16 or higher indicates stronger depressive symptoms.

135 Information about care recipients was collected, including age, gender, diagnosis,
136 and frequency of BPSD assessed using the Japanese version of the Dementia Behavior
137 Disturbance Scale short form (DBD-13) [25]. The DBD-13 consists of 13 items, each
138 assessing the frequency of BPSD over the past month on a 5-point scale. The total score is
139 52.

140 Additional caregiving situation information was collected, including the number
141 of cohabitants with the care recipient, daily caregiving time, duration since the diagnosis of
142 dementia, duration of caregiving, number of caregiving service utilizations, and presence of a
143 secondary caregiver. These survey items, along with the CCSD-P, were compiled into a

144 questionnaire.

145 **Procedures**

146 The survey was conducted in collaboration with the “Alzheimer’s Association
147 Japan” (AAJ), which has branches in all 47 prefectures. A total of 23 branches were
148 randomly selected, and the questionnaire was sent by mail to each branch. The distribution of
149 the questionnaire to each branch was determined based on the actual situation, ranging from 5
150 to 20 questionnaires. A selection criteria letter was enclosed, and the distribution of
151 questionnaires was determined by the branch executives, who then distributed them to the
152 eligible participants. A return envelope was also included, and collection was performed via
153 postal mail.

154 **Survey period**

155 The survey period, approved by the ethics committee, was from March 23, 2023,
156 to the questionnaire collection end date on December 31, 2023.

157 **Data analysis**

158 Ceiling and floor effects were checked to detect any response bias and to verify
159 the validity and reliability of the returned draft of the Caregiving Response Scale. Items
160 demonstrating ceiling or floor effects were subsequently eliminated.

161 Exploratory factor analysis was performed to elucidate the factor structure and
162 finalize the items for each factor. Items with communalities of less than 0.4 were eliminated
163 during exploratory factor analysis. After confirming that no items needed to be removed
164 based on communalities, promax rotation (maximum likelihood method) was performed.
165 Items with factor loading values below 0.4 were eliminated, and this process was iteratively
166 repeated until no removal targets remained. The interpretability of the factor items was
167 carefully examined to confirm the final factor structure. Additionally, items with factor

168 loading values of 0.35 or higher for a nonprimary factor were considered indicative of
169 ambiguity and marked for removal.

170 Confirmatory factor analysis was subsequently performed to assess the validity
171 of the factor structure obtained through exploratory factor analysis. Fit indices, namely, the
172 comparative fit index (CFI) and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), were
173 used as model fit indicators, with CFI of >0.90 indicating good fit, RMSEA of <0.05
174 indicating excellent fit, RMSEA of <0.08 indicating good fit, and RMSEA of <0.10
175 indicating acceptable fit [26].

176 For reliability assessment, Cronbach's α reliability coefficients were calculated
177 for the overall scale and each subscale to ensure internal consistency. Items with reliability
178 coefficients below 0.7 in the subscales were considered for potential removal [27].

179 **Ethical considerations**

180 This study was approved by the Kyoto Tachibana University Research Ethics
181 Committee (Approval Number: 22-60, Approval Date: March 23, 2023). Verbal and written
182 consent were obtained from the participating branches of the AAJ before data collection.
183 Participants were informed about the study purpose, personal information protection policy,
184 research participation details (emphasizing voluntariness and the absence of disadvantages
185 for nonparticipation), and other relevant information both orally and in writing. Consent was
186 considered granted upon the return of the questionnaire.

187

188 **Results**

189 A total of 259 questionnaires were distributed to the AAJ branches, of which 156
190 (recovery rate 60.2%) were collected. Of the 156 questionnaires collected, 6 were excluded
191 due to missing values or exclusion criteria. Finally, 150 participants were considered for the

192 analysis (effective recovery rate 57.9%).

193 **Basic information**

194 **Caregiver characteristics**

195 The average age of caregivers was 68.4 ± 9.5 years. Of the 150 caregivers, 55
 196 were males (36.6%), and 95 were females (63.3%). The caregiver relationship with the care
 197 recipient included husband (n = 47, 31.3%), wife (n = 45, 30.0%), son (n = 8, 5.3%),
 198 daughter (n = 35, 23.3%), son-in-law (n = 1, 0.7%), daughters-in-law (n = 8, 5.3%), brother
 199 (n = 1, 0.7%), sister (n = 3, 2.0%), and others (n = 2, 1.3%). Education duration was ≤ 9 years
 200 for 6 individuals (4%), 10–12 years for 54 (36.0%), and ≥ 13 years for 90 (60.0%). The
 201 average CES-D score was 20.6 ± 10.9 points, with 54 individuals (36.0%) scoring < 16 and 96
 202 (64.0%) scoring ≥ 16 (Table 2).

203 **Table 2. Basic information and attributes.**

	Mean \pm SD	Breakdown (%)	
Age of the primary family caregiver (min: 44; max: 86)	68.4 \pm 9.5	-	
Gender of the primary family caregiver	-	Male	55 (36.6%)
		Female	95 (63.3%)
Kinship (as perceived by the care recipient)	-	Husband	47 (31.3%)
		Wife	45 (30.0%)

		Son	8 (5.3%)
		Daughter	35 (23.3%)
		Son-in-law	1 (0.7%)
		Daughter-in-law	8 (5.3%)
		Brother	1 (0.7%)
		Sister	3 (2.0%)
		Others	2 (1.3%)
Education period		≤9	6 (4%)
		10–12	54 (36.0%)
		≥13	90 (60.0%)
CES-D (min: 0; max: 53)	20.6 ± 10.9	<16	54 (36.0%)
		≥16	96 (64.0%)
Age of the care recipient (min: 58; max: 104)	78.7 ± 10.3	-	
Gender of the care recipient		Male	59 (39.3%)
		Female	91 (60.7%)

