

25 **Abstract**

26 **Background:** As a result of demographic change, a further increase in the number of
27 people in need of care in Germany can be expected in the future. Nursing activities
28 performed by family members are a central component of care provision. The assumption
29 of support services is increasingly associated with an additional physical and psychological
30 burden on informal caregivers. The aim of this study is to identify and characterize groups
31 of informal caregivers with regard to their well-being.

32 **Methodology:** The empirical study was based on a survey on home care in Saxony from
33 2019, which was intended as exploratory work to provide insights into the care situation in
34 Saxony. The central component is a two-step cluster analysis with exclusively informal
35 caregivers.

36 **Results:** The net sample size for the cluster analysis comprised 178 subjects who were
37 involved in caring for relatives. The cluster analysis revealed two groups of caregiving
38 relatives in Saxony, which were differentiated by a different experience of stress and
39 various sociodemographic factors.

40 **Discussion:** Informal caregivers in Saxony are not a homogeneous group. Depending on
41 various sociodemographic factors or the care effort and situation, they are confronted with
42 different challenges in caring for relatives, which are directly reflected in their well-being. In
43 order to achieve a targeted reduction in the burden on family caregivers, cooperation and
44 constructive collaboration between political decision-makers, care and health insurers, and
45 the various players in health and care provision is required.

46

47 **Keywords:** informal care; well-being; cluster analysis.

48

49 Introduction

50 Germany is in the middle of demographic change. This is characterized by a
51 decreasing number of young people and a simultaneous growth in the number of older
52 people [1]. The impact of demographic change varies from region to region. In a nationwide
53 comparison, the situation is more acute in Saxony. While the average age of the population
54 in many German states is between 42 and 45 years, the population living in Saxony is older
55 than average at 46.9 years [2].

56 One of the reasons for demographic change is the increasing life expectancy of the
57 population as a result of advances in medical care, hygiene, etc. [3]. According to the
58 results of the 2018 / 2020 mortality table, average life expectancy is currently 83.4 years
59 for newborn girls and 78.6 years for newborn boys, and has more than doubled in Germany
60 since statistical records began [3]. Increasing life expectancy does not correlate with better
61 health [4]. It increases the probability of the occurrence of multimorbidity, i.e., simultaneous
62 illness from two or more chronic diseases [5]. In view of the demographic development, a
63 further increase in the number of persons with age- and disease-related limitations can be
64 assumed in the future. Expressed in figures, this means for Saxony in 2021 a number of
65 persons in need of care according to SGB XI of more than 310,000 people, which means
66 an increase of 23.9% compared to 2019 [6].

67 Family caregivers are a central component of care provision in Germany. This group
68 includes family members or other people close to the person in need of care. In 2021, there
69 were 4.96 million people in need of care in Germany, of whom 4.17 million (84%) were
70 cared for at home and 790,000 (16%) in institutions [3]. Of the persons in need of care who
71 were cared for at home, 3.12 million were cared for primarily by relatives, without additional
72 outpatient services [3]. The assumption of care services by relatives not only represents
73 the preferred wish of persons in need of care, but also contributes to the maintenance of
74 the health and social system. However, as a result of the involvement of relatives in
75 caregiving activities, they are increasingly confronted with an additional physical as well as
76 psychological burden, which can promote the exposure of corresponding secondary

77 diseases [7; 8]. Supportive measures for the informal caregivers enable the maintenance
78 of the well-being as well as the health of the lay caregiver. For this reason, it is particularly
79 important to identify and characterize the groups of informal caregivers in more detail in
80 order to support the ability and willingness of caregiving relatives to take over home care
81 in a goal- and resource-oriented manner.

82 In Saxony, there are currently no representative survey data that provide reliable
83 information on the well-being of informal caregivers. The specific stresses in the various
84 caregiving situations are insufficiently taken into account. The aim of this work was to
85 identify the different views on well-being when taking over caregiving services from the
86 perspective of informal caregivers. On this basis, specific burdens of caring relatives in
87 different care situations can be better understood and highly stressed groups can be
88 characterized more closely. Health insurance funds and local authorities can use these
89 findings to design effective support services for highly stressed groups of family caregivers,
90 among others, in a target- and resource-oriented manner.

