

Burden in Caregivers of Older Adults with Advanced Illness

Katherine Garlo, BA,* John R. O'Leary, MA,^{†‡} Peter H. Van Ness, PhD, MPH,[†] and Terri R. Fried, MD^{‡§}

OBJECTIVES: To examine caregiver burden over time in caregivers of patients with advanced chronic disease.

DESIGN: Observational cohort with interviews over 12 months.

SETTING: Community.

PARTICIPANTS: Caregivers of 179 community-living persons aged 60 and older with advanced cancer, heart failure (HF), or chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD).

MEASUREMENTS: Caregiver burden was assessed using a short-form of the Zarit Burden Inventory to measure psychosocial distress.

RESULTS: At baseline, the median caregiver burden was 5 (interquartile range (IQR) 1–11), which indicates that the caregiver endorsed having at least two of 10 distressing concerns at least some of the time. Only 10% reported no burden. Although scores increased modestly over time, the association between time and burden was not significant in longitudinal multivariable analysis. High burden was associated with caregiver need for more help with daily tasks (odds ratio (OR) = 23.13, 95% confidence interval (CI) = 5.94–90.06) and desire for greater communication with the patient (OR = 2.53, 95% CI = 1.16–5.53). The longitudinal multivariable analysis did not yield evidence of associations between burden and patient sociodemographic or health characteristics.

CONCLUSION: Caregiver burden was common in caregivers of patients with cancer, HF, and COPD. High burden was associated with the caregiver's report of need for greater help with daily tasks but not with objective measures of the patient's need for assistance, such as symptoms or functional status, suggesting that burden may be a measure of the caregiver's ability to adapt to the caregiving role. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 58:2315–2322, 2010.

Key words: caregiver burden; advanced illness; social support; communication

As physicians prepare to care for an older population of patients with chronic disease, assessing caregiver burden and understanding caregiver needs are increasingly important components of comprehensive clinical care.¹ Caregiver burden refers to the physical, financial, and psychosocial hardships of caring for a loved one, usually a family member, struggling with a medical condition.² Many families caring for terminally ill older adults report making major life changes and personal sacrifices to care for their relative.^{3,4} Furthermore, caregiver burden has been identified as a risk factor for worsening caregiver physical and psychological health,^{5–8} worsening health-related quality of life,⁹ compromised immunity,^{10,11} and mortality.¹² The psychological strain of caregiving and its association with negative health outcomes have been documented in caregivers from multiple nationalities and diverse cultures.^{13–15}

Most research on caregiver burden has examined selected populations, primarily caregivers of patients with dementia¹⁶ and patients at the end of life.^{3,17} Comparison of results across studies examining single populations such as caregivers of patients with heart failure (HF)^{18,19} and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD)²⁰ suggest that there may be differences in caregiver burden with different diseases, but in the absence of direct comparisons within a single study, it is difficult to know whether these are true differences or whether they result from differences in methods across the individual studies. Additionally, there has been more-limited examination of caregiver, versus patient, characteristics associated with burden. There has also been limited evaluation of change in caregiver burden over time, with potentially conflicting results. Whereas one study of spouses of patients with Parkinson's disease demonstrated increasing burden over time,²¹ a study of caregivers of patients with Alzheimer's disease found coping strategies and depressive symptoms to be stable over time.²²

The purpose of this study was to assess changes over time in caregiver burden of patients with advanced cancer, HF, or COPD and to examine characteristics of caregivers and patients associated with caregiver burden.

From the *College of Medicine, Rush University, Chicago, Illinois; [†]Program on Aging School of Medicine and [§]Department of Internal Medicine, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut; and [‡]Clinical Epidemiology Research Center, Veterans Affairs Connecticut Healthcare System, West Haven, Connecticut.

Address correspondence to Terri R. Fried, CERC 151B, VA Connecticut Healthcare System, 950 Campbell Avenue, West Haven, CT 06516. E-mail: terri.fried@yale.edu

DOI: 10.1111/j.1532-5415.2010.03177.x

METHODS

Participants

Study participants were members of a longitudinal cohort study designed to examine as its primary outcome changes in preferences of older persons with advanced illness.²³ Participants were recruited from six cardiology, four oncology, and three pulmonary outpatient practices in the greater New Haven, Connecticut, area; outpatient clinics at two Veterans Affairs (VA) hospitals; and inpatient clinics at a university teaching hospital, community hospital, and VA hospital.²⁴ Sequential medical records of patients aged 60 and older at these sites with a primary diagnosis of cancer, HF, and COPD were reviewed to identify patients with advanced illness, defined using Connecticut Hospice²⁵ or Study to Understand Prognoses and Preferences of Outcomes and Risks of Treatment criteria.^{26,27} Participants eligible according to chart review completed a telephone screen for the additional inclusion criterion of assistance with one or more instrumental activity of daily living (IADLs),²⁸ selected to improve the identification of persons with advanced illness.²⁹ The screen also assessed participants for exclusion criteria, including impaired cognition as determined by the Executive Interview, a test for executive functioning,³⁰ and the Short Portable Mental Status Questionnaire³¹ and part-time residence in Connecticut. Participants were asked to identify as their primary caregiver the person who provided the most help with their IADLs. Screening and enrollment were stratified according to diagnosis. The human investigation committees of all participating hospitals approved the study protocol. All caregivers and patients provided written informed consent.

