

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Judgements about carer assessments for carers of people with dementia: case vignette study

[Dementia carer assessments case vignette study]

Paul Clarkson ^{1*}, Lucie Mills ², Asif Butt ³, Baber Malik ¹, Ruth Eley ⁴, Cecilia Toole ⁵,
Caroline Sanders ⁶, Ian Sheriff ⁷

¹ Social Care and Society, Division of Nursing, Midwifery and Social Work, University of Manchester, UK

² Division of Nursing, Midwifery and Social Work, University of Manchester, UK

³ Huntley Mount Medical Centre, Bury, Greater Manchester, UK

⁴ Together in Dementia Everyday (TIDE), Liverpool, UK

⁵ Sight and Mind CIC, Knowsley, Merseyside, UK

⁶ Centre for Primary Care, Division of Population Health, Health Services Research and Primary Care, University of Manchester, UK

⁷ Peninsula Medical School, Faculty of Health, University of Plymouth, Plymouth, UK

* Corresponding author

E-mail: paul.clarkson@manchester.ac.uk (PC)

24

25 **Abstract**

26 **Objectives**

27 UK carer assessments, in primary and social care, intend to discover what carers need in their caring
28 roles and more widely. Evidence points to these not being configured sufficiently around carers of
29 people with dementia, with potentially their breadth of needs not being recognised. We evaluated
30 the extent of agreement, between carers of people with dementia, primary care, and social care
31 professionals, on their recommendations from assessing carers' needs in a range of circumstances.
32 It is intended for findings to be taken forward as recommendations for policy and practice.

33 **Methods**

34 Comparison of judgements, between carers, primary and social care professionals, on whether real-
35 life circumstances in 9 anonymised case vignettes necessitated a range of 14 services to support
36 carers appropriately. Participants were 6 carers of people with dementia, 7 primary care staff, and 2
37 social care staff. We presented participants with each vignette and asked them to make binary
38 judgements of whether they would recommend a range of services in each case. Percentage
39 agreement and Fleiss' kappa coefficients measured the level of agreement amongst multiple carers,
40 primary and social care staff and overall. These agreements were then compared.

41 **Results**

42 Carers agreed in their judgements more than primary or social care professionals. The overall level
43 of agreement from judgements made by all participants, however, was 'slight' with variability
44 between participant groups and overall. The need for First Language Support in some cases was
45 recognised, an improvement from previous evidence.

46 **Conclusions**

47 Case vignettes are useful for investigating judgements concerning these carers' needs, so raising
48 issues for policy and practice. It is essential for carer assessments to be more reliable in
49 recommending services based on need to ensure less variability, depending on assessor and carers
50 circumstances.

51

52

53 **Introduction**

54 Over 670,000 people (UK) are primary, unpaid carers for people with dementia [1]. Carer
55 assessments are a formal mechanism for identifying what carers need and require in their caring
56 roles and more widely. In social care, these assessments are a legal duty, [2] and in primary care are
57 tied to incentives and are more discretionary, often linked to health checks and signposting by
58 general practices [3].

59 These assessments are not specific to carers of people with dementia, although their early effects
60 for this group of carers, before current legislation under the 2014 Care Act, were evidenced [4].
61 Evidence points to these assessments not being configured sufficiently around carers of people with
62 dementia, with potentially their breadth of needs not being recognised. More recent evidence
63 points to these carers often not receiving an assessment, despite this being mandated, with often
64 carers not seeing these assessments as valuable [5]. Although carer assessments are a requirement,
65 their content and the types of needs judged important for those carers of people with dementia are
66 variable and often not recognised.

67 The experiences of two groups of carers of people with dementia are of note. Those carers from
68 south Asian backgrounds report that the multiplicity of informal carer networks and the distinct
69 needs of second-generation carers are not recognised or neglected [6]. Carers of people living with

70 young onset dementia have distinct needs, which also tend not to be recognised, including impact
71 on relationships, financial implications, and a sense of loss [7].

72 As part of a wider study, we aimed to examine whether the needs and preferences of carers of
73 people with dementia were potentially covered sufficiently in these assessments. We aimed to
74 evaluate the extent of agreement, between carers of people with dementia, primary care, and social
75 care professionals, on their recommendations from assessing carers' needs in a range of
76 circumstances. We used case vignettes, relatively short accounts describing realistic carer's
77 situations, as a method to identify how different groups of raters assessed identical scenarios.