91

92 **Methodology**

93 The present, empirical study was based on a survey on home care in Saxony 2019
94 and was intended as exploratory work to provide insights into the care situation in Saxony
95 (population descriptive study). The survey, on which the dataset used is based, was
96 conducted from 1st June to 21st December 2019 as a cross-sectional study and sample
97 survey. The sample was drawn as active recruitment via the registration offices in the Free
98 State of Saxony. The random selection of the study units was not done directly from the
99 total population, but was collected as a stratified random sample according to the number
100 of inhabitants [9].

101 Data were collected using a scientific questionnaire with 68 items divided into five
102 categories, which was aimed at both informal caregivers and non-caregiver relatives. The
103 Burden Scale for Family Caregivers (BSFC) was used as the basis for a valid assessment
104 of well-being. As a scientific measuring instrument, the BSFC enables the subjective

105 burden of family caregivers to be determined. In order to determine differences in the well-
106 being of the participants, the German version, the Häusliche-Pflege-Skala (HPS), was
107 adapted [10]. Within the questionnaire, there was a filter question, allowing differentiation
108 between non-caring and caring relatives. The questionnaire was checked for completeness
109 and comprehensibility in a pretest by a questionnaire conference and adapted or improved
110 according to the weak points [9].

111 The questionnaire was made available in online or paper format. In compliance with
112 valid procurement and data protection regulations, invitation cards for the survey were sent
113 by mail to individuals from the cleaned reporting data set as part of commissioned data
114 processing. These contained the link to the survey as well as information on data protection,
115 anonymity and voluntariness, whereby the respondents had to agree in writing. In addition,
116 a hotline was set up for people who could not participate in the survey online. In order to
117 reach these persons nevertheless, the questionnaire was sent by post with a stamped
118 return envelope after a telephone request (n=599) [9].

119 The data analysis was carried out with the statistical software SPSS 29 and represented a
120 secondary analysis of a data set that was not self-collected [9]. The target group for the
121 cluster analysis was defined as persons of age who have cared for a relative, friend or
122 neighbor in their own home on an approximately weekly basis. A selection of variables was
123 made for the cluster analysis, which were eligible for the procedure and the pursuit of the
124 objective and research question. In the first step, the three reduction criteria for the
125 selection of variables included the inclusion of only informal caregivers on the basis of the
126 filter question in the questionnaire. Subsequently, the selection of variables was based on
127 the scientific work on highly stressed groups of caring relatives - results of a cluster analysis
128 by Bohnet-Joschko [11]. In order to establish comparability of the results, those variables
129 were left in the cluster model which were identical or had a high intersection compared to
130 the variable selection of Bohnet-Joschko. In the final step, variables were selected and
131 excluded from further analysis if they contained at least 25 percent missing values. In sum,

132 the final model for cluster analysis contained nine variables, with a total of 21 inputs (Table
133 1).

134

135 *Table 1. Overview of the cluster model and corrected scale levels.*

Category of questionnaire	Question	Variable
Sociodemographic background	51	own gender
	52	own year of birth
	55	own family status
Statements of informal carers	7	relationship to the person in need of care
	11	areas of restriction of the person in need of care
	12	duration of support for the person in need of care
	14	weekly amount of care required
General statements on the topic of care	49	own financial situation
	50	own well-being

136

137 Two-step cluster analysis was used as the cluster analytical method. The noise processing
138 for cluster analysis was set at 25 percent [12]. Since the cluster analysis was performed
139 using both categorical and continuous variables, the log-likelihood measure was used. The
140 maximum number of clusters was set at 15. Cluster differences for the well-being metric
141 variable were tested for significance. For this, we first had the skewness and kurtosis output
142 in SPSS and then performed the Shapiro-Wilk test [13]. The significance level for the
143 multivariate analyses was set at $p < .05$.

144

145 **Results**

146 All persons in the identified sample (N=24,018) were invited to participate in the survey. A
147 total of 1,700 valid questionnaires (online and paper versions) were available for evaluation
148 after data cleaning. The net response rate was 7.1449 percent (n=23,793) [14]. 1,297
149 questionnaires (76.3%) were completed online, and 403 paper questionnaires (23.7%)
150 were returned. To assess the representativeness of the sample, the number of inhabitants
151 in Saxony according to three age groups on December 31, 2019 was used as a reference
152 (n=2,460,993) [15]. The sample was representative according to the number of inhabitants

153 living in Saxony by age group and in this respect allows conclusions to be drawn about the
154 population living in Saxony [14] (Figure 1).