Diagnosis		AD	73 (48.7%)
		VaD	9 (6.0%)
		LBD	9 (6.0%)
		FTD	4 (2.7%)
		YOD	19 (12.7%)
		Mixed	10 (6.7%)
		MCI	11 (7.3%)
		Unknown	15 (10.0%)
DBD-13 (min: 2; max: 43)	20.4 ± 10.2	-	
Family size including the care recipient (min: 1; max: 7)	2.3 ± 1.1	1 person	25 (16.7%)
		(one-person household)	
		2 people	76 (67.3%)
		3 people	37 (24.7%)
		4 people	6 (4.0%)
		5 people	2 (1.3%)

		6 people	3 (2.0%)
		7 people	1 (0.7%)
Care hours per day (min: 0.5; max: 15)	9.0 ± 6.0	-	
Duration since diagnosis of dementia (months) (min: 1; max: 216)	60.0 ± 51.3	-	
Duration of caregiving (months) (min: 1; max: 240)	56.7 ± 51.8	-	
Number of caregiving services utilized (min: 0; max: 5)	1.7 ± 0.9	-	
Presence of a secondary caregiver		Yes	63 (42.0%)
		No	87 (58.0%)

204 AD, Alzheimer’s disease; VaD, vascular dementia; LBD, Lewy body dementia; FTD,
 205 frontotemporal dementia; YOD, young-onset dementia; Mixed, mixed-type dementia; MCI,
 206 mild cognitive impairment.

207 **Care recipient characteristics**

208 The average age of care recipients was 78.7 ± 10.3 years. Among them, 59 were
 209 males (39.3%), and 91 were females (60.7%). Of the 150 care recipients, 73 (48.7%) were
 210 diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease (AD), 9 (6.0%) with vascular dementia, 9 (6.0%) with
 211 Lewy body dementia, 4 (2.7%) with frontotemporal dementia, 19 (12.7%) with young-onset
 212 dementia, 10 (6.7%) with mixed-type dementia, 11 (7.3%) with MCI, and 15 (10.0%) with
 213 unspecified type (diagnosed as dementia by a doctor without a specific diagnosis). The
 214 average DBD-13 score was 20.4 ± 10.2 points (Table 2).

215 **Care situation**

216 The average number of cohabitants for care recipients was 2.3 ± 1.1, and 25

217 (16.7%) care recipients were living alone. The average daily caregiving time was 9.0 ± 6.0 h,
218 the average time since dementia diagnosis was 60.0 ± 51.3 months, the average caregiving
219 duration was 56.7 ± 51.8 months, and the average number of services utilized was 1.7 ± 0.9 .
220 42.0% of the care recipients ($n = 63$) had secondary caregivers, whereas 58.0% ($n = 87$) did
221 not.

222 **Question items and ceiling/floor effects**

223 Table 2 shows the scores and ceiling/floor effects of the 45 items considered in
224 the CCSD-P. Items 4 and 5 showed floor effects, and item 42 showed a ceiling effect.
225 Therefore, these items were eliminated (Table 3).

226 **Table 3. Mean scores and ceiling/floor effects of the CCSD-P questionnaire items.**

	Items	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Ceiling	Floor
01	There are times when I feel restless	1	5	2.07	0.99	3.06	1.07
02	Sometimes I feel irritated when I am around the care recipient	1	5	2.49	1.10	3.60	1.39
03	There are times when I feel down because I cannot interact well with the person receiving care	1	5	2.66	1.16	3.82	1.50
04	I feel anxious about taking care of the person for an extended period in the future^a	1	5	2.11	1.29	3.40	0.82
05	I find myself troubled by the behaviors of the care recipient at times^a	1	5	2.11	1.31	3.42	0.80
06	Feeling stressed due to caregiving taking up time and having no personal time for oneself	1	5	2.58	1.09	3.67	1.49
07	Feeling financial burden such as caregiving expenses	1	5	2.98	1.28	4.26	1.70
08	Sometimes I feel that the caregiving I am doing is not rewarded	1	5	3.01	1.29	4.30	1.72
09	I want to elicit positive responses from the care recipient (such as facial expressions and reduced anxiety) through my caregiving	1	5	4.17	0.82	4.99	3.36
10	It is important to work toward enabling the care recipient to have new roles	1	5	3.82	1.07	4.89	2.75

11	I can gather information about the knowledge and skills you feel are lacking in your caregiving	1	5	3.81	0.88	4.69	2.93
12	I have knowledge about the illness called dementia	1	5	3.60	0.93	4.53	2.67
13	I have knowledge about the social resources (such as long-term care insurance services) necessary for individuals with dementia	1	5	3.49	0.99	4.49	2.50
14	I can evoke positive responses from the care recipient through verbal communication and caregiving	1	5	3.46	0.91	4.37	2.55
15	I can understand the care recipient's feelings of anxiety	1	5	3.50	0.88	4.38	2.62
16	I can respond flexibly to the care recipient's expressions and actions	1	5	3.34	0.94	4.28	2.40
17	I can provide care to the care recipient in a way that avoids causing discomfort	1	5	3.23	0.88	4.10	2.35
18	I find joy in caregiving at times	1	5	2.43	1.07	3.50	1.36
19	Caring for the individual sometimes uplifts and encourages me	1	5	2.84	1.15	3.99	1.69
20	Caring for the individual sometimes brings a sense of satisfaction	1	5	3.91	0.97	4.88	2.93
21	There are learning experiences through caregiving	1	5	3.01	1.11	4.12	1.91
22	I am providing care not out of a sense of obligation but because I genuinely want to	1	5	4.14	0.84	4.98	3.30