A total of 548 patients were identified according to chart review. Of these, 30 were not contacted because their physicians did not provide permission, 24 died before the telephone screen, 19 declined the telephone screen, and six could not be reached. Of those completing the telephone screen, 108 were excluded because they did not require help with IADLs, 76 were cognitively impaired, and six were not full-time residents of Connecticut. Of the 279 eligible participants, 51 refused participation, and two died before enrollment, resulting in 226 enrolled patients. Of the 226 patients enrolled, 47 did not have participating caregivers: 33 patients did not provide permission for their caregiver to be contacted, 15 caregivers declined participation, nine patients had only a paid or formal caregiver, and 10 patients did not have participating caregivers for two reasons. An additional 14 caregivers were excluded from the cross-sectional analysis because they were interviewed using an earlier version of the questionnaire that did not include the caregiver burden scale, although their follow-up data were complete, and thus they were included in the longitudinal analysis.

Data Collection

Patients and caregivers were interviewed separately in their homes at least every 4 months for 12 months or until the patient became too sick to participate or died. Patients and caregivers were interviewed immediately if the patient's health declined significantly, defined as a decline in ability to perform one or more activities of daily living (ADLs),³² a hospitalization lasting longer than 1 week, hospital dis-

charge to a nursing home or rehabilitation facility, or the introduction of hospice care.

The outcome variable, caregiver burden, was assessed in terms of the caregiver's psychological and emotional strain using a 10-item subset of the Zarit Burden Inventory (ZBI).³³ The full ZBI consists of 40 questions originally designed to evaluate five broad aspects of caregiver burden in caregivers of patients with dementia.² The subscale used in this report consists of the 10 questions measuring psychosocial distress answered on a 5-point Likert scale with never, rarely, sometimes, often, and always corresponding to scores of 0 to 4 and summed to give a total score ranging from 0 to 40. The subscale includes items such as, "I feel that my relative makes requests of me that are over and above what he or she needs," "Because of my involvement with my relative, I don't have enough time for myself," and "I feel stressed between trying to give to my relative as well as to other responsibilities." This subscale has been demonstrated to have high internal consistency (Cronbach alpha 0.94).⁵

Because burden scores were not normally distributed, the median and interquartile range were used to describe the distribution of scores, although to compare the average level of burden of caregivers in the current study with burden of caregivers in previous studies, burden was characterized using mean and standard deviation, because this was the only description of average burden available in most previous studies. For analytical purposes, a dichotomous variable of high burden was created, defined as a score of greater than the median, versus low burden. This approach has been used previously³⁴ because the ZBI score does not have a theoretically³⁵ or empirically³⁶ defined threshold for high burden.

Descriptive and analytical variables included patient and caregiver sociodemographic and health characteristics and caregiver psychosocial characteristics. Patient sociodemographic variables were age, education, sex, race, marital status, and living arrangements. Health status variables were self-rated health;³⁷ symptoms, measured using a modified version of the Edmonton symptom scale;³⁸ number of hospitalizations in the 6 months before study enrollment; use of hospice services at any time after enrollment (used in longitudinal analysis only); functional status measured in terms of ADLs³² and IADLs;²⁸ and depression, measured using the two-item Primary Care Evaluation of Mental Disorders instrument.³⁹

Caregiver sociodemographic variables were age, education, sex, race, marital status, living arrangements, adequacy of monthly income,⁴⁰ and relationship to the patient. The health variable was the caregiver's self-rated health. Psychosocial variables were prior experience caring for a terminally ill relative; social support assessed using questions from the Established Populations for the Epidemiologic Studies of the Elderly project,⁴¹ which included the questions: "Could you use more help with daily tasks?" and "Could you use more emotional support than you receive?"; concerns about the course of illness, assessed using a 5-point Likert scale (strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree, and don't know) and consisted of the statements "I am concerned that my relative's life will be inappropriately prolonged by the use of machines," "I am concerned about my relative having other uncomfortable symptoms, such as fatigue, nausea, or shortness of breath," and "I am concerned that, if my relative has these symptoms, they will not be adequately

controlled;” and communication concerns, which included the statements, “I would like to talk with my relative more about his or her illness,” and “I would like to talk with the doctor more about my relative’s illness.”