155

156 <Figure 1: Relative frequencies of participants divided according to age groups compared with the number of
157 inhabitants living in Saxony according to age groups (own representation).>

158

159 Of the total of 310 persons who had indicated that they had cared for a relative,
160 friend or neighbor in their home or in their own home on an approximately weekly basis in
161 the past twelve months, 128 cases were excluded from the further investigation process
162 because they had not answered at least one of the questions relevant to the model. The
163 net sample size for the cluster analysis thus comprised 178 subjects.

164 The proportion of women was 64.0 percent (Table 2). The age of the respondents
165 varied between 39 and 84 years ($\bar{x} = 64.02$ years (SD ± 0.618)). 80.3 percent lived in a
166 partnership and 5.1 percent were single. Regarding the relationship with the person in need
167 of assistance, the majority of respondents (57.9%) reported caring for their (mother-in-law)
168 or (father-in-law). 56.7 percent said they had been assisting the person in need of care for
169 one to six years. In this context, 36.0 percent indicated a weekly care effort of five to less
170 than ten hours and another 20.8 percent indicated an effort of ten to less than 20 hours.
171 With regard to the assessment of their own financial situation, 47.8 percent rated it as "I
172 can manage on the whole" and 29.2 percent as "I am well provided for and can afford quite
173 a bit."

174 Information such as "[I] don't know" or, in the case of the duration category, "There
175 is no care level" were considered missing values in SPSS and excluded from further cluster
176 processing.

177

178 **Groups of caregivers**

179 The cluster analysis resulted in two groups of caring relatives in Saxony, which are shown
180 in Table 2. The silhouette coefficient, for assessing cluster homogeneity, was in the

181 middle range with a value of 0.3. No normal distribution could be found for the variable of
182 well-being ($p < .001$). Due to the skewed distribution of values and the increased number
183 of outliers, the median was used for the evaluation of the variable of well-being. So-called
184 outliers can affect the average result. In contrast to the mean, these leave the median
185 unaffected [9].

186 *Table 2. Overview of clustering characteristics.*

Characteristics	Cluster		Total
	1 (42,7%)	2 (57,3%)	
Gender			
female	59,2%	67,6%	64,0%
male	40,8%	30,4%	34,8%
diverse	0,0%	2,0%	1,1%
Age			
18 to 25 years	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%
26 to 35 years	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%
36 to 45 years	5,3%	6,9%	6,2%
46 to 55 years	20,8%	30,4%	26,4%
56 to 65 years	34,1%	44,1%	40,0%
over 65 years	39,4%	19,0%	27,7%
Family status			
single	1,3%	7,8%	5,1%
married / living in partnership	86,6%	75,5%	80,3%
divorced / separated	2,6%	10,8%	7,3%
widowed	9,2%	5,9%	7,3%
Nature of the relationship			
Married partner/life partner	13,2%	18,6%	16,3%
Mother (in law) / father (in law)	60,5%	55,9%	57,9%
(In-law / godfather / foster) child	6,6%	8,8%	7,9%
Other relative (e.g. uncle / aunt, sister / brother, grandchild)	6,6%	4,9%	5,6%
Friend	1,3%	3,9%	2,8%
Neighbour	3,9%	1,0%	2,2%
Other	7,9%	6,9%	7,3%
Areas of limitation of the person in need of care			
physical	51,3%	45,1%	47,8%
cognitive / psychological	7,9%	7,8%	7,9%
both	40,8%	47,1%	44,4%
do not know	-	-	-
Duration			
under 1 year	21,1%	13,7%	16,9%
1 to under 3 years	31,6%	22,5%	26,4%
3 to under 6 years	30,3%	30,4%	30,3%
6 to under 9 years	7,9%	11,8%	10,1%
9 years and more	9,2%	21,6%	16,3%
There is no care level.	-	-	-