78

79 **Material and Methods**

80 **Design**

81 Nine detailed case vignettes of anonymised real-life cases of carers' circumstances were designed
82 and used. These vignettes were created to express a range of situations that carers may be in as
83 they interfaced with health and social care systems. The vignettes were given to participants
84 belonging to three groups: carers of people with dementia, primary care staff, and social care staff.
85 Participants were approached, respectively, through national and local carers' charities, general
86 practice and Primary Care Network, and local authority consortium. All participants gave informed
87 consent to take part. Each participant was told that the vignettes were based on real cases and
88 experiences but were anonymised as to person and place. Vignettes were completed online,
89 through Zoom, email, or (for primary care staff) in person at a workshop meeting. Each participant
90 was asked to read each vignette and make a binary judgement (yes/no) of whether they would
91 recommend a range of services (n=14) in each case, that were warranted to help support the carers'

92 needs. Participants were also given the option of describing their reasons behind the judgements.
93 The vignettes and responses were returned anonymously to the research team.

94

95 **Case vignettes**

96 This was a co-produced study with carers and carer representative organisations. The anonymised
97 vignettes were written jointly by carers of people with dementia, through carers organisations and
98 members of the research team, taken from carers' experiences and circumstances. The vignettes
99 were designed to express a range of different circumstances and possible service responses, but
100 particularly (although not exclusively) focusing on the needs of carers of people with younger onset
101 dementia and those from a south Asian background. The potential needs of carers from these
102 groups, highlighted in vignettes, included financial, employment and relationship need, [8] multi-
103 generational caring, language, and cultural needs [9]. Possible service responses to the vignettes,
104 which participants were asked to indicate if warranted, were included after consultation with carers
105 groups and charities supporting carers of people with dementia. Fig 1 shows an example of an
106 anonymised case vignette with the same standardized format used for all vignettes.

107

108 **Fig 1. Sample vignette.** Description of carer's circumstances and request to signal service responses
109 that would be considered appropriate.

110

111 Each vignette expressed circumstances, presenting insights from carers' perspectives to generate
112 participants' judgements, but without leading too directly. The vignettes had an average length of
113 180 words (ranging from 91 to 318). In general, each vignette took participants about 5-10 minutes
114 to read and complete.

115

116 **Participants**

117 All participants were approached in writing with Participant Information Sheets and invited to take
118 part in the study and had to give their written consent to take part. Recruitment took place
119 between 14/12/2022 and 31/12/2023. Carers of people with dementia were interested carers who
120 had received carers assessments before and who wished to express their views about carers' needs
121 in the context of these assessments. These carers were not involved in the construction of the case
122 vignettes. Primary care staff were professionals working in or with primary care practices who had
123 an interest in dementia or older people's healthcare. Social care staff were present or former
124 statutory assessors within the context of carer assessments and were social workers of local
125 authorities. It was left to participants to decide which of the nine vignettes they rated and the
126 completion of reasons for their judgments was entirely optional.

127

128 **Ethics statement**

129 The study was approved by the University of Manchester Research Ethics Committee (Ref: 2022-
130 14569-26301; 14/12/2022) and, additionally, for primary care staff, the Health Research Authority
131 (IRAS Project ID: 326181; 23/HRA/1321).

132

133 **Statistical analysis**

134 Data analysis was undertaken using SPSS v28 for Windows. Descriptive statistics (percentage
135 agreement) were used to compare judgements of each of the groups, about whether each of the
136 possible 14 service responses was warranted in each case. Fleiss' kappa coefficients, for multiple

137 raters, [10] measured the level of agreement (inter-rater reliability) amongst carers, primary and
138 social care staff and overall. the Kappa coefficient. Based on standards outlined by Landis and Koch
139 [11], a Kappa coefficient <0 was considered to be poor agreement, 0–0.20 slight, 0.21–0.40 fair,
140 0.41–0.60, moderate, 0.61–0.80 substantial, and 0.81–1.0 almost perfect agreement. Tests were
141 two-tailed and $P < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

142

143 **Results**

144 Full data were available from 6 carers, 7 primary care staff and 2 social care staff. Two carers cared
145 for people with younger onset dementia. Primary care staff included general practitioners, an
146 assistant practice manager, nurses, a practice pharmacist, and a paramedic. Social care staff were
147 social workers familiar with statutory carer’s assessments.

