

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Adaptation and validation of the Caregiver Burden Inventory in Spinal Cord Injuries (CBI-SCI)

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1694144> since 2019-02-28T18:30:59Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1038/s41393-018-0179-7

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

1 Title: Adaptation and validation of the Caregiver Burden Inventory in Spinal Cord Injuries (CBI-SCI)

2 Running title: Adaptation and validation of the CBI-SCI

3

4 Authors:

5 1- Alessio Conti^{1,2} (corresponding author); *RN, PhD student*

6 mail: aconti@cittadellasalute.to.it

7 2- Marco Clari^{1,2}; *RN, PhD*

8 3- Lorenza Garrino³; *RN, MSN*

9 4- Patrizia Maitan¹; *RN, MSN*

10 5- Scivoletto Giorgio⁴; *MD, PhD*

11 6- Lucia Cavallaro⁵; *RN*

12 7- Barbara Bandini⁶; *PT, MSc*

13 8- Silvia Mozzone¹; *RN*

14 9- Ercole Vellone²; *RN, PhD*

15 10- Simona Frigerio^{1,2}; *RN, PhD*

16

17 Institutions - Departments

18 ¹⁻ A.O.U. Città della Salute e della Scienza Hospital of Turin, Italy

19 ²⁻ University of Rome "Tor Vergata", Italy

20 ³⁻ University of Turin, Italy

21 ⁴⁻ IRCCS Fondazione Santa Lucia, Rome, Italy

22 ⁵⁻ A.O. Cannizzaro Hospital, Catania, Italy

23 ⁶⁻ A.O.U. Careggi Hospital, Florence, Italy

24

25

26

27

28 Abstract:

29 Design: Validation cross-sectional study.

30 Objectives: Even though caregiver burden (CB) represents a well-recognised concern among
31 caregivers of people with a spinal cord injury (SCI), there are no specific questionnaires designed for
32 its evaluation. This study aimed to assess the psychometric properties of the Caregiver Burden
33 Inventory in Spinal Cord Injury (CBI-SCI), which was modified from its original version, and specifically
34 its construct and reliability.

35 Setting: Multicentre study in four urban spinal units across Italy. The CBI-SCI was administered to
36 family caregivers in outpatient clinics.

37 Methods: CBI-SCI was administered in a toolset composed of a sociodemographic questionnaire, the
38 Family Strain Questionnaire-Short Form (FSQ-SF), the Short Form-36 (SF-36) and the Modified Barthel
39 Index (MBI). The CBI-SCI construct validity was assessed through an exploratory factor analysis. The
40 internal consistency of the questionnaire was examined using Cronbach's alpha (α) coefficient for the
41 total scale and its subscales. Concurrent validity was evaluated performing Pearson's correlation
42 coefficient with all instruments included in the toolset.

43 Results: The CBI-SCI was administered to 176 participants from February 2016 to September 2017.
44 Factor analysis highlighted the five-factored structure of the questionnaire. The total scale
45 Cronbach's α was 0.91 ($p < 0.001$). All the five subscales of CBI-SCI showed an acceptable internal
46 consistency, ranging from 0.76 to 0.91 ($p < 0.001$). Pearson's correlation coefficients of the CBI-SCI
47 with all the administered instruments were statistically significant ($p < 0.001$), showing congruent
48 relations.

49 Conclusion: The CBI-SCI, due to its validity and reliability, may represent a valuable instrument to
50 evaluate the CB longitudinally in SCI.

51

52 Introduction:

53 The care of people with a spinal cord injury (SCI) requires great energy on the part of their
54 family caregivers to maintain the disease-related health status and the well-being of care recipients
55 as well as to preserve their status in the community (1). These elements may produce severe
56 psychological distress and anxiety to both parties, which generate a significant burden on caregivers
57 with, in certain cases, repercussions for the person they care for (2). Despite the fact that caregiver
58 burden (CB) is a concept that is widely used to express the weight carried by caregivers due to their
59 assumption of the caregiver role (3), there is no existing International Classification of Diseases (ICD-9
60 or ICD-10) code that describes it.

61 CB is defined by Zarit and colleagues as, “The extent to which caregivers recognise that
62 caregiving has hurt their emotional, social, financial, physical and spiritual functioning” (4). This
63 definition is useful in understanding how CB may be perceived as a multidimensional experience that
64 affects many aspects of the everyday life of caregivers (5). In particular, a recent literature review
65 highlighted how, over several decades, issues related to the physical, mental and social aspects of
66 caregiver health are affected by SCI, impacting on the QOL of family caregivers (1). Moreover, the
67 cost of illness and the necessity of reducing hours or leaving work to assist with the activities of daily
68 living (ADLs) may subject caregivers to financial deprivation and consequently to social isolation,
69 even though other features can be emotionally rewarding such as saving family resources or
70 confirming family ties with the assisted people (6). In this regard, there is an amount of research
71 focused on caregivers’ quality of life (QOL), on mental or physical issues, and on the impact of respite
72 programs for this population (7,8). Conversely, to date, there are few studies that specifically
73 consider the evaluation of CB in SCI.