23	I feel happy when I see the person I am caring for enjoying something	1	5	2.74	0.75	3.49	2.00
24	Taking care of someone has given meaning to my life	1	5	3.18	1.14	4.32	2.04
25	I feel that the care recipient is grateful to me	1	5	3.37	1.12	4.49	2.25
26	My family and relatives understand my feelings, including the difficulty of caregiving	1	5	3.35	1.12	4.48	2.23
27	I can consult with healthcare and welfare professionals (care managers, doctors, etc.)	1	5	3.98	0.89	4.87	3.09
28	The preillness relationship with the care recipient was good	1	5	3.99	1.00	4.98	2.99
29	The current relationship with the care recipient is good	1	5	3.75	0.98	4.74	2.77
30	The family relationships with individuals other than the care recipient were good before the care recipient's illness	1	5	3.88	0.99	4.87	2.89
31	Currently, family relationships with individuals other than the care recipient are good	1	5	3.70	1.11	4.81	2.58
32	There are times when opinions clash with other family members or relatives regarding the caregiving approach	1	5	3.65	1.22	4.87	2.43
33	Even when I feel angry, I can control my emotions	1	5	3.15	1.12	4.28	2.03
34	I can make time for hobbies, travel, and other leisure activities aside from caregiving	1	5	3.27	1.22	4.49	2.05
35	I find it challenging to balance caregiving and work	1	5	2.83	0.83	3.66	2.00

36	find it challenging to balance caregiving and parenting	1	5	3.02	0.50	3.52	2.52
37	I find it challenging to balance caregiving and household chores	1	5	2.84	1.02	3.86	1.82
38	I have family members I can consult with	1	5	3.60	1.32	4.92	2.28
39	I have relatives I can consult with	1	5	3.11	1.39	4.51	1.72
40	I have friends or acquaintances I can consult with	1	5	3.61	1.29	4.90	2.32
41	I have neighbors I can consult with	1	5	2.77	1.37	4.14	1.41
42	I am utilizing the necessary long-term care insurance services for the care recipient (day services, home nursing, short-stay, etc.)^b	1	5	4.09	1.29	5.38	2.79
43	I am utilizing the necessary community services for the care recipient (family meetings, dementia cafes, preventive care services, etc.)	1	5	3.55	1.37	4.92	2.18
44	I collaborate with family members and share caregiving responsibilities	1	5	2.61	1.35	3.96	1.26
45	I consciously make an effort to take regular breaks and engage in activities to avoid caregiver fatigue	1	5	3.67	1.06	4.73	2.61
^a Items acknowledging floor effects.							
^b Items acknowledging ceiling effects.							

228 **Results of exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses**

229 Items 7, 9, 10, 21, 32, 35, 36, 37, 43, and 44 showed a commonality of less than
230 0.4 and were eliminated. Regarding the results of the scree plot, a five- or six-factor structure
231 was considered. Based on the criterion of factor loading 0.40 or higher, items with low
232 loading and those with ambiguity were eliminated. After repeated exploratory factor analysis,
233 27 items in the 5 factors were extracted. The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin value was 0.851, and
234 Bartlett’s sphericity test was significant at the 0.1% level, indicating that the scale has a
235 statistically valid structure. The five-factor structure extracted by exploratory factor analysis
236 was named “Positive Emotions and Awareness” for Factor 1, “Presence of Consultation
237 Partners and Family Support” for Factor 2, “Care Burden and Coping Skills” for Factor 3,
238 “Dementia Literacy” for Factor 4, and “Involvement and Emotion Control” for Factor 5
239 (Table 4 and Fig 1).

240

241 **Fig 1. Results of confirmatory factor analysis.** CFI = 0.905; RMSEA = 0.072.

242 **Table 4. Results of exploratory factor analysis (maximum likelihood method, promax rotation).**

			Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
			Positive Emotions and Awareness	Existence of Consultation Partners and Family Support	Care Burden and Coping Skills	Dementia Literacy	Involvement and Emotion Control
Overall Cronbach's α reliability coefficient for the scale ($\alpha = 0.892$)							
Factor 1 Positive Emotions and Awareness ($\alpha = 0.903$)							
20	Caring for the individual sometimes brings a sense of satisfaction		0.855	-0.107	0.221	0.148	-0.245

19	Caring for the individual sometimes uplifts and encourages me		0.774	-0.078	0.195	0.043	-0.098
24	Taking care of someone has given meaning to my life		0.771	0.027	-0.030	-0.041	0.039
23	I feel happy when I see the person I am caring for enjoying something		0.698	0.191	-0.107	-0.053	-0.156
29	The current relationship with the care recipient is good		0.665	0.113	-0.068	-0.064	0.217
25	I feel that the care recipient is grateful to me		0.659	0.129	-0.164	0.001	-0.005
18	I find joy in caregiving at times		0.640	-0.118	0.221	0.066	0.120
14	I can evoke positive responses from the care recipient through verbal communication and caregiving		0.565	0.014	-0.278	0.187	0.182
22	I am providing care not out of a sense of obligation but because I genuinely want to		0.564	-0.030	0.016	-0.056	0.222

Factor 2 Existence of Consultation Partners and Family Support ($\alpha = 0.802$)							
39	I have relatives I can consult with		-0.002	0.803	0.027	-0.072	0.011
41	I have neighbors I can consult with		0.043	0.684	-0.03 1	0.026	0.022
40	I have friends or acquaintances I can consult with		-0.003	0.614	-0.04 9	0.245	-0.076
38	I have family members I can consult with		0.006	0.611	0.234	-0.105	0.023
26	My family and relatives understand my feelings, including the difficulty of caregiving		0.016	0.513	0.134	0.065	-0.012
30	The family relationships with individuals other than the care recipient were good before the care recipient's illness		0.241	0.487	-0.10 6	-0.159	0.020
Factor 3 Care Burden and Coping Skills ($\alpha = 0.743$)							
6	Feeling stressed due to caregiving taking up time and having no personal time for oneself		-0.099	-0.046	0.807	-0.045	0.043