148

149 **Comparison of judgements by carers and professional staff**

150 Table 1 summarises the agreement of participants in each group and overall concerning whether
151 they would recommend each of the 14 services in each case. Percentage agreement and Fleiss’
152 kappa coefficients are compared. Total agreement (100%) between all groups was seen in only two
153 cases: case vignette 8 for Sitting Service and case vignette 1 for Financial Advice. There was
154 relatively high agreement for case vignette 7, Sitting Service; case vignette 8 for Financial Advice;
155 and case vignette 1, First Language Support, which was a case of a carer and person with dementia
156 from a south Asian background. The remaining cases showed a range of differing judgements about
157 whether each service was recommended.

158 Kappa values for all participant groups showed only ‘slight’ agreement [11] across the case vignettes,
159 but ‘fair’ agreement for First Language Support. Across the groups (Total column in Tables 1 and 2),

160 agreement for Social Support Worker, Care Co-ordinator and Live in Carer was no better than
 161 chance. Carers had the highest level of agreement: ‘slight’ (9 services), ‘moderate’ (1 service) and
 162 ‘almost perfect’ (1 service; First Language Support). For carers, agreement on three services (Care
 163 Co-ordinator, Live in Care, Befriending Scheme) was no better than chance. Primary care staff had
 164 ‘slight’ agreement for 8 services, ‘fair’ agreement for 1 service, with agreement no better than
 165 chance for the remaining 5 services. Social care staff had the lowest level of agreement, ‘slight’ (2
 166 services) fair’ (2 services), ‘moderate (1 service), and no better than chance for the remaining 8
 167 services. However, social care staff had ‘almost perfect’ agreement on the need for First Language
 168 Support.

169

170 **Table 1.** Proportion (%) of each group judging case warrants service and overall level of agreement;
 171 Fleiss’ kappa (95% confidence interval); p value, between participants