74 To assess the CB, different instruments have been developed over several decades to provide
75 a valid and reliable measurement of this phenomenon (4,9–12). Despite the various questionnaires
76 assessing CB that have been used in caregivers of people with SCI (7,8,13–17), the Caregiver Burden

77 Inventory (CBI), which was largely used in different caregiver populations (18–21), has demonstrated
78 to be suitable in evaluating the effects of the burden in its entirety. Unlike the other questionnaires,
79 such as the Zarit Burden Interview (ZBI) (4,13,14), the Caregiver Burden Scale (CBS) (7) or the Burden
80 Assessment Scale (BAS) (15), the CBI has, in fact, a multidimensional more definite structure, that is
81 capable of identifying the elements characterising the CB directly attributable to the individual
82 reaction to this condition, rather than to the related socioeconomic or environmental factors. This
83 self-reported questionnaire was developed in 1989 (9) and is composed of five subscales assessing
84 the impact of the burden on different domains: time-dependent burden (T/dep-B), evaluating strain
85 caused by restriction of individual personal time; developmental burden (Dev-B), indicating the sense
86 of failing about one's intentions and hopes; physical burden (Phys-B), assessing the bodily strain and
87 physical disorders; social burden (Soc-B), produced by striving to achieve the roles connected to the
88 caregiver's job or family; and emotional burden (Emot-B), referring to any shaming or humiliation
89 caused by the assisted people. All subscales except Phys-B include five items with scoring ranging
90 from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree), and an overall score ranging from 0 to 20 for each
91 dimension. Since Phys-B incorporates four items, a correction factor of 1.25 was applied to allow
92 comparisons with the other subscales. Thus, the total score of CBI was assessed starting from a
93 minimum of 0, showing no burden, to a maximum of 100, indicating the highest achievable burden
94 level.

95 The CBI has been subjected to an Italian, cross-cultural validation by Marvardi in 2005 (22),
96 revealing interesting characteristics. Since the instrument is designed explicitly for caregivers of
97 people with dementia and behavioural disorders, it does not seem to be completely appropriate in
98 the field of SCI, in which assisted individuals are not affected by cognitive impairments. For this
99 reason, it was considered appropriate to modify the original CBI to fit SCI caregivers, and a new
100 version called the Caregiver Burden Inventory in Spinal Cord Injury (CBI-SCI) was specifically
101 developed (Supplementary file 1).

102 This study aimed to assess the psychometric properties of the CBI-SCI, such as its construct (including
103 the factorial structure and concurrent validity) and reliability (internal consistency).

104 Methods:

105 Participants:

106 A cross-sectional design was used to conduct the study. The sample size was determined based on a
107 criterion of at least seven participants for each item, as detailed in the quality criteria for the
108 evaluation of validation studies included in the COSMIN® checklist (23). Between February 2016 and
109 September 2017, 176 family caregivers of people with SCI who attended the outpatient clinics of the
110 Città della Salute e della Scienza Hospital of Turin, IRRCs Fondazione Santa Lucia of Rome, Cannizzaro
111 Hospital of Catania and Careggi Hospital of Florence were enrolled in a consecutive sample. The
112 definition of family caregiver adopted in this study is an individual, related by blood or partnership,
113 who provides informal assistance to the relative with SCI. We included in the study: (i) family
114 caregivers of individuals with traumatic or non-traumatic SCI, (ii) discharged at least six months ago,
115 (iii) understood the Italian language and (iv) aged 18 or older. Formal caregivers, who are paid to
116 assist, or individuals with cognitive disorders were excluded.

117 Instrument adaptation:

118 People with a SCI have some needs that have to be responded to quickly by their caregivers, and
119 their advanced problem-solving skill imposes high emotional strain. Thus, caregivers of people with
120 SCI are not embarrassed by their relatives' behaviours, but rather stressed by their condition and
121 their constant attention needs, even concerning the built environment. For these reasons, during the
122 modification process, three items of the original CBI version were changed. A group composed of
123 four healthcare professionals examined the scale. Since they had more than ten years' experience in
124 SCI, AC, PM and SM identified and proposed the items that had to be changed. Subsequently, MC,
125 who was an expert in psychometrics, provided technical advice on the process.