Characteristics	Cluster		Total
	1 (42,7%)	2 (57,3%)	
I do not know	-	-	-
Weekly maintenance effort			
under 5 hours	22,4%	11,8%	16,3%
5 to under 10 hours	44,7%	29,4%	36,0%
10 to under 20 hours	18,4%	22,5%	20,8%
20 to under 30 hours	9,2%	15,7%	12,9%
30 to under 40 hours	2,6%	8,8%	6,2%
40 hours and more	2,6%	11,8%	7,9%
Financial situation			
It's not enough at all.	1,3%	2,0%	1,7%
I just about manage to get by.	6,6%	27,5%	18,5%
On the whole, I manage.	32,9%	58,8%	47,8%
I am well provided for and can afford a lot.	52,6%	11,8%	29,2%
I don't have to restrict myself in any way.	6,6%	0,0%	2,8%
Own well-being in the last four weeks - median figure			
I have enough time for my own interests and needs.	3	2	3
I often feel physically exhausted.	2	3	3
Every now and then I have the desire to "break out" of my situation.	2	3	2
I can be happy from the heart.	4	3	3
I sometimes no longer really feel like myself.	1	3	2
My standard of living has decreased in recent years.	1	2,5	2
I sometimes feel taken advantage of by people I support.	1	2	1
My current tasks take a lot of my own energy.	2	3	3
I feel "torn" between the different demands of my environment (e.g. work, family, care).	2	3	3
I have the feeling that I have everything "under control".	3	2	3
Because of my current tasks, my relationship with family members, relatives, friends and acquaintances suffers.	1	3	2
The fate of sick people around me makes me sad.	3	3	3
I get recognition / gratitude through my achievements.	3	3	3

187 Note. 1 – not true; 2 – little true; 3 – mostly true; 4 – true exactly.

188

189 **Cluster 1: low assistance, good financial situation, high well-being.**

190 Cluster 1 was assigned 42.7 percent (n=76) of informal caregivers (Table 2). The mean
191 age of this group was 62.12 years (SD ± 1.076). The percentage of age, over 65 years old
192 in this group was the highest (39.4 percent) and also included the highest percentage of
193 men (40.8%). It is also characteristic that 86.6% of the informal caregivers in this group
194 were married or living in a partnership.

195 The cluster is characterized by low participation of family caregivers in support
196 activities. The majority (67.1%) of respondents devoted less than ten hours per week to

197 family caregiving. About half of the respondents (52.7%) had been involved in caregiving
198 for less than three years. With regard to the assessment of their own financial situation, the
199 cluster had the highest percentages for the statements "I am well provided for and can
200 afford quite a bit" (52.6%) and "I do not have to limit myself in any way" (6.6%). With regard
201 to the experience of stress or well-being, the respondents showed a low level of stress
202 (Figure 2). In all three questions, which according to the BSFC are formulated in terms of
203 a positive sense of well-being, the highest levels of agreement were found in this group.
204 These include "I have enough time for my own interests and needs" ($\bar{x} = 3$ (mostly true)),
205 "I can be happy from the bottom of my heart" ($\bar{x} = 4$ (true exactly)) and "I feel I have
206 everything under control" ($\bar{x} = 3$ (mostly true)).

207 At 51.3%, the majority of persons in need of assistance in this group had disabilities
208 in the physical sphere. Relatives in need of assistance mostly included (in-)law mother or
209 (in-)law father (60.5%) as well as other relatives or other close persons (7.9%).

210

211 **Cluster 2: intensive assistance, solid to weak financial situation, low well-being.**

212 Cluster 2 included 57.3% (n=102) of family caregivers (Table 2). The group included
213 the highest proportion of women (67.6%). The mean age in this cluster was 58.90 years
214 (SD \pm 0.884). Again, the majority (75.5%) of respondents reported living in a partnership or
215 being married. Compared to cluster 1, the proportion of single (7.8%) or separated or
216 divorced persons (10.8%) is significantly higher.

217 Cluster 2 is characterized by a high level of participation in support activities by
218 informal caregivers. Of the participants, 42.2 percent indicated a duration of three to less
219 than nine years in relation to the question of how long they have been helping the person
220 being cared for. Another 21.6 percent indicated a duration of nine years or more. With
221 regard to the weekly care effort expended in the process, compared to cluster 1, the
222 respondents in this group consistently showed the highest values from ten hours per week.