Statistical Analysis

Frequencies and proportions and means and standard deviations were used to describe patient and caregiver characteristics of the cohort as a whole and as stratified according to patient diagnosis. All binary and ordinal variables were categorized at clinically meaningful cut points. Associations between patient and caregiver characteristics and patient diagnosis were examined in cross-sectional bivariate analyses using the chi-square test for categorical variables and the *F*-test for continuous variables. The Kruskal-Wallis test was used to examine the significance of the association between caregiver burden score and patient diagnosis.

Changes in caregiver burden scores over time are described by presenting median and interquartile range (IQR) for the entire cohort and stratified according to patient diagnosis at baseline and the interview occurring closest to 4, 8, and 12 months after baseline. To explore the effect of patient dropout secondary to declining health and death on caregiver burden, median burden scores at the initial and 12-month interview for caregivers of patients who completed study participation and at the initial and final interview for caregivers of patients who died during follow-up were examined. This analysis included caregiver burden scores for 14 caregivers who completed interviews when the patient was too sick to participate in an interview before his or her death. The analysis excluded 15 caregivers whose patients died before a second interview could be performed, one caregiver who died before a second interview could be performed, and six caregivers who declined or the patient declined to complete a follow-up interview.

The relationships between patient and caregiver characteristics and the dichotomous caregiver burden variable (high vs low burden) at baseline were examined in bivariate cross-sectional analysis using the chi-square test or *F*-test, as appropriate. The variables associated with caregiver burden at a significance level of $P < .20$ were examined in bivariate longitudinal analysis, in which data from all patient and caregiver interviews were included, using mixed-effects models. The variables associated with caregiver burden in longitudinal analysis at a significance level of $P < .10$ were included in a multivariable mixed-effects logistic regression model having a random intercept, and odds ratios with 95% confidence intervals are reported for these variables. Correlations between these variables were examined cross-sectionally using the Spearman rank correlation coefficient. When pairs of variables demonstrated correlation with a Spearman rho greater than 0.4, a single variable was selected for inclusion in the model. SAS version 9.2 (SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, NC) was used for all analyses.

RESULTS

Caregiver and Patient Populations

Characteristics of the 179 caregivers are summarized in Table 1. Of the total caregiver cohort, 56% were the patient’s spouse, 25% a child, 13% another relative, and 6%

a friend. Overall, the majority of caregivers reported themselves to be in good or excellent health and to have sufficient help with daily tasks and sufficient emotional support. Concerns about communication were high; 39% reported wanting to talk with their relative more about his or her illness. A lower proportion of caregivers of patients with HF reported having experience caring for a sick relative (53%) than did caregivers of patients with cancer (75%) or COPD (69%). A higher proportion of caregivers of patients with HF reported needing more help with daily tasks (23%) than of caregivers of patients with cancer (9%) or COPD (11%).

Characteristics of the 179 patients are also summarized in Table 1. The majority of patients reported three or more IADL disabilities (78%) and fair or poor self-rated health (67%), and 50% reported depression. A higher proportion of patients with HF reported more than two hospitalizations in the previous year (64%) than of patients with COPD (50%) and cancer (32%). A higher proportion of patients with COPD reported their health to be fair or poor (81%) than of patients with cancer (53%) and HF (66%).

Description of Caregiver Burden at Baseline and over 12 Months

At baseline, the median caregiver burden (on a scale from 0–40) was 5 (IQR 1–11), which indicates that the caregiver endorsed having at least two of the 10 concerns included in the scale. For example, a score of 5 can reflect the reporting of one concern occurring always and a second occurring rarely or the reporting of one concern occurring sometimes and a second occurring frequently. Only 10% reported no burden. The mean caregiver burden score was 7.1 ± 7.2 . Caregiver burden scales of this magnitude have been reported in caregivers of patients with dementia (7.6 ± 7.8^{35}) and terminal cancer receiving palliative care using the full-length ZBI with scores ranging from 0 to 88 (18.3 ± 11.6^{42} and 18.5 ± 11.0^{34}).

Over 12 months, there was little change in caregiver burden overall. Whereas burden increased slightly in caregivers of patients with COPD and cancer, it decreased in caregivers of patients with HF (Figure 1). In caregivers of the patients who completed a full year of study participation, the initial caregiver burden score was 4 (IQR 1–12), and the final score was 6 (IQR 2–12). In caregivers of the patients who died or became too sick to complete the full year, the initial score was 6 (IQR 3–10), and the final score was 7 (IQR 3–14).