126 Specifically, the original Item 3, “I have to watch my care receiver constantly”, was changed to “I
127 have to maintain a high level of attention”; the initial Item 20, “I feel embarrassed over my care
128 receiver’s behaviour”, was modified to “I feel embarrassed about my care receiver’s condition”; the
129 original Item 23, “I feel uncomfortable when I have friends over”, was changed to “I feel
130 uncomfortable when I have friends over or when we go out”.

131 The CBI-SCI was presented to a panel of five healthcare professionals and five caregivers who were
132 experts in the SCI field for at least 5 years. To assess the understandability and to determine its
133 content validity, a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (not consistent) to 5 (strongly consistent) was
134 used independently by the experts. The scale scored 0.83 about its content validity index/average,
135 and the items that compose it reached the 0.78 cut-off value for everyone, showing their validity
136 (24). A pilot study was performed to assess the clarity, comprehensibility and legibility of the CBI-SCI.
137 Data assessed from 12 caregivers, who were not included in the study, obtained a face validity value
138 of 9.43 out of 10, using a 10-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (not consistent) to 10 (strongly
139 consistent). The CBI-SCI was approved as acceptable to apply the following psychometric tests.

140 Procedure:

141 Participants were recruited during routine follow-up appointments at the spinal unit’s outpatient
142 clinic. The entire toolset, which required a collection time of almost 15 minutes, was completed in an
143 isolated area to avoid the risk that the closeness of care recipients might modify the responses of
144 their caregivers. The following data were collected:

145 *Sociodemographic information of caregivers and people with SCI*

146 Sociodemographic data were collected using a questionnaire purposely designed for this study.
147 Caregivers’ information covered age, gender, marital status, rapport with the individual with SCI,
148 level of education, employment, cohabitation and economic situation. The same variables were
149 gathered from people with SCI; furthermore, the clinical information of the SCI including the level,
150 the cause and the time since injury were collected.

151 *Functional independence of individuals with SCI*

152 The Modified Barthel Index (MBI) (25) was completed by participants and used to assess the
153 independence level of care recipients. This one-dimensional scale consists of 10 items regarding the
154 person's daily functioning in ADLs. MBI scores vary from 0 (total dependence) to 100 (independence).
155 Even though the Spinal Cord Independence Measure (SCIM) demonstrated a better sensitivity (26),
156 given the aim of the study, the MBI was selected as a reliable tool that is simpler and shorter and
157 could be completed more easily by participants. Kucukdeveci et al. (27) presented excellent internal
158 consistency (Cronbach's alpha [α] = 0.88) and criterion validity ($r = 0.76$) with the American Spinal
159 Injury Association (ASIA) scores in a SCI population.

160 *Caregiver burden*

161 CB was assessed using the CBI-SCI, a 24-item modified version of the CBI (9).

162 *Psychological health of caregivers*

163 The Family Strain Questionnaire-Short Form (FSQ-SF) is a self-administered one-dimensional
164 questionnaire employed to determine the psychological impact of caregiving. It was developed by
165 Vidotto et al. (28) to evaluate caregiver strain and the potential risks related to emotional and
166 psychophysical disorders. It consists of 30 dichotomic questions progressively indicating four
167 psychological risk areas and the urgency needed for support interventions, respectively: OK,
168 Recommended, Strongly Recommended and Urgent. The highest score obtainable is 30, which
169 suggests a high risk of psychological complications due to the more severe level of strain perceived
170 by caregivers. The FSQ-SF attained satisfactory psychometric properties in a sample of caregivers of
171 people with dementia (28); it has been used for the first time in the field of SCI in this study.

172 *Health status of caregivers*

173 The Short Form-36 (SF-36) was administered to assess the general health perceived by caregivers.
174 This questionnaire was developed in 1992 to be applied in all health conditions and detect

175 fundamental human values that describe health concepts significant to a person's functional status
176 and well-being (29). It consists of 36 self-administered questions covering eight main domains
177 (vitality, physical functioning, bodily pain, general health, physical role functioning, emotional role
178 functioning, social role functioning and mental health) represented on a 0 to 100 scale; the lower the
179 score, the more impairment in the specific domain. The SF-36 showed very reasonable values of
180 validity and reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.82$); thus, it is broadly adopted to discriminate, evaluate and
181 anticipate effects in various health conditions, including SCI (30).

182 Ethical consideration:

183 The Città della Salute e della Scienza di Torino, Mauriziano Hospital, ASL TO 1 Research Ethics
184 Committee, Turin, Italy, gave the ethics approval (Resolution n° 1002/2016 - #CS/1040); all
185 recruitment centres received the authorisation for participating in the study. Participation was
186 voluntary, and caregivers who met the inclusion criteria and signed the written informed consent
187 were asked to complete a set of structured questionnaires. Anonymity and confidential treatment of
188 data were maintained during all the research processes.