223 Here, 11.8 percent of respondents stated that they invested 40 hours or more per week in
224 support activities for the person in need of assistance.

225 Considering their financial situation, the majority of respondents stated "By and
226 large, I get by" (58.8%). A further 27.5% answered with "I just about get by". With regard to
227 the assessment of the personal experience of stress or well-being in the past four weeks,
228 the respondents showed an increased level of stress (Figure 2). The respondents
229 belonging to cluster 2 always showed the highest agreement values for items that are
230 formulated in terms of a high stress experience.

231 Only the two statements "The situation of sick people in my environment makes me
232 sad" and "My achievements give me recognition/gratitude" did not differ in the two clusters.
233 Both groups indicated a median agreement level of "mostly true".

234 Also in cluster 2, the majority (55.9%) of respondents supported the (in-law) mother
235 or (in-law) father. When asked in which areas the person to be supported had limitations,
236 45.1% indicated physical limitations and another 47.1% indicated both physical and
237 cognitive/mental impairments.

238

239 <Figure 2. Respondents' assessment of their personal experience of stress or well-being (n=178)..>

240

241 Discussion

242 The aim of this study was to identify and characterize the different views on well-
243 being when taking over nursing services from the perspective of family caregivers. Based
244 on the results of the cluster analysis, two groups of caregiving relatives in Saxony could be
245 identified. The increasing duration and time spent on caring for relatives and the negative
246 trend in the financial situation of informal caregivers are accompanied by an increased
247 experience of stress and a rather low sense of well-being.

248 In line with the publication by Oltmanns et al. 2016, a positive assessment of one's
249 own financial situation has a positive effect on subjective well-being [16]. Reconciling care

250 and work often involves conflicts and difficulties. Worrying about one's own liquid situation
251 can put additional strain on employed informal caregivers, especially in a full-time
252 employment relationship [11]. According to Bohnet-Joschko's findings, gainful employment
253 can mitigate the negative effects of caregiving and should be maintained if possible. In
254 addition, gainful employment is often reduced due to caregiving in order to be able to
255 provide more extensive care for the relative [17]. It is therefore advisable to further support
256 working relatives in organizing care services and to develop relief programs.

257 Gratitude and empathy are of great importance in informal care and in care in
258 general. There is consistent evidence in the literature of a positive relationship between
259 self-compassion, as a personal resource, and subjective well-being [18]. If the state of
260 health makes relatives increasingly sad, this can reduce the well-being of informal
261 caregivers. On the other hand, a high level of recognition and gratitude, which informal
262 caregivers receive for their services from the persons in need of help, contributes to an
263 increased creative power and conditions an increased sense of well-being [18].

264 As the person in need of care becomes more restricted, the caregiving activities
265 become more complex, more extensive and require more time. As a result, the emotional
266 and psychological burden on the family caregiver increases in addition to the physical
267 burden, and they more often feel overwhelmed (cluster 2) [7]. The described physical and
268 psychological burden can be less and less coped with as the age of the family caregiver
269 increases. With retirement age, the proportion of those who support others decreases [17].
270 However, at older ages (80 years and older), the proportion of caregiving tasks to support
271 provided increases. If people of this age provide help and support to others, it is largely in
272 the form of caregiving activities. Associated with this, the amount of time spent providing
273 assistance also increases with age [19]. The results of the present study reflect this, among
274 other things. While the respondents in cluster 1, who were less involved in caring for their
275 relative, had more than twice the proportion of people over 65, the proportions in the age
276 groups below this in cluster 2 were always the highest.