| Case vignette | carers | Primary care staff | Social care staff | Total |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| <i>Respite care for person with dementia</i> | | | | |
| 1 | 67 | 57 | 100 | 67 |
| 2 | 17 | 43 | 0 | 27 |
| 3 | 17 | 29 | 50 | 27 |
| 4 | 83 | 29 | 100 | 60 |
| 5 | 67 | 14 | 50 | 40 |
| 6 | 33 | 43 | 50 | 33 |
| 7 | 33 | 43 | 50 | 40 |
| 8 | 67 | 57 | 100 | 67 |
| 9 | 83 | 100 | 100 | 93 |
| Fleiss’ kappa | 0.11 (-0.09 to 0.28); p=0.20 | 0.08 (-0.06 to 0.23); p=0.25 | 0.30 (-0.35 to 0.95); p=0.37 | 0.12 (0.06 to 0.18); p<0.001 |
| <i>Sitting service</i> | | | | |
| 1 | 83 | 71 | 100 | 87 |
| 2 | 33 | 29 | 50 | 33 |
| 3 | 50 | 57 | 50 | 53 |
| 4 | 83 | 86 | 50 | 80 |
| 5 | 17 | 29 | 50 | 27 |
| 6 | 33 | 43 | 50 | 33 |
| 7 | 100 | 100 | 50 | 93 |
| 8 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 9 | 50 | 57 | 50 | 53 |
| Fleiss’ kappa | 0.24 (0.07 to 0.40); p=0.006 | 0.18 (0.04 to 0.32); p=0.01 | -0.35 (-1.00 to 0.15); p=0.30 | 0.12 (0.17 to 0.30); p<0.001 |
| <i>Social support worker for carer</i> | | | | |
| 1 | 100 | 86 | 50 | 87 |
| 2 | 67 | 86 | 0 | 67 |
| 3 | 83 | 86 | 0 | 73 |
| 4 | 83 | 71 | 0 | 67 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| 5 | 83 | 71 | 0 | 67 |
| 6 | 33 | 86 | 0 | 53 |
| 7 | 83 | 86 | 0 | 73 |
| 8 | 83 | 86 | 0 | 73 |
| 9 | 100 | 86 | 100 | 93 |
| Fleiss' kappa | 0.06 (-0.10 to 0.23); p=0.46 | -0.14 (-0.28 to 0.004); p=0.06 | 0.60 (-0.05 to 1.25); p=0.07 | -0.005 (-0.07 to 0.06); p=0.87 |
| <i>Dementia specialist coordinator, e.g. Admiral Nurse</i> | | | | |
| 1 | 100 | 71 | 100 | 87 |
| 2 | 0 | 14 | 50 | 13 |
| 3 | 0 | 14 | 50 | 13 |
| 4 | 83 | 43 | 100 | 67 |
| 5 | 17 | 43 | 50 | 33 |
| 6 | 17 | 57 | 50 | 40 |
| 7 | 33 | 71 | 50 | 53 |
| 8 | 67 | 71 | 50 | 67 |
| 9 | 83 | 57 | 100 | 73 |
| Fleiss' kappa | 0.46 (0.29 to 0.63); p<0.001 | 0.05 (-0.09 to 0.19); p=0.52 | -0.50 (-1.15 to 0.15); p=0.13 | 0.19 (0.13 to 0.25); p<0.001 |
| <i>Carers support group</i> | | | | |
| 1 | 100 | 67 | 100 | 80 |
| 2 | 50 | 86 | 100 | 73 |
| 3 | 100 | 43 | 50 | 67 |
| 4 | 67 | 71 | 100 | 73 |
| 5 | 83 | 43 | 50 | 60 |
| 6 | 33 | 43 | 0 | 33 |
| 7 | 100 | 57 | 50 | 73 |
| 8 | 83 | 57 | 100 | 73 |
| 9 | 100 | 71 | 50 | 80 |
| Fleiss' kappa | 0.20 (0.03 to 0.37); p=0.02 | -0.07 (-0.21 to 0.07); p=0.34 | 0.00 (-0.65 to 0.65); p=1.00 | 0.02 (-0.04 to 0.08); p=0.54 |
| <i>Care coordinator, supporting carer to 'walk through' services available</i> | | | | |
| 1 | 67 | 71 | 50 | 67 |
| 2 | 83 | 71 | 100 | 80 |
| 3 | 83 | 71 | 100 | 80 |
| 4 | 100 | 57 | 100 | 80 |
| 5 | 83 | 86 | 100 | 87 |
| 6 | 50 | 86 | 50 | 67 |
| 7 | 83 | 71 | 100 | 80 |
| 8 | 83 | 86 | 100 | 87 |
| 9 | 83 | 86 | 100 | 87 |
| Fleiss' kappa | -0.07 (-0.24 to 0.09); p=0.39 | -0.11 (-0.25 to 0.03); p=0.14 | -0.12 (-0.78 to 0.53); p=0.71 | -0.04 (-0.10 to 0.03); p=0.26 |
| <i>Live in care support (24-hour support)</i> | | | | |
| 1 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 33 |
| 2 | 17 | 28 | 0 | 20 |
| 3 | 50 | 14 | 0 | 20 |
| 4 | 17 | 14 | 0 | 13 |
| 5 | 17 | 28 | 0 | 20 |
| 6 | 33 | 14 | 0 | 20 |
| 7 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 13 |
| 8 | 17 | 28 | 0 | 20 |
| 9 | 50 | 57 | 0 | 47 |