Caregiver and Patient Characteristics in Association with Caregiver Burden

In bivariate cross-sectional analysis, patient report of moderate to severe physical discomfort was the only patient characteristic significantly associated with high burden (Table 2). A larger proportion of caregivers of patients who had a diagnosis of HF, greater IADL disability, depression, and moderate to severe shortness of breath reported high caregiver burden than of caregivers of patients without these characteristics, although these differences did not reach statistical significance. Additional patient characteristics examined were not associated with caregiver burden (age, sex, race, education, marital status, self-rated health, number of hospitalizations in the 6 months before study enrollment, ADL disability, and living alone). In contrast, a

Table 1. Description of Caregivers and Patients

Characteristic	Total (n = 179)	Cancer (n = 68)	Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (n = 64)	Heart Failure (n = 47)	P-Value
Caregiver					
Age, mean ± SD	62 ± 14	60 ± 14	63 ± 15	62 ± 14	.60
Education, years, mean ± SD	13 ± 3	13 ± 3	12 ± 3	13 ± 3	.19
Female, %	78	78	77	81	.86
White, %	92	93	94	89	.68
Married, %	78	77	78	79	.95
Not enough or just enough money, %	45	42	43	51	.62
Self-rated health fair or poor, %	18	10	23	21	.11
Relationship to patient, %					.51
Spouse, husband, wife	56	54	55	60	
Child, daughter, son	27	25	27	32	
Other, relative, friend, paid caregiver	17	21	19	9	
Prior experience caring for ill person, %	67	75	69	53	.05
Some or a lot more help with daily tasks needed, %	13	9	11	23	.06
Some or a lot more emotional support needed, %	17	15	16	23	.53
I would like to talk to the patient more, agree or strongly agree, %	39	50	34	30	.06
I would like to talk to the doctor more, agree or strongly agree, %	35	37	38	28	.50
Caregiver burden, median (interquartile range)*	5 (1–11)	4 (1–10)	4 (2–9)	8 (1–15)	.36
Patient					
Age, mean ± SD	73 ± 7	72 ± 7	73 ± 7	75 ± 8	.03
Education, years, mean ± SD	12 ± 3	12 ± 3	11 ± 3	12 ± 3	.07
Female, %	41	44	45	32	.31
White, %	91	93	94	85	.24
Married, %	61	62	59	62	.95
Just enough or not enough money, %	58	54	61	58	.68
Lives alone, %	20	16	22	21	.67
≥1 activity of daily living disabilities, %	39	32	48	34	.13
≥3 instrumental activity of daily living disabilities, %	78	68	81	87	.03
≥2 hospitalizations in previous year, %	47	32	50	64	<.01
Self-rated health fair or poor, %	67	53	81	66	<.01
Physical discomfort moderate to severe, %	39	42	42	30	.31
Depression, %	50	47	61	38	.05

* As measured according to a short form of the Zarit Burden Inventory (range 0–40; higher scores indicating higher burden).
SD = standard deviation.

number of caregiver psychosocial and demographic characteristics were associated with high burden, as were several caregiver concerns. The large majority of caregivers who reported needing more help with daily tasks reported a high burden (88%), compared with 40% of caregivers who did not need more help ($P < .001$). Likewise, nearly all caregivers who reported a need for more emotional support reported high burden (97%), compared with 36% of caregivers who did not need more support ($P < .001$). The caregivers' desire for more communication with their relative and with their relative's doctor and female sex of the caregiver were significantly associated with high caregiver burden. A greater proportion of caregivers with the relationship to the patient of child than of those with the relationship of spouse or other reported higher burden, as did caregivers with not enough or just enough money than caregivers with more than enough money, but these relationships did not reach statistical significance. A greater proportion of caregivers who were

concerned that their loved one's life would be inappropriately prolonged using machines and who were concerned that their loved one's symptoms would not be well controlled reported high burden than of those who did not have these concerns, but these relationships did not reach statistical significance (Table 2).

In longitudinal multivariable analysis, the need for more help with daily tasks remained the variable most strongly associated with high caregiver burden. Because this variable was highly correlated with the need for greater emotional support, the latter was not included in the multivariable model. In addition, caregiver desire for more communication with the patient remained statistically significantly associated with high caregiver burden. This variable was highly correlated with desire for more communication with the patient's doctor, so the latter was not included in the model. Time in the study and caregiver relationship to the patient of child were significantly associated with high burden in bivariate longitudinal analysis,




Figure 1. Longitudinal description of caregiver burden according to patient diagnosis. The figure shows the median caregiver burden score and interquartile range measured at baseline (time 0) and 4-, 8-, and 12-month follow-up. Caregiver burden was assessed during an in-person interview with the caregiver using a 10-item short-form of the Zarit Burden Inventory scored on a 5-point Likert scale with total scores ranging from 1 to 40. The total sample size was 179 caregivers at baseline (cancer 68, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) 64, heart failure (HF) 47), 165 at 4 months (cancer 54, COPD 63, HF 48), 137 at 8 months (cancer 41, COPD 57, HF 39), and 113 at 12 months (cancer 27, COPD 51, HF 35).

although these factors did not retain their significance in multivariable analysis. Patient reports of shortness of breath, physical discomfort, and depression; patient enrollment in hospice; and caregiver concerns about prolonging the patient’s life with machines had elevated odds ratios, but the results did not reach statistical significance (Table 3). The relationships seen in cross-sectional analysis between diagnosis, caregiver sex, caregiver income, caregiver concerns that the patient’s symptoms would not be controlled, patient IADL disability, and caregiver burden were not confirmed in longitudinal analysis.