1	There are times when I feel restless		0.156	-0.011	0.607	-0.209	-0.038
34	I can make time for hobbies, travel, and other leisure activities aside from caregiving		-0.200	0.223	0.489	0.124	0.081
45	I consciously make an effort to take regular breaks and engage in activities to avoid caregiver fatigue		-0.071	0.279	0.470	0.181	-0.048
8	Sometimes I feel that the caregiving I am doing is not rewarded		0.299	0.016	0.453	-0.123	0.067
3	There are times when I feel down because I cannot interact well with the person receiving care		0.056	-0.041	0.409	0.114	0.230
Factor 4 Dementia Literacy ($\alpha = 0.782$)							
13	I have knowledge about the social resources (such as long-term care insurance services) necessary for individuals with dementia		-0.002	-0.027	0.106	0.832	0.029
12	I have knowledge about the illness called dementia		0.020	-0.019	0.002	0.779	0.036
11	I can gather information about the knowledge and skills you		0.054	0.041	-0.17	0.586	-0.009

	feel are lacking in your caregiving				8		
Factor 5 Involvement and Emotion Control ($\alpha = 0.783$)							
16	I can respond flexibly to the care recipient's expressions and actions		0.047	-0.024	0.003	0.139	0.738
17	I can provide care to the care recipient in a way that avoids causing discomfort		0.333	0.003	-0.04 4	-0.018	0.594
33	Even when I feel angry, I can control my emotions		0.041	0.024	0.237	-0.082	0.576
	Factor correlation	Factor 1	1.000	0.232	0.381	0.224	0.581
		Factor 2		1.000	0.141	0.275	0.222
		Factor 3			1.000	0.084	0.200
		Factor 4				1.000	0.399
		Factor 5					1.000
		Eigenvalues	7.8	2.9	2.5	2.0	1.1

	Cumulative contribution rate	27.1	35.7	43.2	48.3	51.4
Deleted items						
02	Sometimes I feel irritated when I am around the care recipient					
04	I feel anxious about taking care of the person for an extended period in the future					
05	I find myself troubled by the behaviors of the care recipient at times					
07	Feeling financial burden such as caregiving expenses					
09	I want to elicit positive responses from the care recipient (such as facial expressions and reduced anxiety) through my caregiving					
10	It is important to work toward enabling the care recipient to have new roles					
15	I can understand the care recipient's feelings of anxiety					
21	There are learning experiences through caregiving					

27	I can consult with healthcare and welfare professionals (care managers, doctors, etc.)	
28	The preillness relationship with the care recipient was good	
31	Currently, family relationships with individuals other than the care recipient are good	
32	There are times when opinions clash with other family members or relatives regarding the caregiving approach	
35	I find it challenging to balance caregiving and work	
36	find it challenging to balance caregiving and parenting	
37	I find it challenging to balance caregiving and household chores	
42	I am utilizing the necessary long-term care insurance services for the care recipient (day services, home nursing, short-stay, etc.)	
43	I am utilizing the necessary community services for the care	

	recipient (family meetings, dementia cafes, preventive care services, etc.)	
44	I collaborate with family members and share caregiving responsibilities	

244 Subsequently, in confirmatory factor analysis, the validity of the five-factor
245 model structure was confirmed with path coefficients of 0.4 or higher from each factor to the
246 observed variables. The model fit indices were CFI = 0.905 and RMSEA = 0.072, meeting
247 the criteria of CFI >0.90 (good), RMSEA of <0.05 (excellent), 0.08 (good), and 0.10
248 (acceptable).

249 **Internal consistency**

250 The internal consistency of each subscale was as follows: $\alpha = 0.903$ for Factor 1,
251 $\alpha = 0.802$ for Factor 2, $\alpha = 0.743$ for Factor 3, $\alpha = 0.781$ for Factor 4, $\alpha = 0.783$ for Factor 5,
252 and $\alpha = 0.892$ for the overall scale, all meeting the criteria (Table 4). Structural validity and
253 internal consistency were confirmed, and the CCSD was completed.

254

255 **Discussion**

256 **Basic information**

257 The characteristics and caregiving situations of the subjects in this study were
258 compared with those in a nationwide survey conducted in our country [20] to verify their
259 representativeness. The nationwide survey included 3,514 family caregivers, including 789
260 families after the patient's death. In the nationwide survey, the average age of caregivers was
261 62.4 ± 12.2 years; 946 were males (26.9%), and 2,533 were females (72.1%) (with 35
262 respondents not providing gender information) [20]. In the nationwide survey, among the
263 2,010 respondents (excluding those who did not respond or were postmortem caregivers),
264 caregiver relationship with the care recipient included spouse (41.6%), biological child
265 (42.5%), son/daughter-in-law (10.1%), sibling (1.1%), and "others" (5%) [20]. In
266 comparison, this study showed a higher average age of caregivers (68.4 ± 9.5 years), with
267 36.6% of the caregivers being males and 63.3% being females. The majority of caregivers

268 were spouses (61.3%), and biological children accounted for 28.3% (Table 1).

269 In the nationwide survey, the average age of the care recipients was 81.7 ± 8.7
270 years [20], which was slightly higher than that of the care recipients targeted in this study. In
271 the nationwide survey, the disease distribution included AD (65.1%), vascular dementia
272 (4.1%), Lewy body dementia (5.0%), frontotemporal dementia (4.2%), mixed-type dementia
273 (1.6%), MCI (1.5%), unknown (10.9%), and others (7.5%) [20]. In contrast, this study had
274 fewer AD cases (Table 1). In the nationwide survey, young-onset dementia was not
275 separately classified, and the AD category in that survey might have included younger-onset
276 cases. Therefore, the distribution of disease types in this study is similar to that of the
277 nationwide survey and within a standard range.