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Fleiss' kappa | -0.03 (-0.20 to 0.14); p=0.75 | -0.03 (-0.17 to 0.11); p=0.68 | N/A service not recommended in all cases | -0.02 (-0.08 to 0.05); p=0.62 |
| Health practitioner, advice on carer's own health needs | | | | |
| 1 | 67 | 57 | 100 | 67 |
| 2 | 17 | 57 | 0 | 33 |
| 3 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 13 |
| 4 | 17 | 43 | 0 | 27 |
| 5 | 0 | 29 | 50 | 20 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 33 | 43 | 0 | 33 |
| 8 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 27 |
| 9 | 17 | 86 | 50 | 53 |
| Fleiss' kappa | 0.17 (0.005 to 0.34); p=0.04 | 0.07 (-0.06 to 0.22); p=0.28 | 0.36 (-0.30 to 1.01); p=0.28 | 0.11 (0.05 to 0.17); p<0.001 |
| Leisure activities for carer | | | | |
| 1 | 67 | 28 | 50 | 47 |
| 2 | 17 | 28 | 0 | 27 |
| 3 | 33 | 28 | 50 | 33 |
| 4 | 33 | 28 | 0 | 27 |
| 5 | 33 | 28 | 0 | 27 |
| 6 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 7 |
| 7 | 33 | 57 | 50 | 47 |
| 8 | 50 | 86 | 100 | 73 |
| 9 | 83 | 57 | 50 | 67 |
| Fleiss' kappa | 0.05 (-0.12 to 0.22); p=0.57 | 0.05 (-0.09 to 0.19); p=0.50 | 0.00 (-0.65 to 0.65); p=1.00 | 0.11 (0.04 to 0.17); p<0.001 |
| Financial advice for carer, e.g., benefit entitlement | | | | |
| 1 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2 | 100 | 86 | 100 | 87 |
| 3 | 67 | 57 | 100 | 67 |
| 4 | 67 | 57 | 100 | 60 |
| 5 | 67 | 57 | 50 | 60 |
| 6 | 67 | 57 | 50 | 53 |
| 7 | 83 | 86 | 100 | 87 |
| 8 | 100 | 43 | 100 | 73 |
| 9 | 100 | 86 | 100 | 93 |
| Fleiss' kappa | 0.01 (-0.12 to 0.18); p=0.88 | 0.02 (-0.15 to 0.16); p=0.78 | -0.12 (-0.78 to 0.53); p=0.71 | 0.06 (0.00 to 0.12); p=0.05 |
| Befriending scheme for carer | | | | |
| 1 | 50 | 43 | 50 | 47 |
| 2 | 17 | 28 | 0 | 20 |
| 3 | 17 | 28 | 0 | 20 |
| 4 | 17 | 14 | 0 | 13 |
| 5 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 13 |
| 6 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 20 |
| 7 | 17 | 43 | 0 | 27 |
| 8 | 33 | 57 | 50 | 47 |
| 9 | 33 | 57 | 50 | 47 |
| Fleiss' kappa | -0.03 (-0.19 to 0.14); p=0.71 | -0.07 (-0.21 to 0.07); p=0.29 | -0.20 (-0.03 to 0.45); P=0.55 | 0.03 (-0.03 to 0.09); P=0.41 |
| Day care for person with dementia | | | | |
| 1 | 67 | 57 | 50 | 60 |
| 2 | 17 | 57 | 50 | 40 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 3 | 0 | 43 | 50 | 20 |
| 4 | 67 | 43 | 100 | 60 |
| 5 | 33 | 14 | 50 | 27 |
| 6 | 17 | 29 | 50 | 27 |
| 7 | 50 | 100 | 50 | 73 |
| 8 | 67 | 71 | 100 | 73 |
| 9 | 67 | 86 | 100 | 80 |
| Fleiss' kappa | 0.11 (-0.06 to 0.27); p=0.22 | 0.14 (0.00 to 0.28); p=0.05 | -0.50 (-1.15 to 0.15); p=0.13 | 0.11 (0.05 to 0.18); p<0.001 |
| Direct payment for carer | | | | |
| 1 | 50 | 71 | 100 | 67 |
| 2 | 17 | 43 | 50 | 33 |
| 3 | 50 | 43 | 50 | 47 |
| 4 | 50 | 29 | 0 | 33 |
| 5 | 50 | 57 | 50 | 53 |
| 6 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 13 |
| 7 | 50 | 86 | 50 | 67 |
| 8 | 17 | 17 | 0 | 13 |
| 9 | 83 | 57 | 50 | 67 |
| Fleiss' kappa | 0.08 (-0.08 to 0.24); p=0.35 | 0.04 (-0.09 to 0.19); p=0.53 | -0.17 (-0.82 to 0.48); p=0.61 | 0.11 (0.05 to 0.17); p<0.001 |
| First language support, literature for carer | | | | |
| 1 | 100 | 57 | 100 | 80 |
| 2 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 6 |
| 3 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 13 |
| 4 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 13 |
| 5 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 13 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 6 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 6 |
| Fleiss' kappa | 1.00 (0.83 to 1.17); p<0.001 | 0.03 (-0.11 to 0.17); p=0.67 | 1.00 (0.34 to 1.65); p=0.003 | 0.37 (0.31 to 0.43); p<0.001 |