277 In accordance with the Bohnet-Joschko cluster analysis, the research results show
278 that informal caregivers who are heavily involved in the care of the relative tend to
279 experience a high level of stress (cluster 2) [11]. A similar picture emerges with regard to
280 the areas of restriction of the person in need of care. Accordingly, relatives who provide
281 support services such as personal hygiene, nutrition and mobility for persons with physical
282 limitations tend to experience high physical stress. High physical strain can lead to physical
283 health problems among informal caregivers themselves [7]. Thus, behind the health effects
284 of home care is the danger that family caregivers themselves become patients. They are
285 also referred to as hidden patients or second victims [3]. In this context, respondents in
286 cluster 1 showed the highest proportion of support in the physical area. The respondents
287 in cluster 2, on the other hand, recorded the highest proportion in the assumption of care
288 activities, with both physical and mental limitations. When caring for relatives with mental
289 limitations, the informal caregiver may experience increased stress and emotional pressure
290 due to social isolation and constant availability [11]. Despite the differences, the two
291 clusters are relatively homogeneous with respect to the domains of limitations. Preventive
292 measures, such as the early teaching of knowledge about the activities as well as back-
293 and joint-friendly working methods when taking over basic care services, can prevent
294 potential damage to the health of informal caregivers. For family caregivers, who are
295 particularly exposed to emotional and psychological pressure, information materials and
296 practical aids can offer the opportunity to have more time for themselves and to engage in
297 compensatory activities [11].

298 When indicating the relationship of the person to be cared for, with regard to the answer
299 option "(mother-in-law) / (father-in-law)", the proportion was over half in both clusters. Due
300 to the proximity to the person in need of help, the care situation is often emotionally stressful
301 for the adult children [7]. Self-help groups or networks of informal caregivers with similar
302 fates can provide effective support in this regard, offering mutual exchange and support.

303

304 **Limitation**

305 With regard to the data collection date in 2019, it should be noted that this was
306 before the Covid-19 pandemic. In addition, there is the general increase in prices as a result
307 of inflation. Due to these multiple pressures, psychological as well as monetary, cluster
308 solutions may have shifted somewhat. Future research could look more closely at and
309 incorporate such a potential difference based on this foundational work.

310 In accordance with the objective and research question of this study, a selection of
311 variables was made for the cluster analysis. One selection criterion was to exclude
312 variables from further analysis that contained more than 25 percent missing values. If
313 questions were left unanswered by the subjects, all of the subject's answers were omitted
314 for the cluster algorithm and he or she was automatically excluded from the clustering. The
315 25 percent criterion was intended to ensure that the sample size for clustering was not
316 disproportionately reduced due to a variable with numerous missing values, which could
317 have caused further bias in the study results. In addition to variable selection, only informal
318 caregivers were selected for cluster analysis. 82.0 percent of the original sample was thus
319 excluded from further consideration against this background.

320 The silhouette coefficient in the present study was 0.3, indicating mediocre model
321 quality, according to Kaufman and Rousseeuw [20]. A mediocre classification corresponds
322 to a weak indication of cluster structure, according to the study by Kaufman and
323 Rousseeuw, on which the classification in SPSS is based [20]. However, in order to pursue
324 the objective and research question, it was important to include the listed variables in the
325 cluster analysis.

326 Cluster analyses allow for the basic desire of people to group objects, facts, etc. into
327 homogeneous groups in order to bring order into a previously confusing situation. It should
328 be noted here that the various generalizing cluster solutions should, however, only be used
329 in an advisory capacity. Information and services should continue to be tailored to the most
330 individual situation possible for family caregivers.

331

332 **Conclusion**

333 The research results show that informal caregivers in Saxony are not a
334 homogeneous group. They are confronted with different challenges in caring for relatives,
335 depending on their age, financial situation, care effort and situation. The differentiated level
336 of challenges in the activities, the scope and the individual background of the family
337 caregiver are directly reflected in their well-being and stress experience.

338 In order to achieve targeted burden reduction for family caregivers, cooperation
339 and constructive collaboration between political decision-makers at the macro level, care
340 and health insurance funds at the meso level and, last but not least, the various actors in
341 health and care provision at the micro level is required. Only if these levels are interlinked
342 and typologies, such as the presented research results from, for example, nursing and
343 health science, are used as an empirical knowledge base, can targeted measures to
344 reduce the burden on informal carers be pursued further in the future.