278 Regarding caregiving situations, the nationwide survey reported that 12.2% of
279 the care recipients were living alone [20], which was comparable to that reported in this study
280 (16.7%). In the nationwide survey, the duration since the diagnosis of dementia was $66 \pm$
281 52.8 months, whereas it was 60.0 ± 51.8 months in this study. Regarding the presence of
282 secondary caregivers, in the nationwide survey, among 1,291 respondents, 53.5% had a
283 secondary caregiver, and 36.0% did not [20]. In this study, 42.0% had a secondary caregiver,
284 and 58.0% did not. The higher percentage of “no secondary caregivers” in this study suggests
285 a higher burden on the primary caregiver.

286 In summary, this study, focusing on elderly caregiving cases where spouses are
287 often caregivers, showed a higher average age of caregivers. Although a direct comparison is
288 challenging because of differences in survey and aggregation methods, an overview of
289 overall attributes and caregiving situations suggests that this study does not significantly
290 deviate from standard data and is comparable to the nationwide survey.

291 **Structural validity and reliability**

292 Based on the exploratory factor analysis results, considering factors such as

293 Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin, cumulative contribution rate, Cronbach’s α reliability coefficient, and
294 factor loadings of each item, the model with 5 factors and 27 items was determined to be
295 valid. The confirmatory factor analysis results confirmed that this model adequately fits the
296 data obtained from the study participants.

297 Regarding reliability, Cronbach’s α reliability coefficient for the entire scale was
298 0.892, indicating internal consistency. Furthermore, all subscales met the criteria for internal
299 consistency.

300 **Characteristics of each factor**

301 **Factor 1: Positive emotions and awareness**

302 This factor comprises items related to positive emotions derived from caregiving
303 experiences, positive feelings toward the care recipient, and positive attitudes toward
304 caregiving. The concept of caregiving positivity has been extensively studied since the 1990s,
305 with a focus on caregiving satisfaction [28], meaning in caregiving [29], and self-growth
306 [30]. Furthermore, recent intervention studies have highlighted the importance of caregiving
307 well-being [31] and positive emotions [32,33]. Therefore, this factor was determined to be
308 valid for constituting caregiving competence.

309 **Factor 2: Existence of consultation partners and family support**

310 This factor includes items related to the existence of consultation partners,
311 psychological support from family in caregiving situations, and the relationship with family
312 from before the illness. Family functioning [34], the presence of secondary caregivers [35],
313 sharing issues with the community [19], and support from friends [36] have been reported to
314 be associated with caregiving burdens and can be crucial factors in continuing home care.
315 Sharing caregiving situations can strengthen family bonds [37], thus contributing to enhanced
316 caregiving competence.

317 **Factor 3: Care burden and coping skills**

318 This factor includes items related to caregiving-related psychological burdens
319 and coping strategies. Previous studies have consistently reported significant psychological
320 stress in dementia caregiving [38-41], and the correlation between the frequency of BPSD
321 expression and psychological stress has been well established [42-44]. Furthermore,
322 numerous studies have emphasized the importance of coping strategies for such stress
323 [45-48], and leisure activities and social interactions with friends have been suggested to play
324 a crucial role in reducing subjective caregiving burden [36]. Based on these findings, this
325 factor was determined to be a valid component in constituting caregiving competence.

326 **Factor 4: Dementia literacy**

327 This factor comprises items related to knowledge about dementia, caregiving,
328 and health literacy. In psychological education aimed at reducing BPSD [49], sessions
329 addressing knowledge about the disease [50,51] and caregiving [50,52] are considered
330 crucial. Health literacy is the ability to obtain and process information and services needed to
331 make health-related decisions [53]. Caregivers with high health literacy possess more
332 knowledge about dementia [54] and show a correlation with improved caregiving abilities
333 [55]. The convergence of knowledge about dementia and health literacy contributes to
334 caregiving competence, forming what we term “Dementia Literacy” [56].

335 **Factor 5: Involvement and emotion control**

336 This factor includes items related to involvement and emotional control in
337 dementia caregiving situations. These items inquire about subjective perceptions, such as “Do
338 you think you can handle it yourself?” Therefore, they can be interpreted in terms of
339 caregivers’ self-efficacy in dealing with persons with dementia and caregiving tasks.
340 Self-efficacy has an effect on coping strategies [57], and caregivers with stronger
341 self-efficacy can reduce their caregiving burden and enjoy a higher quality of life by taking

342 time for themselves [57,58]. Thus, this factor was considered an important component for
343 controlling caregiving situations and enhancing caregiving competence.

344

345 **Conclusion**

346 The structural validity and internal consistency of the CCSD were assessed, and a
347 finalized scale with 5 factors and 27 items that met established criteria was developed.
348 Measuring caregiving competence has the potential to aid in implementing strategies to
349 support caregivers and enable appropriate interventions.

350

351 **Author contributions**

352 Ippei Suganuma: Conceptualization, Funding Acquisition, Methodology, Project
353 Administration, Supervision, Visualization, Writing–Original Draft, Writing–Review &
354 Editing

355 Noriyuki Ogawa: Investigation, Resources

356 Kenji Kamijou: Investigation, Data Curation

357 Aki Nakanishi: Methodology

358 Ippei Kawasaki: Investigation

359 Keisuke Itotani: Visualization

360 Shinichi Okada: Formal Analysis, Methodology

361 **Funding**

362 This study was a part of the research project funded by Grants - in - Aid for Scientific
363 Research (C) of Japan Society for Promotion of Science: grants number JP 22K02052 from
364 2022 to 2024.

365 **Conflict of Interest**

366 There are no conflicts of interest to disclose in this study

367 **Acknowledgments**

368 We sincerely thank the facilities and family caregivers for their cooperation in collecting the
369 data for this study.