172 Vignettes 1,3,4, and 5 = carers of people with dementia from south Asian background; vignettes 2 and 7 = carers of people
173 with young onset dementia

174 **P= significant at ≤ 0.05**

175

176 **Reasons behind the judgements**

177 Examination of the stated reasons behind the judgements made by participants in the vignettes

178 helped to discern some of the wider factors influencing decision-making in these assessments.

179 These tended to vary according to the groups of participants undertaking the exercise. For carers,

180 judgements were made based on perceived risk, such that if there was a notion that needs were

181 increasing to an unsustainable level then more and different services would be recommended.

182 Carers often recommended services with the aim of building confidence in the carer's ability to

183 continue caring. Carers were also concerned about people's entitlements and ensuring that these
184 were supported through assessments but also that this depended on the local supply of services
185 where the carer lived. Primary care staff, perhaps understandably, stressed the need for a formal
186 dementia diagnosis for the carer's relative, so that they could be keyed into the support services
187 available. The thought of 'carer burnout' was also evident in the reasoning of primary care staff and
188 that the carers needed to know all the options and support available to them to perhaps prevent
189 that. Social care staff again stressed a consideration with carers' entitlements and ensuring that
190 they were eligible for certain services and financial help. Assessment was not seen as a one-off
191 process by social care staff, and there was a notion of establishing a continuity to decisions and
192 referring the carer on further for help from other professionals.

193

194 **Discussion**

195 The nature and process of carer assessments are no different than for assessments in general.
196 Previous work on social care assessments has shown wide variability, across professionals, in the
197 identification of older people's needs [12,13]. For carer assessments of those caring for someone
198 with dementia, this variability continues to be an issue, with many carers dissatisfied that their
199 needs had not been identified or met [14,15]. In this case vignette study, we found wide variability
200 in the reliability to which carers' needs and suitable service responses were identified that concur
201 with some of these judgements. Total agreement on needs occurred in only two vignettes for two
202 service responses and there was mostly only slight agreement across the case vignettes. Carers
203 tended to agree the most, with primary care staff second and social care staff agreeing the least.
204 There was relatively high agreement in terms of the need for First Language Support, amongst carers
205 and social care staff (showing 'almost perfect' agreement), particularly for case vignette 1 which was
206 a case of a south Asian carer. This finding is encouraging considering previous evidence of this type

207 of support being undervalued in carer assessments and support [16]. On the other hand, there was
208 relatively low agreement by professionals on the need for Befriending Support, for the vignettes
209 focusing on south Asian carers. This type of support has been highly valued by south Asian carers
210 [16] and is seen as providing a different focus than more traditional services such as respite and day
211 care.

212

213 **Strengths and Limitations of the Study**

214 Our study has limitations. We examined the judgements of a relatively small number of participants,
215 [17] particularly social care staff. This limits the statistical power by which the indices of agreement
216 were produced. Smaller samples also raise the potential of bias, in that it may be likely for raters
217 who tended to choose particular categories (service responses) as present or absent to influence the
218 results. This can produce situations where there is high percentage agreement amongst raters but a
219 low kappa [18]. This was the case for our study, where, for example, for Financial Advice and
220 Dementia Specialist Coordinator, rated by social care staff, there was high percentage agreement
221 but with very low kappa scores, resultant agreement being no better than chance.

222 However, this notwithstanding, our study has some strengths. We used real-life, detailed vignette
223 descriptions of carers' circumstances and these were able to prompt responses that mimic the
224 decision-making processes of assessments. This makes it possible to draw conclusions that have
225 ecological validity [19] and can be more realistically generalised to inform practice and policy. There
226 is no 'gold standard' by which to judge the reliability of assessments, particularly for assessments
227 that have a legislative basis, such as these carer assessments in the UK. The assessment process is
228 complex and variable and is influenced by many factors, both internal and external to the
229 assessment 'encounter'. In addition, there is very little prior research investigation of how carer
230 assessments operate in primary care in the UK, primarily because they do not have a legislative basis

231 and are informed only by guidance, usually as part of UK health checks. Thus, this study adds to the
232 evidence base in this area by considering the judgements of social care and primary care staff
233 against those of carers, the subject of these assessments. Carers, arguably, are the best judge of
234 their own needs for support and it is noteworthy that carers here agreed the most across the service
235 responses and vignettes. Our study design recognised this in terms of co-producing the vignettes
236 with carers to stimulate participant's judgement decisions.