189 Statistical analysis:

190 Descriptive statistical analysis (means, standard deviations and frequencies) were used to describe
191 the sociodemographic characteristics of participants, including the clinical information of people with
192 SCI and the results of administered questionnaires.

193 The construct validity of the CBI-SCI was evaluated analysing its factorial structure. To this end, an
194 exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was performed. In this study the interest is directed to the
195 dimensions behind the variables, thus to identify latent constructs rather than easily reducing the
196 data. For this purpose, a principal axis factorisation was used with a Promax rotation, assuming that
197 the factors of the scale were correlated. The suitability of the sample for factor analysis was
198 supported by the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's tests. A KMO test threshold value of 0.80
199 was considered satisfactory to indicate the sampling was adequate, while a significance level < 0.05

200 on Bartlett's test suggested the homogeneity of item variances (31,32). The factors that reach an
201 eigenvalue ≥ 1 were considered to be retained, and a minimum factor loading coefficient of 0.30 was
202 accepted to maintain each item in the scale (33).

203 The reliability and validity of the scale were assessed for the total scale and each dimension
204 extracted by factor analysis. Total CBI-SCI and internal consistency reliability of its subscales were
205 tested by computing Cronbach's α coefficient, values of 0.70 and above were considered as
206 satisfactory (34).

207 The concurrent validity of the CBI-SCI was assessed correlating the total score with scores of other
208 questionnaires, specifically MBI, FSQ-SF and the eight subscales of SF-36, using the Pearson product-
209 moment correlation: a value of ± 0.30 was considered to be a weak correlation, a value of ± 0.50 was
210 considered a moderate correlation and a value of ± 0.70 was considered a strong correlation (34).

211 Statistical analysis of all data collected was carried out using the SPSS statistical package (version 22;
212 IBM SPSS Statistics, Armonk, NY). Level of significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

213 Results:

214 The mean age of family caregivers was 56.2 years (SD ± 14.6), only 30 (17%) were males, and one-
215 quarter of them ($n = 44$, 25%) were parents of the individual with SCI. Almost the entire sample ($n =$
216 139, 79%) lived with the assisted person, and around half of them ($n = 86$, 49%) lived in an urban
217 area. Almost half of the sample ($n = 95$, 54%) had been in the caregiving role for more than three
218 years, and a third of them ($n = 59$, 33%) declared that they do not have any significant income from
219 work or government assistance. The mean age of people with SCI was 51.9 years (SD ± 17.9), and
220 eighty-nine (51%) of the sample consisted of tetraplegics. The most common cause of SCI is
221 traumatic ($n = 142$, 81%), within which road accidents were the 46% ($n = 80$). The time since the
222 injury was mostly greater than three years ($n = 100$, 58%), and more than half ($n = 108$, 62%) were
223 married. The sociodemographic characteristics of participants are presented in Table 1.

224 *Construct validity*

225 The normality and the sphericity measures on the CBI-SCI were performed through the KMO and
226 Bartlett's sphericity tests. The KMO test reached a value of 0.867, and the Bartlett's test provided a
227 value of 2510.33 ($df = 276, p = 0.000$). Due to this these results, the sample was considered
228 acceptable for factor analysis, that confirmed the five-factored structure of the original scale. Table 2
229 shows the factor loadings for each item.

230 *Reliability*

231 Table 3 summarises the Cronbach's α values of the entire CBI-SCI and each of its subscales, their
232 means and standard deviations. The total scale Cronbach's α coefficient was found to be 0.91. All five
233 subscales of the CBI-SCI showed acceptable Cronbach's α scoring, which varied between 0.76 and
234 0.91.

235 *Concurrent validity*

236 All Pearson correlations between CBI-SCI and other administered instruments were statistically
237 significant ($p < 0.001$), as shown in Table 4. The FSQ-SF obtained the highest r value ($r = 0.63; p <$
238 0.001), indicating a moderate direct correlation with the burden level perceived by participants. All
239 other correlations were negative, showing an inverse effect between variables. Particularly, CB
240 showed a moderate correlation with General Health ($r = -0.50; p < 0.001$) and Social Role Functioning
241 ($r = 0.58; p < 0.001$) on the subscales of SF-36.

242 Discussion:

243 This study assessed the psychometric properties of the CBI-SCI in an Italian family caregivers
244 sample. The modified scale was evaluated positively for its content validity by a panel of experts,
245 who identified the presence of the desired features in the included items. Furthermore, the face
246 validity calculated during the preliminary testing showed an excellent value concerning the clarity,
247 comprehensibility and legibility of the questionnaire (33).