370 371 **References**

- 372 1. World Health Organization. 2023 Mar 15 [cited 2024 Feb 1]. In: Dementia. Available
373 from: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/dementia>.
- 374 2. Statistics Bureau of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications. 2022 Sep
375 17 [cited 2024 Feb 1]. In: Japan's Elderly Population from a Statistical Perspective—In
376 Commemoration of 'Respect for the Aged Day'. Available from:
377 <https://www.stat.go.jp/data/topics/topi1380.html>.
- 378 3. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. White Paper on Aging Society 2017.2018
379 [cited 2024 Feb 1]. In: Chapter 1: Situation of Aging (Section 2: Elderly People—
380 Current Status and Trends in their Environment) Available from:
381 https://www8.cao.go.jp/kourei/whitepaper/w-2017/html/gaiyou/s1_2_3.html.
- 382 4. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. 2017 [cited 2024 Feb 1]. In: Survey of
383 Household Economy, 2016: IV. Situation of Care. Available from:

- 384 <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/toukei/saikin/hw/k-tyosa/k-tyosa16/dl/05.pdf>.
- 385 5. Pinquart M, Sörensen S. Differences between caregivers and noncaregivers in
386 psychological health and physical health: a meta-analysis. *Psychol Aging*. 2003;18:
387 250-267. doi: [10.1037/0882-7974.18.2.250](https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.18.2.250).
- 388 6. Livingston G, Mahoney R, Regan C, Katona C. The caregivers for Alzheimer's
389 disease Problems Scale (CAPS): development of a new scale within the LASER-AD
390 study. *Age Ageing*. 2005;34: 287-290. doi: [10.1093/ageing/afi103](https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afi103).
- 391 7. Schulz R, O'Brien AT, Bookwala J, Fleissner K. Psychiatric and physical morbidity
392 effects of dementia caregiving: prevalence, correlates, and causes. *Gerontologist*.
393 1995;35: 771-791. doi: [10.1093/geront/35.6.771](https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/35.6.771).
- 394 8. Markowitz JS, Gutterman EM, Sadik K, Papadopoulos G. Health-related quality of
395 life for caregivers of patients with Alzheimer disease. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*.
396 2003;17: 209-214. doi: [10.1097/00002093-200310000-00003](https://doi.org/10.1097/00002093-200310000-00003).
- 397 9. Kim B, Noh GO, Kim K. Behavioural and psychological symptoms of dementia in
398 patients with Alzheimer's disease and family caregiver burden: a path analysis. *BMC*
399 *Geriatr*. 2021;21: 160. doi: [10.1186/s12877-021-02109-w](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-021-02109-w).
- 400 10. Alzheimer's Association. 2023 Alzheimer's disease facts and figures. *Alzheimers*
401 *Dem*. 2023;19: 1598-1695. doi: [10.1002/alz.13016](https://doi.org/10.1002/alz.13016).
- 402 11. Brodaty H, Hadzi-Pavlovic D. Psychosocial effects on carers of living with persons
403 with dementia. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry*. 1990;24: 351-361. doi:
404 [10.3109/00048679009077702](https://doi.org/10.3109/00048679009077702).
- 405 12. Gallicchio L, Siddiqi N, Langenberg P, Baumgarten M. Gender differences in burden
406 and depression among informal caregivers of demented elders in the community. *Int J*
407 *Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2002;17: 154-163. doi: [10.1002/gps.538](https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.538).
- 408 13. Schulz R, Williamson GM. A 2-year longitudinal study of depression among

- 409 Alzheimer's caregivers. Psychol Aging. 1991;6: 569-578. doi:
410 [10.1037//0882-7974.6.4.569](https://doi.org/10.1037//0882-7974.6.4.569).
- 411 14. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Manual for Family Caregiver Support by
412 Municipal Comprehensive Support Centers: Support for Caregivers' Life Journey.
413 2017 [cited 2024 Feb 1]. In: The Urgent Need for Advancing Support Policies and
414 Programs for Family Caregivers with a Fresh Perspective. Available from:
415 <chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/12300000/000307003.pdf>.
416
- 417 15. Folkman S, Moskowitz JT. Stress, positive emotion, and coping. Curr Dir Psychol
418 Sci. 2000;9: 115-118. doi: [10.1111/1467-8721.00073](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00073).
- 419 16. Fredrickson BL. What good are positive emotions? Rev Gen Psychol. 1998;2:
420 300-319. doi: [10.1037/1089-2680.2.3.300](https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.2.3.300).
- 421 17. Tugade MM, Fredrickson BL, Barrett LF. Psychological resilience and positive
422 emotional granularity: examining the benefits of positive emotions on coping and
423 health. J pers. 2004;72: 1161-1190. doi: [10.1111/j.1467-6494.2004.00294.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2004.00294.x).
- 424 18. Wu X. Main care-givers empowerment measurement (MCEM). J Jpn Acad Nurs Sci,
425 Chinese version. 2008;28: 3-13 (in Japanese).
- 426 19. Sakanashi S and Fujita K. Development of the empowerment scale for family
427 caregivers of community-dwelling people with dementia in Japan. Jpn J Nurs Sci.
428 2020;17: e12311. doi: [10.1111/jjns.12311](https://doi.org/10.1111/jjns.12311).
- 429 20. Suzuki M Survey on the Thoughts of Families of People with Dementia and the
430 Support They Receive: A Real-World Investigation. "Subsidy for the Promotion of
431 Elderly Health Project in the Fiscal Year 2021: Senior Health Promotion and Health
432 Enhancement Grant – ". In: Survey Results on Support for Families of per with
433 Dementia, Hara N, Inomata S, Shibuya M, Okura Y. Kyoto: Alzheimer's Association