DISCUSSION

In this population of caregivers of older adults with advanced cancer, COPD, and HF, the great majority of caregivers reported caregiver burden measured in terms of psychosocial distress. Although caregivers of patients with HF reported higher burden at baseline than caregivers of patients with cancer and COPD, this difference did not reach statistical significance, and there was no longitudinal relationship between patient diagnosis and burden. Overall, level of burden showed only minimal change over time, and the relationship between time and burden did not remain significant in multivariable analysis. Caregiver characteristics were more strongly associated with high burden than were patient characteristics. In longitudinal analysis, the caregiver’s need for more help with daily tasks demonstrated the strongest association with high caregiver burden.

Table 2. Bivariate Associations Between Patient and Caregiver Characteristics and High Caregiver Burden in Cross-Sectional Analysis

Characteristic	High Burden % (n = 84)	P-Value
Patient		
Diagnosis		
Cancer (n = 68)	43	.13
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (n = 64)	42	
Heart failure (n = 47)	60	
Number of instrumental activity of daily living disabilities		
≥3 (n = 139)	50	.18
<3 (n = 40)	38	
Physical discomfort		
Moderate to severe (n = 70)	57	.03
None to mild (n = 109)	40	
Shortness of breath		
Moderate to severe (n = 67)	54	.16
None to mild (n = 112)	43	
Depression		
Present (n = 89)	53	.12
Absent (n = 90)	41	
Caregiver		
Sex		
Female (n = 140)	51	.05
Male (n = 39)	33	
Income		
Not enough or just enough money (n = 78)	55	.08
More than enough money (n = 96)	42	
Relationship to patient		
Spouse, husband, wife (n = 100)	45	.07
Child (n = 49)	59	
Other (n = 30)	33	
More help with daily tasks needed		<.001
Yes (n = 24)	88	
No (n = 154)	40	
More emotional support needed		<.001
Yes (n = 30)	97	
No (n = 144)	36	
“I am concerned that symptoms will not be controlled”		.09
Strongly agree or agree (n = 70)	56	
Neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree (n = 109)	43	
“I am concerned the patient’s life will be inappropriately prolonged”		.13
Strongly agree or agree (n = 44)	57	
Neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree (n = 135)	44	
“I would like to talk to the patient about his or her illness more”	0.03	
Strongly agree or agree (n = 70)	57	
Neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree (n = 109)	40	
“I would like to talk to the doctor about the patient’s illness more”		.03
Strongly agree or agree (n = 62)	58	
Neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree (n = 117)	41	

Table 3. Patient and Caregiver Characteristics Associated with Caregiver Burden in Longitudinal Bivariate and Multivariable Analysis

Characteristic	Odds Ratio (95% Confidence Interval)	
	Bivariate	Multivariable
Caregiver		
Relationship to patient of child	3.95 (1.09–14.36)	2.84 (0.78–10.34)
More help with daily tasks needed	30.63 (7.79–120.50)	23.13 (5.94–90.06)
Concerns about prolonging life with machines	2.25 (0.87–5.82)	2.03 (0.74–5.59)
Desire to talk with relative more	2.72 (1.32–5.63)	2.53 (1.16–5.53)
Patient		
Shortness of breath	2.04 (0.88–4.73)	1.53 (0.63–3.74)
Moderate to severe physical discomfort	1.92 (0.97–3.79)	1.47 (0.70–3.07)
Depression	2.06 (0.98–4.32)	1.49 (0.68–3.29)
Enrolled in hospice	7.70 (0.98–60.70)	5.35 (0.62–46.03)
Time (months)	1.08 (1.01–1.15)	1.05 (0.98–1.13)

The level of caregiver burden found in this study was similar across different patient diagnoses and comparable with the level of burden previously documented in caregivers of patients with dementia³⁵ and terminal cancer.^{34,42} These findings suggest that caregiver burden may not be disease specific but may be a universal phenomenon of caring for older adults with chronic illnesses.