248 Factor analysis and Promax rotation were used to explore the construct validity of the CBI-
249 SCI. Marvardi (22) identified that the Italian version of the original CBI showed a four dimension
250 structure, with the items related to Dev-B and Phys-B investigating the same dimension of burden.
251 Nevertheless, in this study, five factors were identified in the CBI-SCI, which could explain the total
252 variance of 66%, as proposed in the original CBI version developed by Nolan and Guest (9,35).
253 Furthermore, the three items that were changed did not modify the original dimensions that
254 composed the instrument. The internal consistency of the CBI-SCI showed a Cronbach's α value of
255 0.91, and all subscales obtained values consistently > 0.70 , which are comparable with the ones
256 obtained by the original CBI version in different populations (9,35).

257 Moreover, correlations identified between CBI-SCI and all the subscales of the SF-36, as well
258 as with the MBI and the FSQ-SF, used to test the concurrent validity of the instrument were entirely
259 significant and congruent in their correlations. These findings strengthen the validity of the CBI-SCI,
260 as previous research identified the relation between burden and QOL in caregivers of different
261 populations (36,37). Also, the positive correlation of the modified tool with the FSQ-SF agrees with
262 prior studies, which identified the strain of caregiving affecting the psychological well-being of
263 relatives of people with SCI (8,16). Despite evidence that the level of independence of care recipients
264 affects only the physical health of caregivers and is not a predictor of CB (15), a significant negative
265 correlation is found between CBI-SCI and MBI in the current sample.

266 Caregivers are essential to maintaining the well-being of people with SCI, as well as to
267 maintain their social participation in the community. The caregivers' efforts may cause severe
268 psychological distress and create a significant burden, especially on those who are not ready to take
269 on this role (38). In this regard, the CBI-SCI explores different elements that previous research on
270 caregivers of individuals with SCI identified as distinctive in this population. Caregivers of people with
271 SCI are subjected to a reduction of their personal time, due to the need to assist relatives in their
272 ADLs; thus, they spend a high number of hours assisting (17,38). Moreover, the financial constraints
273 and the difficulties in choosing alternative solutions which may derive from this situation are

274 predictors of developing burden and lead them to social isolation (15). Caregivers of people with a
275 SCI are frequently exposed to a physical burden, due to the nature of the daily activities they perform
276 (7); assisting their relatives is frequently linked to pain and poor physical health, which are associated
277 with negative outcomes such as the occurrence of depression (15). Moreover, a longer duration of
278 caregiving is associated with a poorer QOL (38).

279 All the previous domains are measured in the CBI-SCI by its dimensions. To our knowledge,
280 no specific questionnaires were previously developed and, given the importance of assessing
281 subjective CB, the findings of this study suggest the applicability of this tool to the global evaluation
282 of caregivers in SCI. The administration of the CBI-SCI at regular intervals could provide the
283 opportunity to profile an individual's burden trend for each respondent and to identify caregivers
284 who are more at risk. This multidimensional portrait could be helpful in tailoring intervention
285 programs directed to specific burden dimensions of caregivers.

286 Despite its strengths, such as the sample size, which is large for a validation study (39), this
287 study has several limitations. In fact, the study was conducted in a specific geographical area, and the
288 use of a cross-sectional design limits the results of the concurrent validity of the CBI-SCI. Particularly,
289 a longitudinal design is recommended to test the predictive validity of questionnaires, since the
290 empirical evidence supports the suitability of the CBI's original version. Because of its adequate
291 reliability (9,35) and given the maintenance of the structure despite the changes in three items, it
292 was not considered necessary to perform a test-retest assessment of the modified tool.

293 Future studies are needed to understand the relationship between CB in SCI and the
294 sociodemographic and psychological characteristics of caregivers, in addition to functional
295 independence and clinical information of their relatives. A more in-depth comprehension of this
296 topic is fundamental for the development of healthcare policies in support of families and to
297 compare CB across different illness.

298

299 Conclusion:

300 The study findings support the validity and reliability of the CBI-SCI as an instrument to assess the
301 burden for caregivers of individuals with a SCI. The present version, modified explicitly for SCI, may
302 represent a valuable tool for research in this field as well as to longitudinally evaluate the difficulties
303 experienced by caregivers. The possibility to identify the level of burden perceived by caregivers of
304 people with a SCI is fundamental to guide healthcare professionals in determining the needs of
305 caregivers and to plan appropriate interventions.

306 Acknowledgements:

307 Authors wish to thank the caregivers and the staff at the Spinal Cord Injury Units of Città della Salute
308 e della Scienza Hospital of Turin, IRRCs Fondazione Santa Lucia of Rome, Cannizzaro Hospital of
309 Catania and Careggi Hospital of Florence for dedicating their time to this study.