- 434 Japan; 2022. pp. 26-67.
- 435 21. Liew TM, Tai BC, Yap P, Koh GC. Contrasting the risk factors of grief and burden in
436 caregivers of persons with dementia: multivariate analysis. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry*.
437 2019;34: 258-264. doi: [10.1002/gps.5014](https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.5014).
- 438 22. Rosdinom R, Zarina MZ, Zanariah MS, Marhani M and Suzaily W. Behavioural and
439 psychological symptoms of dementia, cognitive impairment and caregiver burden in
440 patients with dementia. *Prev Med*. 2013;57: S67-S69. doi:
441 [10.1016/j.ypmed.2012.12.025](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2012.12.025).
- 442 23. Watson B, Tatangelo G, McCabe M. Depression and anxiety among partner and
443 offspring carers of people with dementia: a systematic review. *Gerontologist*.
444 2019;59: e597-e610. doi: [10.1093/geront/gny049](https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gny049).
- 445 24. Shima S, Shikano T, Kitamura T, Asai M. New self-rating scales for depression New
446 depressive self-rating scale. *Clin Psychiatry*. 1985;27: 717-723. (in Japanese).
- 447 25. Furuta K, Tanaka T, Ogisawa F, Matsui H, Omori Y, Awata S. Study on equivalence
448 of the revised short-form version of Dementia Behavior Disturbance Scale. *Jpn J*.
449 2022;59: 384-387. (in Japanese).
- 450 26. Kline RB. Principles and practice of structural equation modeling, 2nd ed. New York:
451 Guilford Press; 2005.
- 452 27. Clark LA, Watson D. Constructing validity: basic issues in objective scale
453 development. *Psychol Assess*. 1995;7: 309-319. doi: [10.1037/1040-3590.7.3.309](https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.7.3.309).
- 454 28. Kramer BJ. Gain in the caregiving experience: where are we? What next?
455 *Gerontologist*. 1997;37: 218-232. doi: [10.1093/geront/37.2.218](https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/37.2.218).
- 456 29. Farran CJ, Keane-Hagerty E, Salloway S, Kupferer S, Wilken CS. Finding meaning:
457 an alternative paradigm for Alzheimer's disease family caregivers. *Gerontologist*.
458 1991;31: 483-489. doi: [10.1093/geront/31.4.483](https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/31.4.483).


- 459 30. Skaff MM, Pearlin LI. Caregiving: role engulfment and the loss of self. *Gerontologist*.
460 1992;32: 656-664. doi: [10.1093/geront/32.5.656](https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/32.5.656).
- 461 31. Gonçalves AC, Demain S, Samuel D, Marques A. Physical activity for people living
462 with dementia: carer outcomes and side effects from the perspectives of professionals
463 and family carers. *Aging Clin Exp Res*. 2021;33: 1267-1274. doi:
464 [10.1007/s40520-020-01636-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40520-020-01636-7).
- 465 32. Yoon HK, Kim GS. An empowerment program for family caregivers of people with
466 dementia. *Public Health Nurs*. 2020;37: 222-233. doi: [10.1111/phn.12690](https://doi.org/10.1111/phn.12690).
- 467 33. Suganuma I, Segawa D, Kamijou K, Okada S. Study of support for enhancing
468 empowerment of primary family caregiver who cares for elderly persons with
469 dementia: a pilot study of a psychoeducational intervention. *The Jpn J Occup Ther*.
470 2021;55: 1529-1535 (in Japanese).
- 471 34. Yu H, Wang X, He R, Liang R, Zhou L. Measuring the caregiver burden of caring for
472 community-residing people with Alzheimer's disease. *PLoS One*. 2015;10: e0132168.
473 doi: [10.1371/journal.pone.0132168](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0132168). eCollection.
- 474 35. Kim B, Kim JI, Na HR, Lee KS, Chae KH, Kim S. Factors influencing caregiver
475 burden by dementia severity based on an online database from Seoul dementia
476 management project in Korea. *BMC Geriatr*. 2021;21: 649. doi:
477 [10.1186/s12877-021-02613-z](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-021-02613-z).
- 478 36. Steinsheim G, Malmedal W, Follestad T, Olsen B, Saga S. Factors associated with
479 subjective burden among informal caregivers of home-dwelling people with
480 dementia: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Geriatr*. 2023;23: 644. doi:
481 [10.1186/s12877-023-04358-3](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-023-04358-3).
- 482 37. Uchiyama S, Tsukada N, Sakuraba T. The family support by family psycho education
483 based on EBP in community mental disabled facilities. *Kanto Gakuin Univ J Nurs*.

- 484 2015;2: 11-20.
- 485 38. Schoenmakers B, Buntinx F, Delepeleire J. Factors determining the impact of
486 care-giving on caregivers of elderly patients with dementia. A systematic literature
487 review. *Maturitas*. 2010;66: 191-200. doi: [10.1016/j.maturitas.2010.02.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.maturitas.2010.02.009).
- 488 39. Sheehan OC, Haley WE, Howard VJ, Huang J, Rhodes JD, Roth DL. Stress, burden,
489 and well-being in dementia and nondementia caregivers: insights from the caregiving
490 transitions study. *Gerontologist*. 2021;61: 670-679. doi: [10.1093/geront/gnaa108](https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnaa108).
- 491 40. American Association of Retired Persons. Caring for people with dementia:
492 Caregivers' experiences. 2018 Nov [cited 2024 Feb 1]. In: Caregivers Cite Emotions
493 and the Demands of Care as the Biggest Challenges of Caring for Someone with
494 Dementia. Available from:
495 https://www.aarp.org/content/dam/aarp/research/surveys_statistics/ltc/2018/caring-pe
496 [ople-dementia-survey.doi.10.26419-2Fres.00262.001.pdf](https://www.aarp.org/content/dam/aarp/research/surveys_statistics/ltc/2018/caring-pe-people-dementia-survey.doi.10.26419-2Fres.00262.001.pdf).
- 497 41. Goto Y, Morita K, Suematsu M, Imaizumi T and Suzuki Y. Caregiver burdens, health
498 risks, coping and interventions among caregivers of dementia patients: a review of the
499 literature. *Intern Med*. 2023;62: 3277-3282. doi: [10.2169/internalmedicine.0911-22](https://doi.org/10.2169/internalmedicine.0911-22).
- 500 42. de Vugt ME, Nicolson NA, Aalten P, Lousberg R, Jolle J, Verhey FRJ. Behavioral
501 problems in dementia patients and salivary cortisol patterns in caregivers. *J*
502 *Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci*. 2005;17: 201-207. doi: [10.1176/jnp.17.2.201](https://doi.org/10.1176/jnp.17.2.201).
- 503 43. Savla J, Roberto KA, Blieszner R, Cox M, Gwazdauskas F. Effects of daily stressors
504 on the psychological and biological well-being of spouses of persons with mild
505 cognitive impairment. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. 2011;66: 653-664. doi:
506 [10.1093/geronb/gbr041](https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbr041).
- 507 44. Savla J, Granger DA, Roberto KA, Davey A, Blieszner R, Gwazdauskas F. Cortisol,
508 alpha amylase, and daily stressors in spouses of persons with mild cognitive