Prior studies examining the relationship between patient characteristics and caregiver burden have yielded mixed results. A comprehensive review of caregiver burden in caregivers of patients with dementia concluded that patient variables were not particularly strong predictors of caregiver outcomes,⁴³ although one small study of caregivers of older adult patients with chronic illness found an association between activities of care performed by the caregiver and caregiver burden.⁴⁴ A second small study of caregiver burden in caregivers of patients with terminal cancer receiving home palliative care was associated with patient psychological status.⁴⁵ These latter studies analyzed association as correlations between patient characteristics and burden measured using continuous scales, which, in contrast to the conservative approach of evaluating caregiver burden as a dichotomous outcome used in the present study, may have increased the likelihood of finding associations.

The association between the caregivers' objective need for social support and concerns about communication and high burden provide quantitative evidence consistent with the findings of qualitative studies of caregivers of patients with cancer,⁴⁶ HF,¹⁸ and COPD,⁴⁷ indicating that limited social support,⁴⁶ social isolation,⁴⁷ lack of professional communication with clinicians, and concerns about the future of the patient¹⁸ are important aspects of caregiver psychological well-being and possible sources of emotional strain. In a study of recently bereaved caregivers, informal social support was directly related to better caregiver physical and mental health.⁴⁸

The need for greater social support was included in the study as a measure of caregivers' objective requirements for

more help with their caregiving tasks, in contrast to the caregiver burden scale, which was developed as a measure of the subjective emotional strain associated with those tasks. Given the strong association between these measures, it could be argued that these are assessments of the same phenomenon. Several additional results of this study support the notion that the measure of need for social support, rather than reflecting an objective assessment of need, is assessing the subjective construct of caregivers' ability to cope with their caregiving role. First, caregiver burden was not strongly associated with patient functional disability, a measure of patient need for direct assistance from caregivers. Second, caregiver burden changed little over the 1-year course of the study, despite the advancing illness of the patients. Finally, caregiver burden was higher, albeit nonsignificantly, in caregivers of patients who received hospice services and presumably were therefore receiving a greater amount of formal caregiving services to relieve their burden. Taken together, these results suggest that caregivers' psychological response to their role, rather than the objective tasks they perform to care for their relative, may determine to a large extent the strain of caregiving. A number of studies that have found a relationship between caregivers' personality attributes and coping strategies and caregiver burden support this conclusion.^{16,21,22}

These findings have several implications for the clinical care of patients with advanced illness and their families. The level and frequency of caregiver burden suggest that caregiver burden is important to assess in caregivers of older adult patients with advanced illnesses, regardless of specific diagnosis. The strong association between caregiver perceived need for social support and high burden indicate that it may be possible to capture levels of burden by simply asking caregivers about their need for social and emotional support. The lack of association between burden and patient characteristics suggests that more work is necessary to understand fully the aspects of caregiving that contribute to caregivers' sense of burden and need for greater assistance, although the association between high caregiver burden and caregiver desire for more communication illustrates that unmet communication needs is one such aspect. It has been suggested that physicians who engage families in difficult conversations and demonstrate empathy for family emotions may relieve psychological stress on caretakers.¹ To the extent that burden appears to be a function of the caregiver's ability to adapt, rather than the caregiving needs of the patient, interventions aimed at helping caregivers cope with their role may help reduce burden and improve caregiver outcomes. A review of psychosocial interventions aimed at caregivers concluded that they had small but significant effects on caregiver burden, depression, and anxiety.⁴⁹ Better understanding about factors that affect caregivers' ability to adapt and cope may aid in developing interventions with even greater efficacy.

This study has several limitations. Several caregiver characteristics that have previously been found to be associated with caregiver burden, such as caregiver functional status, depression, and cognition¹⁶ and the quality of the relationship between caregiver and patient,²⁰ were not measured. Because the study cohort included few caregivers of minority ethnic or racial status, whose burden has been shown to differ systematically from that of white caregivers,

the results may have limited generalizability.⁵⁰ The 1-year study period reflects only a brief portion in the course of patients' illness trajectories. Because caregivers of patients with advanced illness were studied, a substantial proportion did not complete participation because of the death or worsening health of the patient. Although this dropout was unavoidable, it created the potential for bias in the measurement of burden over time if caregivers with the greatest burden were more likely to fail to complete the study. Nevertheless, although the initial burden scores were slightly higher for caregivers who did not complete participation than for those who did, the final burden scores were similar, providing some evidence that burden did not rise substantially before the caregiver left the study. Last, the ZBI does not have an a priori defined threshold for high burden³⁵ because cutoff scores³⁶ are not sufficiently specific or sensitive. Thus it is unknown whether the caregivers in the high-burden group were at greater risk for adverse outcomes.

In conclusion, caregiver burden, assessed in terms of psychosocial distress, was common in caregivers of patients with cancer, HF, and COPD. High burden was associated with caregiver report of need for greater help with daily tasks but not with factors affecting the patient's need for assistance, such as symptoms or functional status, suggesting that burden may be a measure of the caregiver's ability to adapt to the caregiving role.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Conflict of Interest: The editor in chief has reviewed the conflict of interest checklist provided by the authors and has determined that the authors have no financial or any other kind of personal conflicts with this paper.