345

346 **References**

- 347 [1] Bevölkerung nach relevanten Altersgruppen 2021. Statista. Retrieved 5 May 2023, from
348 [https://de.statista.com/statistik/daten/studie/1365/umfrage/bevoelkerung-](https://de.statista.com/statistik/daten/studie/1365/umfrage/bevoelkerung-deutschlands-nach-altersgruppen/)
349 [deutschlands-nach-altersgruppen/](https://de.statista.com/statistik/daten/studie/1365/umfrage/bevoelkerung-deutschlands-nach-altersgruppen/)
- 350 [2] Keller, S. (2021). Durchschnittsalter der Bevölkerung in Deutschland nach
351 Bundesländern 2021. Retrieved 6 May 2023, from
352 [https://de.statista.com/statistik/daten/studie/1093993/umfrage/durchschnittsalter-](https://de.statista.com/statistik/daten/studie/1093993/umfrage/durchschnittsalter-der-bevoelkerung-in-deutschland-nach-bundeslaendern/)
353 [der-bevoelkerung-in-deutschland-nach-bundeslaendern/](https://de.statista.com/statistik/daten/studie/1093993/umfrage/durchschnittsalter-der-bevoelkerung-in-deutschland-nach-bundeslaendern/)
- 354 [3] Demografischer Wandel. (o. D.). Statistisches Bundesamt. Retrieved 6 May 2023, from
355 [https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Querschnitt/Demografischer-](https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Querschnitt/Demografischer-Wandel/_inhalt.html;jsessionid=4AD17CFFFE956AF4F28E241E88F14901.interne)
356 [Wandel/_inhalt.html;jsessionid=4AD17CFFFE956AF4F28E241E88F14901.interne](https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Querschnitt/Demografischer-Wandel/_inhalt.html;jsessionid=4AD17CFFFE956AF4F28E241E88F14901.interne)
357 [t8732# sprg239000](https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Querschnitt/Demografischer-Wandel/_inhalt.html;jsessionid=4AD17CFFFE956AF4F28E241E88F14901.interne)
- 358 [4] Sohn, M. (2019, 7. Januar). WHO-Report 2018: Die Europäer werden zwar immer älter,
359 aber nicht gesünder - BVPG. Retrieved 6 May 2023, from
360 <https://bvpraevention.de/cms/index.asp?inst=newbv&snr=12499>

- 361 [5] Robert Koch-Institut (Hrsg) (2016) Gesundheit in Deutschland – die wichtigsten
362 Entwicklungen. Gesundheitsberichterstattung des Bundes. Gemeinsam getragen
363 von RKI und Destatis. RKI, Berlin. <https://doi.org/10.17886/rki-gbe-2016-021.2>
- 364 [6] Sächsisches Staatsministerium für Soziales und Gesellschaftlichen Zusammenhalt,
365 2021. Pflegebedürftige. Retrieved 6 May 2023, from
366 <https://www.statistik.sachsen.de/html/pflegebeduerftige.html>
- 367 [7] Posch-Eliskases, U., Rungg, C., Moosbrugger, M. & Perkhofer, S. (2014). Stress bei
368 pflegenden Angehörigen. Heilberufescience, 6(1), 27–32.
369 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s16024-014-0234-z>
- 370 [8] UNECE Working Group on Ageing (2019). Die schwierige Rolle informeller
371 Pflegepersonen. Retrieved 6 May 2023, from
372 [https://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/pau/age/Policy_briefs/German/ECE-WG1-](https://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/pau/age/Policy_briefs/German/ECE-WG1-31-GER.pdf)
373 [31- GER.pdf](https://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/pau/age/Policy_briefs/German/ECE-WG1-31-GER.pdf)
- 374 [9] Döring, N., Bortz, J., Pöschl, S., Werner, C. S., Schermelleh-Engel, K., Gerhard, C. &
375 Gäde, J. C. (2015). Forschungsmethoden und Evaluation in den Sozial- und
376 Humanwissenschaften (Springer-Lehrbuch) (5. Aufl.). Springer. ISBN: 978-3-642-
377 41089- 5
- 378 [10] Graessel, E., Berth, H., Lichte, T. et al. Subjektive Betreuungsbelastung: Gültigkeit der
379 10-Punkte-Kurzversion der Belastungsskala für Familienbetreuer BSFC-s. BMC
380 Geriatr 14, 23 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2318-14-23>
- 381 [11] Bohnet-Joschko, B. (2021). Hochbelastete Gruppen pflegender Angehöriger –
382 Ergebnisse einer Clusteranalyse. Thieme - Das Gesundheitswesen. DOI
383 [10.1055/a-1378-8897](https://doi.org/10.1055/a-1378-8897)
- 384 [12] Janssen, J. & Laatz, W. (2013). Statistische Datenanalyse mit SPSS. In Springer
385 eBooks. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-32507-6>
- 386 [13] Backhaus, K., Erichson, B., Plinke, W. & Weiber, R. (2015). Multivariate
387 Analysemethoden: Eine anwendungsorientierte Einführung. Springer Gabler. ISBN:
388 978- 3-662-46075-7