237

238 **Conclusion**

239 Case vignettes are a useful tool for investigating different professionals' judgements concerning the
240 needs of carers of people with dementia and so raising issues for policy and practice. This study
241 showed these assessments can still be highly variable in terms of identifying the kinds of needs and
242 service responses that might be required to support carers in their caring role. The need for First
243 Language Support in some cases was recognised, an improvement from previous evidence.
244 However, efforts to improve the reliability with which carer assessments are undertaken, so that
245 prominent needs are identified and acted on in a consistent way, are still required.

246

247 **Acknowledgements**

248 We thank the carers, primary care, and social care staff for their time in taking part in the study.
249 Together in Dementia Everyday (TIDE), Sight and Mind CIC, Dementia United (Greater Manchester),
250 Kirklees Council, Bury Primary Care Network, and the Greater Manchester Social Work Academy
251 assisted in the recruitment of participants.

252

254 References

- 255 1. Alzheimer's Society. Alzheimer's Society's view on carer support. 2014; Available from:
256 [https://www.alzheimers.org.uk/about-us/policy-and-influencing/what-we-think/carers-](https://www.alzheimers.org.uk/about-us/policy-and-influencing/what-we-think/carers-support)
257 [support](https://www.alzheimers.org.uk/about-us/policy-and-influencing/what-we-think/carers-support)
258
- 259 2. Seddon D, Robinson C. Carer assessment: continuing tensions and dilemmas for social care
260 practice. *Health Soc Care Community*. 2015; 23(1): 14–22.
- 261 3. BMA/NHS England. Quality and Outcomes Framework guidance for 2021/22. 2021. Available
262 from: [https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/B0456-update-on-quality-](https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/B0456-update-on-quality-outcomes-framework-changes-for-21-22-.pdf)
263 [outcomes-framework-changes-for-21-22-.pdf](https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/B0456-update-on-quality-outcomes-framework-changes-for-21-22-.pdf)
264
- 265 4. Seddon D, Robinson C. (2001) Carers of older people with dementia: assessment and the
266 Carers Act. *Health Soc Care Community*. 2021; 9(3): 151–158.
267
- 268 5. Newbronner L, Chamberlain R, Borthwick R, Baxter M, Glendinning C. A Road Less Rocky –
269 Supporting Carers of People with Dementia. London, Carer’s Trust. 2013 Available at:
270 [https://carers.org/resources/all-resources/84-a-road-less-rocky-a-supporting-carers-of-](https://carers.org/resources/all-resources/84-a-road-less-rocky-a-supporting-carers-of-people-with-dementia)
271 [people-with-dementia](https://carers.org/resources/all-resources/84-a-road-less-rocky-a-supporting-carers-of-people-with-dementia)
272
- 273 6. Giebel CM, Zubair M, Jolley D, Bhui KS, Purandare N, Worden A, et al. South Asian older
274 adults with memory impairment: improving assessment and access to dementia care. *Int J*
275 *Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2015; 30(4): 345-56.
276
- 277 7. Together In Dementia Everyday (TIDE). Young Onset Dementia Survey Findings. 2020.
278 Available from: <https://www.tide.uk.net/young-onset-dementia/>
279
- 280 8. Stamou V, La Fontaine J, Gage H, Jones B, Williams P, O'Malley M, et al. Services for people
281 with young onset dementia: The ‘Angela’ project national UK survey of service use and
282 satisfaction. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2021; 36: 411–422.
283
- 284 9. Baghirathan S, Cheston R, Hui R, Chacon A, Shears P, Currie K. A grounded theory analysis of
285 the experiences of carers for people living with dementia from three BAME communities:
286 Balancing the need for support against fears of being diminished. *Dementia*. 2020; 19(5);
287 1672-1691.
288
- 289 10. Fleiss JL. Measuring nominal scale agreement among many raters. *Psychol Bull*. 1971; 76:
290 378–82.
291
- 292 11. Landis JR, Koch GG. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data.
293 *Biometrics*. 1977; 33: 159-74.
- 294 12. Clarkson P. What research tells social workers about their work with older people. In: Davies
295 M, editor. *Social Work with Adults*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan; 2012. pp.
296 300-313.
297
- 298 13. Ellis K. *Squaring the circle: user and carer participation in needs assessment*. York: Joseph
299 Rowntree Foundation; 1993.
300
- 301 14. Carers UK. (2022) State of Caring 2022 report. London: carers UK. 2022. Available from:
302 <https://www.carersuk.org/media/p4kblx5n/cukstateofcaring2022report.pdf>