This study was supported by a Medical Student Training in Aging Research award, P30 AG21342, from the Claude D. Pepper Older Americans Independence Center at Yale University and R01 AG19769 from the National Institute on Aging. Dr. Fried is supported by K24 AG028443 from the National Institute on Aging.

Author Contributions: Study concept and design: KG, TF. Acquisition of subjects and data: TF. Analysis and interpretation of data: KG, PHVN, JOL, TF. Preparation of manuscript: KG, TF. Editing of manuscript: PHVN, JOL, TF.

Sponsor's Role: The sponsors had no role in the design, methods, subject recruitment, data collection, or analysis and preparation of the paper.

REFERENCES

- Rabow MW, Hauser JM, Adams J. Supporting family caregivers at the end of life: "They don't know what they don't know." *JAMA* 2004;291:483–491.
- Zarit SH, Reever KE, Bach-Peterson J. Relatives of the impaired elderly: Correlates of feelings of burden. *Gerontologist* 1980;20:649–655.
- Covinsky KE, Goldman L, Cook EF et al. The impact of serious illness on patients' families. SUPPORT investigators study to understand prognoses and preferences for outcomes and risks of treatment. *JAMA* 1994;272:1839–1844.
- Emanuel EJ, Fairclough DL, Slutsman J et al. Understanding economic and other burdens of terminal illness: The experience of patients and their caregivers. *Ann Intern Med* 2000;132:451–459.
- Beery LC, Prigerson HG, Bierhals AJ et al. Traumatic grief, depression and caregiving in elderly spouses of the terminally ill. *Omega: Int Manage Sci* 1997;35:261–279.
- Anthony-Bergstone CR, Zarit SH, Gatz M. Symptoms of psychological distress among caregivers of dementia patients. *Psychol Aging* 1988;3:245–248.
- Pinquart M, Sorensen S. Differences between caregivers and noncaregivers in psychological health and physical health: A meta-analysis. *Psychol Aging* 2003;18:250–267.
- Vitaliano PP, Zhang J, Scanlan JM. Is caregiving hazardous to one's physical health? A meta-analysis. *Psychol Bull* 2003;129:946–972.
- Burton LC, Newsom JT, Schulz R et al. Preventive health behaviors among spousal caregivers. *Prev Med* 1997;26:162–169.
- Kiecolt-Glaser JK, Dura JR, Speicher CE et al. Spousal caregivers of dementia victims: Longitudinal changes in immunity and health. *Psychosom Med* 1991;53:345–362.
- von Kanel R, Dimsdale JE, Mills PJ et al. Effect of Alzheimer caregiving stress and age on frailty markers interleukin-6, C-reactive protein, and D-dimer. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2006;61A:963–969.
- Schulz R, Beach SR. Caregiving as a risk factor for mortality: The Caregiver Health Effects Study. *JAMA* 1999;282:2215–2219.
- Uwakwe R, Modebe I. Disability and care-giving in old age in a Nigerian community. *Niger J Clin Pract* 2007;10:58–65.
- Andrieu S, Balardy L, Gillette-Guyonnet S et al. Burden experienced by informal caregivers assisting Alzheimer's patients in the REAL.FR study. *Rev Med Interne* 2003;3:351s–359s.
- Ho SC, Chan A, Woo J et al. Impact of caregiving on health and quality of life: A comparative population-based study of caregivers for elderly persons and noncaregivers. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2009;64A:873–879.
- Schulz R, Martire LM. Family caregiving of persons with dementia: Prevalence, health effects, and support strategies. *Am J Geriatr Psychiatry* 2004;12:240–249.
- McCorkle R, Pasacrete JV. Enhancing caregiver outcomes in palliative care. *Cancer Control* 2001;8:36–45.
- Aldred H, Gott M, Gariballa S. Advanced heart failure: Impact on older patients and informal carers. *J Adv Nurs* 2005;49:116–124.
- Hooley PJ, Butler G, Howlett JG. The relationship of quality of life, depression, and caregiver burden in outpatients with congestive heart failure. *Congest Heart Fail* 2005;11:303–310.
- Pinto RA, Holanda MA, Medeiros MM et al. Assessment of the burden of caregiving for patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Respir Med* 2007;101:2402–2408.
- Lyons KS, Stewart BJ, Archbold PG et al. Optimism, pessimism, mutuality, and gender: Predicting 10-year role strain in Parkinson's disease spouses. *Gerontologist* 2009;49:378–387.
- Powers DV, Gallagher-Thompson D, Kraemer HC. Coping and depression in Alzheimer's caregivers: Longitudinal evidence of stability. *J Gerontol Series B Psychol Sci Soc Sci* 2002;57B:P205–P211.
- Fried TR, Byers AL, Gallo WT et al. Prospective study of health status preferences and changes in preferences over time in older adults. *Arch Intern Med* 2006;166:890–895.
- Fried TR, Bradley EH, Towle VR. Assessment of patient preferences: Integrating treatments and outcomes. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci* 2002;57B:S348–S354.
- The Connecticut Hospice Inc. Summary Guidelines for Initiation of Advanced Care. John Thompson Institute, Branford, CT: 1996.
- Murphy DJ, Knaus WA, Lynn J. Study population in SUPPORT: Patients (as defined by disease categories and mortality projections), surrogates, and physicians. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1990;43:11S–28S.
- Knaus WA, Harrell FE Jr, Lynn J et al. The SUPPORT prognostic model. Objective estimates of survival for seriously ill hospitalized adults. Study to Understand Prognoses and Preferences for Outcomes and Risks of Treatments. *Ann Intern Med* 1995;122:191–203.
- Lawton MP, Brody EM. Assessment of older people: Self-maintaining and instrumental activities of daily living. *Gerontologist* 1969;9:179–186.
- Inouye SK, Peduzzi PN, Robison JT et al. Importance of functional measures in predicting mortality among older hospitalized patients. *JAMA* 1998;279:1187–1193.
- Royall DR, Mahurin RK, Gray KF. Bedside assessment of executive cognitive impairment: The Executive Interview. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1992;40:1221–1226.
- Pfeiffer E. A short portable mental status questionnaire for the assessment of organic brain deficit in elderly patients. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1975;23:433–441.
- Katz S, Ford AB, Moskowitz RW et al. Studies of illness in the aged. The index of ADL: A standardized measure of biological and psychosocial function. *JAMA* 1963;185:914–919.
- Schulz R, Williamson GM. The measurement of caregiver outcomes in Alzheimer disease research. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord* 1997;11:117–124.
- Higginson IJ, Gao W. Caregiver assessment of patients with advanced cancer: Concordance with patients, effect of burden and positivity. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2008;6:42.
- O'Rourke N, Tuokko HA. Psychometric properties of an abridged version of the Zarit burden interview within a representative Canadian caregiver sample. *Gerontologist* 2003;43:121–127.
- Bedard M, Molloy DW, Squire L et al. The Zarit Burden Interview: A new short version and screening version. *Gerontologist* 2001;41:652–657.