310 Conflicts of Interest:

311 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-
312 for-profit sectors. The authors report no conflicts of interest.

313 Authors' contributions

314 AC was responsible for designing and writing the study protocol, and for submitting the study to the
315 ethical committee. He was also responsible for writing the report, coordinating the recruiting centres
316 and interpreting results.

317 MC was responsible for the database managing, analysing data and interpreting results. He
318 contributed to writing the report.

319 PM and SF were responsible for designing and writing the study protocol. They provided feedback on
320 the report.

321 GS, LC, BB and SM were responsible for recruiting the participants and managing the data. They
322 provided feedback on the report.

323 LG and EV provided feedback on the report.

324 Supplementary file 1: contains the final version of the CBI-SCI, an instrument to assess the burden for
325 caregivers of individuals with a SCI.

326

327 References:

- 328 1. Lynch J, Cahalan R. The impact of spinal cord injury on the quality of life of primary family
329 caregivers: a literature review. *Spinal Cord*. 2017 Nov;55(11):964–78.
- 330 2. Glzman JM. Quality of Life of Caregivers. *Neuropsychol Rev*. 2004 Dec 1;14(4):183–96.
- 331 3. Adelman RD, Tmanova LL, Delgado D, Dion S, Lachs MS. Caregiver burden: a clinical review.
332 *JAMA*. 2014 Mar 12;311(10):1052–60.
- 333 4. Zarit SH, Todd PA, Zarit JM. Subjective Burden of Husbands and Wives as Caregivers: A
334 Longitudinal Study. *The Gerontologist*. 1986 Jun 1;26(3):260–6.
- 335 5. Gillick MR. The Critical Role of Caregivers in Achieving Patient-Centered Care. *JAMA*. 2013 Aug
336 14;310(6):575–6.
- 337 6. Tarlow BJ, Wisniewski SR, Belle SH, Rubert M, Ory MG, Gallagher-Thompson D. Positive Aspects
338 of Caregiving: Contributions of the REACH Project to the Development of New Measures for
339 Alzheimer’s Caregiving. *Res Aging*. 2004 Jul 1;26(4):429–53.
- 340 7. Blanes L, Carmagnani MIS, Ferreira LM. Health-related quality of life of primary caregivers of
341 persons with paraplegia. *Spinal Cord*. 2007 Jun;45(6):399–403.
- 342 8. Middleton JW, Simpson GK, De Wolf A, Quirk R, Descallar J, Cameron ID. Psychological Distress,
343 Quality of Life, and Burden in Caregivers During Community Reintegration After Spinal Cord
344 Injury. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2014 Jul 1;95(7):1312–9.
- 345 9. Novak M, Guest C. Application of a Multidimensional Caregiver Burden Inventory. *The*
346 *Gerontologist*. 1989 Dec 1;29(6):798–803.
- 347 10. Gerritsen JC, Ende VD, C P. The Development of a Care-giving Burden Scale. *Age Ageing*. 1994
348 Nov 1;23(6):483–91.
- 349 11. Malhotra R, Chan A, Malhotra C, Østbye T. Validity and reliability of the Caregiver Reaction
350 Assessment scale among primary informal caregivers for older persons in Singapore. *Aging Ment*
351 *Health*. 2012;16(8):1004–15.
- 352 12. Graessel E, Berth H, Lichte T, Grau H. Subjective caregiver burden: validity of the 10-item short
353 version of the Burden Scale for Family Caregivers BSFC-s. *BMC Geriatr*. 2014 Feb 20;14:23.