- 509 impairment. Psychol Aging. 2013;28: 666-679. doi: [10.1037/a0032654](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032654).
- 510 45. Almborg B, Grafström M, Winblad B. Major strain and coping strategies as reported
511 by family members who care for aged demented relatives. J Adv Nurs. 1997;26:
512 683-691. doi: [10.1046/j.1365-2648.1997.00392.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.1997.00392.x).
- 513 46. Gilhooly KJ, Gilhooly ML, Sullivan MP, McIntyre A, Wilson L, Harding E, et al. A
514 meta-review of stress, coping and interventions in dementia and dementia caregiving.
515 BMC Geriatr. 2016;16: 106. doi: [10.1186/s12877-016-0280-8](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-016-0280-8).
- 516 47. Monteiro AMF, Santos RL, Kimura N, Baptista MAT, Dourado MCN. Coping
517 strategies among caregivers of people with Alzheimer disease: a systematic review.
518 Trends Psychiatry Psychother. 2018;40: 258-268. doi:
519 [10.1590/2237-6089-2017-0065](https://doi.org/10.1590/2237-6089-2017-0065).
- 520 48. Cooper C, Katona C, Orrell M, Livingston G. Coping strategies, anxiety and
521 depression in caregivers of people with Alzheimer's disease. Int J Geriatr Psychiatry.
522 2008;23: 929-936. doi: [10.1002/gps.2007](https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.2007).
- 523 49. Livingston G, Johnston K, Katona C, Paton J, Lyketsos CG and Old Age Task Force
524 of the World Federation of Biological Psychiatry. Systematic review of psychological
525 approaches to the management of neuropsychiatric symptoms of dementia. Am J
526 Psychiatry. 2005;162: 1996-2021. doi: [10.1176/appi.ajp.162.11.1996](https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.162.11.1996).
- 527 50. Llanque SM, Enriquez M, Cheng AL 3, Doty L, Brotto MA, Kelly PJ, et al. The
528 family series workshop: a community-based psychoeducational intervention. Am J
529 Alzheimers Dis Other Demen. 2015;30: 573-583.
- 530 51. Ponce CC, Ordonez TN, Lima-Silva TB, Dos Santos GD, Viola LF, Nunes PV, et al.
531 Effects of a psychoeducational intervention in family caregivers of people with
532 Alzheimer's disease. Dement Neuropsychol. 2011;5: 226-237. doi:
533 [10.1590/S1980-57642011DN05030011](https://doi.org/10.1590/S1980-57642011DN05030011).

- 534 52. Livingston G, Barber J, Rapaport P, Knapp M, Griffin M, King D, et al. Clinical
535 effectiveness of a manual based coping strategy programme (START, STrAtegies for
536 RelaTives) in promoting the mental health of carers of family members with
537 dementia: pragmatic randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2013;347: f6276. doi:
538 [10.1136/bmj.f6276](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.f6276).
- 539 53. Nielsen-Bohlman L, Panzer AM, Kindig DA, eds. Institute of Medicine (US)
540 committee on health literacy. Washington (DC): National Academies Press. US;
541 2004.
- 542 54. Crawley S, Moore K, Vickerstaff V, Fisher E, Cooper CI, Sampson EL. How do
543 factors of sociodemographic, health literacy and dementia experience influence carers'
544 knowledge of dementia? *Dementia (London)*. 2022;21: 1270-1288. doi:
545 [10.1177/14713012221074219](https://doi.org/10.1177/14713012221074219).
- 546 55. Li Y, Hu L, Mao X, Shen Y, Xue H, Hou P, et al. Health literacy, social support, and
547 care ability for caregivers of dementia patients: structural equation modeling. *Geriatr*
548 *Nurs*. 2020;41: 600-607. doi: [10.1016/j.gerinurse.2020.03.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gerinurse.2020.03.014).
- 549 56. Lo RY. Uncertainty and health literacy in dementia care. *Ci Ji Yi Xue Za Zhi*.
550 2020;32: 14-18. doi: [10.4103/tcmj.tcmj_116_19](https://doi.org/10.4103/tcmj.tcmj_116_19).
- 551 57. Gonyea JG, O'Connor M, Carruth A, Boyle PA. Subjective appraisal of Alzheimer's
552 disease caregiving: the role of self-efficacy and depressive symptoms in the
553 experience of burden. *Am J Alzheimers Dis Other Demen*. 2005;20: 273-280. doi:
554 [10.1177/153331750502000505](https://doi.org/10.1177/153331750502000505).
- 555 58. Coen RF, O'Boyle CA, Coakley D, Lawlor BA. Individual quality of life factors
556 distinguishing low-burden and high-burden caregivers of dementia patients. *Dement*
557 *Geriatr Cogn Disord*. 2002;13: 164-170. doi: [10.1159/000048648](https://doi.org/10.1159/000048648).

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.10.24304060>; this version posted March 13, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



Figure