37. Idler EL, Benyamini Y. Self-rated health and mortality: A review of twenty-seven community studies. *J Health Soc Behav* 1997;38:21–37.
38. Walke LM, Gallo WT, Tinetti M et al. The burden of symptoms among community-dwelling older persons with advanced chronic disease. *Arch Intern Med* 2004;164:2321–2324.
39. Whooley MA, Avins AL, Miranda J et al. Case-finding instruments for depression. Two questions are as good as many. *J Gen Intern Med* 1997;12:439–445.
40. Pearlin LI, Lieberman MA, Menaghan EG et al. The stress process. *J Health Soc Behav* 1981;22:337–356.
41. Mendes de Leon CF, Gold DT, Glass TA et al. Disability as a function of social networks and support in elderly African Americans and whites: The Duke EPESE 1986–1992. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci* 2001;56:S179–S190.
42. Grunfeld E, Coyle D, Whelan T et al. Family caregiver burden: Results of a longitudinal study of breast cancer patients and their principal caregivers. *Can Med Assoc J* 2004;170:1795–1801.
43. Dunkin J, Anderson-Hanley C. Dementia caregiver burden: A review of the literature and guidelines for assessment and intervention. *Neurology* 1998;51: S53–S60.
44. Faison KJ, Faria SH, Frank D. Caregivers of chronically ill elderly: Perceived burden. *J Commun Health Nurs* 1999;16:243–253.
45. Harding R, Higginson IJ, Donaldson N. The relationship between patient characteristics and carer psychological status in home palliative cancer care. *Support Care Cancer* 2003;11:638–643.
46. Payne S, Smith P, Dean S. Identifying the concerns of informal carers in palliative care. *Palliat Med* 1999;13:37–44.
47. Bergs D. “The hidden client”—women caring for husbands with COPD: Their experience of quality of life. *J Clin Nurs* 2002;11:613–621.
48. Williams SW, Williams CS, Zimmerman S et al. Emotional and physical health of informal caregivers of residents at the end of life: The role of social support. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci* 2008;63:S171–S183.
49. Martire LM, Lustig AP, Schulz R et al. Is it beneficial to involve a family member? A meta-analysis of psychosocial interventions for chronic illness. *Health Psychol* 2004;23:599–611.
50. Dilworth-Anderson P, Williams IC, Gibson BE. Issues of race, ethnicity, and culture in caregiving research: A 20-year review (1980–2000). *Gerontologist* 2002;42:237–272.