303

304 **15.** Stock C, Lambert S. (2011) Who cares wins? Carers' experiences of assessment since the
305 introduction of the Carers (Equal Opportunities) Act 2004. *Research Policy and Planning*.
306 2011; 28: 173- 184.

307

308 **16.** Hepworth D. (2005) Asian carers' perceptions of care assessment and support in the
309 community. *Br J Soc Work*. 2005; 35: 337-353.

310 **17.** Sim J, Wright CC. The kappa statistic in reliability studies: use, interpretation, and sample
311 size requirements. *Phys Ther*. 2005; 85: 257–68.

312 **18.** Dettori JR, Norvell DC. Kappa and beyond: Is there agreement? *Global Spine J*. 2020; 10(4):
313 499-501.

314

315 **19.** Kieffer S. ECOVAL: Ecological validity of cues and representative design in user experience
316 evaluations. *AIS Transactions on Human-Computer Interaction*. 2017; 9 (2): 149–172.

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

Case vignette 1

Mohammed is 78 and living with vascular dementia. Mohammed lives at his home with his wife Salma, his two sons Khalid and Hussain, his daughter-in-law Fatima, and two grandchildren, Mohsin and Yusuf. Mohammed was living with vascular dementia for several years before he received a formal diagnosis, aged 72. His dementia is now advanced, and he requires hoist-assisted transfers.

Mohammed is mostly cared for by his wife and two sons. Mohammed's son Khalid is 32 years old and handles most medical-related communication with Mohammed's GP. His daughter-in-law Fatima also supports with several tasks, such as cooking and laundry.

Recently, home care was put in place, as Mohammed's behaviour was often becoming more challenging. Often, he becomes quite aggressive, and as his grandchildren are living with them, the family are often worried about how this will affect them. Mohammed's two sons handle much of his personal care, and they are finding this increasingly difficult due to Mohammed's challenging behaviour. Khalid is finding that the responsibility of caring for Mohammed, together with managing home carers (who are essentially becoming part of the family) is becoming too difficult; he also works full time and would like to spend more time with his children. Khalid is considering taking part time employment but is worried that he will not be able to financially support his family. Mohammed's other son, 29-year-old Hussain, works full time and is often out of town for his work commitments.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.11.24305691>; this version posted April 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/).

Mohammed's wife Salma speaks very little English and finds it difficult to keep up with homecare support workers' requests regarding Mohammed's medical needs, as this is something that her son Khalid usually handles; things are put on hold until he comes home from work, and she often forgets to inform him. Salma has found there is also little time to attend to her own needs, like leisure, and this often results in her staying home most of the day.

Could you judge whether the situation described here would merit any of the following (*indicate with an "X" by clicking your mouse in the box where relevant*)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Respite: person with dementia stays elsewhere e.g., a care home | <input type="checkbox"/> Leisure activities for carer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sitting Service: a home carer comes into the home to care for the person with dementia | <input type="checkbox"/> Financial advice for carer, e.g. benefit entitlement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Social support worker for carer | <input type="checkbox"/> Befriending scheme for carer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dementia specialist co-ordinator e.g. Admiral Nurse | <input type="checkbox"/> Day care for person with dementia |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Carers support group | <input type="checkbox"/> Direct payment for carer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Care co-ordinator supporting the carer to 'walk through' the services available | <input type="checkbox"/> First-language support and literature for carer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Live in care support (24-hour support) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please state: _____ _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Health practitioner for advice on carer's own health needs | |