- 389 [14] Stadtmüller, S. (2009). Rücklauf gut, alles gut? Zu erwünschten Effekten monetärer
390 Anreize bei postalischen Befragungen. *Methoden, Daten, Analysen (mda)*, 3 (2),
391 167-185. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-127169>
- 392 [15] Turulski, A. (2023). Bevölkerung in Sachsen nach Altersgruppen 2021. Retrieved 6
393 May 2023, from
394 [https://de.statista.com/statistik/daten/studie/1096075/umfrage/bevoelkerung-in-](https://de.statista.com/statistik/daten/studie/1096075/umfrage/bevoelkerung-in-sachsen-nach-altersgruppen/#professional)
395 [sachsen-nach-altersgruppen/#professional](https://de.statista.com/statistik/daten/studie/1096075/umfrage/bevoelkerung-in-sachsen-nach-altersgruppen/#professional)
- 396 [16] Oltmanns, E. (2016). Einflussfaktoren des subjektiven Wohlbefindens: Empirische
397 Ergebnisse für Deutschland. *WISTA – Wirtschaft und Statistik*, 1010200-16003–4.
398 Retrieved 6 May 2023, from [https://www.destatis.de/DE/Methoden/WISTA-](https://www.destatis.de/DE/Methoden/WISTA-Wirtschaft-und-Statistik/2016/03/einflussfaktoren-wohlbefinden-032016.pdf?__blob=publicationFile)
399 [Wirtschaft-](https://www.destatis.de/DE/Methoden/WISTA-Wirtschaft-und-Statistik/2016/03/einflussfaktoren-wohlbefinden-032016.pdf?__blob=publicationFile) und-Statistik/2016/03/einflussfaktoren-wohlbefinden-
400 [032016.pdf?__blob=publicationFile](https://www.destatis.de/DE/Methoden/WISTA-Wirtschaft-und-Statistik/2016/03/einflussfaktoren-wohlbefinden-032016.pdf?__blob=publicationFile)
- 401 [17] Nowossadeck, S., Engstler, H., & Klaus, D. (2016). Pflege und Unterstützung durch
402 Angehörige. (Report Altersdaten, 1/2016). Berlin: Deutsches Zentrum für
403 Altersfragen. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-47091-5>
- 404 [18] McDonald, M. A., Meckes, S. J. & Lancaster, C. L. (2021). Compassion for Oneself
405 and Others Protects the Mental Health of First Responders. *Mindfulness*, 12(3),
406 659–671. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-020-01527-y>
- 407 [19] Schaal, T. (2023). Pflegesituationen in Sachsen – eine Untersuchung zu Bedarfen,
408 Angeboten und Zugangsbarrieren. [https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:bsz:14-](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:bsz:14-qucosa2-847255)
409 [qucosa2-847255](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:bsz:14-qucosa2-847255)
- 410 [20] Gentle, J. E., Kaufman, L. & Rousseuw, P. (1991). Finding Groups in Data: An
411 Introduction to Cluster Analysis. *Biometrics*, 47(2), 788.
412 <https://doi.org/10.2307/2532178>





Figure 1



A – I have enough time for my own interests and needs.

H – My current tasks cost a lot of my own strength.

B – I often feel physically exhausted.

I – I feel "torn" between the different demands of my environment (e.g. work, family, care).

C – Every now and then I have the desire to "break out" of my situation.

J – I have the feeling that I have everything "under control".

D – I can rejoice with all my heart.

K – Due to my current duties, my relationship with family members, relatives, friends and acquaintances is suffering.

E – Sometimes I don't really feel like myself any more.

L – The fate of sick people around me makes me sad.

Q – My standard of living has decreased in recent years.

M – I get recognition / gratitude through my achievements.

G – I sometimes feel taken advantage of by people I support.

Figure 2