- 354 13. Tough H, Brinkhof MW, Siegrist J, Fekete C. Subjective Caregiver Burden and Caregiver
355 Satisfaction: The Role of Partner Relationship Quality and Reciprocity. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.*
356 2017 Oct 1;98(10):2042–51.
- 357 14. Khazaeipour Z, Rezaei-Motlagh F, Ahmadipour E, Azarnia-Ghavam M, Mirzababaei A, Salimi N, et
358 al. Burden of care in primary caregivers of individuals with spinal cord injury in Iran: its
359 association with sociodemographic factors. *Spinal Cord.* 2017 Jun;55(6):595–600.
- 360 15. Secinti E, Yavuz HM, Selcuk B. Feelings of burden among family caregivers of people with spinal
361 cord injury in Turkey. *Spinal Cord.* 2017 Aug;55(8):782–7.
- 362 16. Gajraj-Singh P. Psychological impact and the burden of caregiving for persons with spinal cord
363 injury (SCI) living in the community in Fiji. *Spinal Cord.* 2011 Aug;49(8):928–34.
- 364 17. Chan RC. Stress and coping in spouses of persons with spinal cord injuries. *Clin Rehabil.* 2000 Apr
365 1;14(2):137–44.
- 366 18. Greco A, Pancani L, Sala M, Annoni AM, Steca P, Paturzo M, et al. Psychometric characteristics of
367 the caregiver burden inventory in caregivers of adults with heart failure. *Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs.*
368 2017 Feb 10;1474515117693890.
- 369 19. Tramonti F, Barsanti I, Bongioanni P, Bogliolo C, Rossi B. **a Permanent Emergency: A Longitudinal**
370 **Study on Families Coping With Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis.** *Fam Syst Health.* 2014 Sep
371 1;32(3):271–9.
- 372 20. Zavagli V, Varani S, Samolsky-Dekel AR, Brighetti G, Pannuti F. Worry as a risk factor for mental
373 and somatic diseases. A research on home-cared cancer patients family caregivers. *G Ital Med*
374 *Lav Ergon.* 2012 Jun;34(2 Suppl B):B17-22.
- 375 21. Han S-H, Kim B, Lee S-A. Contribution of the family environment to depression in Korean adults
376 with epilepsy. *Seizure - Eur J Epilepsy.* 2015 Feb 1;25:26–31.
- 377 22. Marvardi M, Mattioli P, Spazzafumo L, Mastriforti R, Rinaldi P, Polidori MC, et al. The Caregiver
378 Burden Inventory in evaluating the burden of caregivers of elderly demented patients: results
379 from a multicenter study. *Aging Clin Exp Res.* 2005 Feb 1;17(1):46–53.
- 380 23. Terwee CB, Mokkink LB, Knol DL, Ostelo RWJG, Bouter LM, de Vet HCW. Rating the
381 methodological quality in systematic reviews of studies on measurement properties: a scoring
382 system for the COSMIN checklist. *Qual Life Res Int J Qual Life Asp Treat Care Rehabil.* 2012
383 May;21(4):651–7.
- 384 24. Polit DF, Beck CT, Owen SV. Is the CVI an acceptable indicator of content validity? Appraisal and
385 recommendations. *Res Nurs Health.* 2007 Aug 1;30(4):459–67.
- 386 25. Collin C, Wade DT, Davies S, Horne V. The Barthel ADL Index: A reliability study. *Int Disabil Stud.*
387 1988 Jan 1;10(2):61–3.
- 388 26. Bonavita J, Torre M, China S, Bressi F, Bonatti E, Capirossi R, et al. Validation of the Italian version
389 of the Spinal Cord Independence Measure (SCIM III) Self-Report. *Spinal Cord.* 2016 Jul;54(7):553–
390 60.
- 391 27. Kucukdeveci AA, Yavuzer G, Tennant A, Suldur N, Sonel B, Arasil T. Adaptation of the modified
392 Barthel Index for use in physical medicine and rehabilitation in Turkey. *Scand J Rehabil Med.*
393 2000;32(2):87–92.

- 394 28. Vidotto G, Ferrario SR, Bond TG, Zotti AM. Family Strain Questionnaire – Short Form for nurses
395 and general practitioners. *J Clin Nurs*. 2010 Jan 1;19(1-2):275–83.
- 396 29. Brazier JE, Harper R, Jones NM, O’Cathain A, Thomas KJ, Usherwood T, et al. Validating the SF-36
397 health survey questionnaire: new outcome measure for primary care. *BMJ*. 1992 Jul
398 18;305(6846):160–4.
- 399 30. Nogueira PC, Rabeh SAN, Caliri MHL, Dantas RAS. Health-Related Quality of Life Among
400 Caregivers of Individuals With Spinal Cord Injury. *J Neurosci Nurs*. 2016 Feb;48(1):28.
- 401 31. Cerny BA, Kaiser HF. A Study Of A Measure Of Sampling Adequacy For Factor-Analytic Correlation
402 Matrices. *Multivar Behav Res*. 1977 Jan 1;12(1):43–7.
- 403 32. Snedecor GW, Cochran WG. *Statistical methods* [Internet]. 8th ed. Ames, Iowa : Iowa State
404 University Press; 1989. Available from: <https://trove.nla.gov.au/version/28403945>
- 405 33. Kimberlin CL, Winterstein AG. Validity and reliability of measurement instruments used in
406 research. *Am J Health Syst Pharm*. 2008 Dec 1;65(23):2276–84.
- 407 34. Altman D, Machin D, Bryant T, Gardner M. *Statistics with Confidence: Confidence Intervals and
408 Statistical Guidelines*. John Wiley & Sons; 2013. 283 p.
- 409 35. Caserta MS, Lund DA, Wright SD. Exploring the Caregiver Burden Inventory (CBI): Further
410 Evidence for a Multidimensional View of Burden. *Int J Aging Hum Dev*. 1996 Jul 1;43(1):21–34.
- 411 36. Luttik ML, Jaarsma T, Veeger N, Tijssen J, Sanderman R, van Veldhuisen DJ. Caregiver burden in
412 partners of Heart Failure patients; limited influence of disease severity. *Eur J Heart Fail*. 2007 Jun
413 7;9(6-7):695–701.
- 414 37. Gauthier A, Vignola A, Calvo A, Cavallo E, Moglia C, Sellitti L, et al. A longitudinal study on quality
415 of life and depression in Als patient–caregiver couples. *Neurology*. 2007 Mar 20;68(12):923–6.
- 416 38. Ebrahimzadeh MH, Shojaei B-S, Golhasani-Keshtan F, Soltani-Moghaddas SH, Fattahi AS,
417 Mazloumi SM. Quality of life and the related factors in spouses of veterans with chronic spinal
418 cord injury. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. 2013 Mar 18;11:48.
- 419 39. Terwee CB, Bot SDM, Boer MR de, Windt DAWM van der, Knol DL, Dekker J, et al. Quality criteria
420 were proposed for measurement properties of health status questionnaires. *J Clin Epidemiol*.
421 2007 Jan 1;60(1):34–42.

422

Table 1

Sample Characteristics (N=176)

Variable	N (%)	Mean	SD
Age of caregivers (years)		56.2	14.6
Females	146 (83%)		
Married/Partner	95 (54%)		
Education of caregivers			
Primary School	22 (13%)		
Middle School	56 (32%)		
High School	80 (45%)		
University	17 (10%)		
Unemployed	59 (33%)		
Age of people with SCI (years)		51.9	17.9
Males	139 (79%)		
Unmarried	60 (34%)		
Education of people with SCI			
Primary School	24 (14%)		
Middle School	56 (33%)		
High School	83 (47%)		
University	10 (6%)		
Active Workers	35 (61)		

Legend: SD Standard Deviation

Table 2

Factor loadings for the 24 items in the Caregiver Burden Inventory in Spinal Cord Injury (CBI-SCI)

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Name of factors
1. My care receiver needs my help to perform many daily tasks	0,92					Time-dependent burden
2. My care receiver is dependent on me	0,94					
3. I have to maintain a high level of attention	0,75					
4. I have to help my care receiver with many basic functions	0,96					
5. I don't have a minute's break from my caregiving chores	0,49					
6. I feel I am missing out on life		0,73				Developmental burden
7. I wish I could escape from this situation		0,80				
8. My social life has suffered		0,84				
9. I feel emotionally drained due to caring for my care receiver		0,60				
10. I expected that things would be different at this point in my life		0,84				
11. I'm not getting enough sleep			0,47			Physical burden
12. My health has suffered			0,74			
13. Caregiving has made me physically sick			0,94			
14. I'm physically tired			0,35			
15. I don't get along with other family members as well as I used to				0,48		Social burden
16. My caregiving efforts aren't appreciated by others in my family				0,81		
17. I've had problems with my marriage				0,57		
18. I don't do as good a job at work as I used to				0,49		
19. I feel resentful of other relatives who could but do not help				0,68		
20. I feel embarrassed about my care receiver's condition					0,83	Emotional burden
21. I feel ashamed of my care receiver					0,75	
22. I resent my care receiver					0,54	
23. I feel uncomfortable when I have friends over or when we go out					0,66	
24. I feel angry about my interactions with my care receiver					0,48	

Table 3

Cronbach's alpha coefficients, means and standard deviations of CBI-SCI and its subscales

	Cronbach's alpha	Mean	SD
Time-dependent burden	0,91	13,91	5,48
Developmental burden	0,88	9,79	5,87
Physical burden	0,87	10,10	5,88
Social burden	0,76	5,15	4,62
Emotional burden	0,76	1,93	2,90
Total CBI-SCI	0,91	41,05	18,10

Legend: SD Standard Deviation

Table 4

Correlation between CBI-SCI and administered questionnaires

Questionnaire	<i>p</i> value	Pearson's <i>r</i>
Modified Barthel Index (MBI)	0,000	- 0,45
Family Strain Questionnaire - Short Form (FSQ-SF)	0,000	0,63
SF-36 Subscale - Vitality	0,000	- 0,45
SF-36 Subscale - Physical functioning	0,000	- 0,35
SF-36 Subscale - Bodily pain	0,000	- 0,48
SF-36 Subscale - General health	0,000	- 0,50
SF-36 Subscale - Physical role functioning	0,000	- 0,49
SF-36 Subscale - Emotional role functioning	0,000	- 0,45
SF-36 Subscale - Social role functioning	0,000	- 0,58
SF-36 Subscale - Mental health	0,000	- 0,52