



ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

Nursing

“A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY TO ASSESS CARE GIVING BURDEN AMONG CARE GIVERS OF CHRONICALLY ILL PATIENTS ADMITTED IN MMIMS&R, MULLANA, AMBALA, HARYANA.”

KEY WORDS: Care giver, Care giving burden.

Ms. Shalini Youssouf

Nursing Tutor, Medical Surgical Nursing, Maharishi Markandeshwar college of Nursing Maharishi Markandeshwar (Deemed to be) University, Mullana, Ambala PIN: 133203

Ms. Sandeep kaur*

Nursing Tutor, Child Health Nursing, Maharishi Markandeshwar college of Nursing Maharishi Markandeshwar (Deemed to be) University, Mullana, Ambala PIN: 133203 *Corresponding Author

Mr. Pardeep Singh

Associate Profssor, Pharmaceuticals, Guru Nanak Institute of Technology, Mullana, Ambala. Pandit Bhagwat Dayal Sharma. University of Health Sciences, Rohtak. PIN: 133203

ABSTRACT

Title of study: “A Descriptive Study to Assess Care Giving Burden Among Care Givers of Chronically ill Patients Admitted in MMIMS&R, Mullana, Ambala, Haryana.” **Background:** Keeping family care givers healthy and able to provide care is crucial to maintaining our nation's long term healthcare system. **Aims:** To assess the care giving burden among care givers of chronically ill patients admitted. **Methodology:** The research includes Quantitative approach and Descriptive design. A total of 150 Care givers of chronically ill admitted patients were selected from MMIMS&R Hospital, Mullana, Ambala, Haryana using purposive sampling technique. Selected patient variables and selected caregiver variables were collected using Structured Interview technique and Care giver burden was assesses using Care Giver Burden Scale. Reliability of tool was established by using Cronbach alpha for standardized tool (0.89). Data collection was done during month of April 2022. **Results:** The study showed that 3.4% of care givers had severe burden, 64% had moderate to severe burden and 32.6% had mild to moderate burden. There was no association of care giving burden score with selected patient variables except for any permanent disability, average expenditure on health services, duration of illness, marital status, age and diagnosis of patient and with selected care giver variables except for income of family. **Conclusion:** Most care givers of chronically ill patients admitted had moderate to severe burden.

INTRODUCTION

A chronic condition is a physical or mental health condition that lasts more than one year and causes functional restrictions or require ongoing monitoring and treatment. Chronic Illness not only affects the individual but also have a significant impact on the family unit. Highly stressed family caregivers have been found to be at increased risk for state of depression and health problems and increased death rates.¹

Upto 52 million Americans provide help to a family member with an illness or disability. Around 68 million Indians and 95 lakh people of Haryana Caregivers provide extensive help to impaired relatives with chronic illness. Nearly 62 % of caregivers in face moderate to severe stress which ultimately affects quality of care that is being provided to the patient. This is also because they are unprepared to provide care , have adequate knowledge about care giving.²

There are some studies addressing the caregivers who get social support feel less care burden and that there exists a negative relation between the increase in social support and intensity of care Burden. It has also been reported that social support level perceived by caregivers is among the primary factors affecting the health state of caregivers.³

A caregiver burden is a multi-layered phenomenon involving various factors for both patients and caregivers. It is imperative that the need and concerns of the caregiver are not forgotten or neglected in the rush to provide greater comfort for the person with the illness. Professionals healthcare providers should thoroughly assess the caregiver's life and lifestyle to ensure the caregivers is able to meet the needs of patients with Alzheimer's disease. Additionally, it may become imperative for the healthcare provider to understand the impact the family member's illness may have on a caregiver's life. The impact the may come from the patient's illness, injury, age related diagnosis.⁴

MATERIAL & METHODS

The research includes Quantitative approach and Descriptive design. A total of 150 Care givers of chronically ill admitted patients were selected from MMIMS&R Hospital, Mullana, Ambala, Haryana using purposive sampling technique. Selected patient variables and selected caregiver variables were collected using Structured Interview technique and Care giver burden was assesses using Care Giver Burden Scale. Reliability of tool was established by using Cronbach alpha for standardized tool (0.89). Data collection was done during month of April 2022.

Results & Data Analysis

Table 1 Frequency And Percentage Distribution In Terms Of Care Giver Burden Among Caregivers Of Chronically Ill Patients Admitted.

Level of stress	Range of score	Group n=150 (f)	Percentage (%)
Mild to Moderate burden	22-40	49	32.6
Moderate to Severe burden	41-60	96	64
Severe burden	61-88	5	3.4

Minimum score= 22

Maximum score=88

Table 1 depicts that more than half (54%) of the caregivers were having moderate to severe level of care giving burden . Less than one third (32.6%) were having mild to moderate level of stress and the minimum (3.4%) of the caregivers were having severe level of burden.

Table 2 ANOVA/t value showing association among care giver burden with selected patient variables.

N= 150

Patient Variables	f (%)	F/t value	df	p value
1. Age				

1.1 16-35 yrs	24 (16 %)	2.69	3/146	0.04*	1.2 Parents	27 (18 %)	41.03			
1.2 36-55 yrs	61 (40.6 %)				1.3 Children	47 (31.4 %)	47.31			
1.3 56-75 yrs	47 (31.4 %)				1.4 Siblings	7 (4.6 %)	42.14			
1.4 >75 yrs	18 (12 %)				2.Age					
2. Gender					2.1 19-33yrs	39 (26 %)	44.41	0.15	3/146	0.92 NS
2.1 Female	54 (36%)	0.61	147	0.53 NS	2.2 34-49 yrs	70 (46.6 %)	45.21			
2.2 Male	96 (64%)				2.3 50-65 yrs	39 (26 %)	44.89			
3. Ward					2.4 >65 yrs	2 (1.4 %)	48.00			
3.1 Neurology	53 (35.4 %)	2.878	3/146	0.03*	3. Gender					
3.2 Orthopaedics	7 (4.6 %)				3.1 Male	56(37.4 %)	44.50	0.51	148	0.61 NS
3.3 MICU	45 (30 %)				3.2 Female	94 (62.6 %)	45.23			
3.4 Dialysis Unit	45 (30%)				4. Marital status					
4. Duration of Illness					4.1 Single	17 (11.4%)	43.05	0.96	1/148	0.32 NS
4.1 1-3 months	41 (27.4 %)	7.29	4/145	0.00*	4.2 Married	133 (88.6%)	45.20			
4.2 4-7 months	35 (23.3 %)				4.3 Divorced/wi dow/separated	0	0			
4.3 8-11 months	17 (11.4 %)				5. Place of living	27 (18%)	46.51	1.05	148	0.29 NS
4.4 12-15 months	20 (13.3 %)				5.1 Urban	123 (82%)	44.61			
4.5 above 15 months	37 (24.6 %)				5.2 Rural					
5. Marital Status					6. Education					
5.1 Single	13 (8.6 %)	5.53	2/147	0.00*	6.1 Illiterate					
5.2 Married	126 (84 %)				6.2 Primary					
5.3 Divorced/Widow/Se parated	11 (7.4 %)				6.3 Matriculate	22 (14.6%)	46.63	0.67	5/144	0.64 NS
6. Weight					6.4 12th pass	28 (18.6%)	43.21			
6.1 40-50 kg	18 (12 %)	2.03	3/146	0.11*	6.5 Graduate	50 (33.4%)	44.98			
6.2 51-60 kg	50 (33.3 %)				6.6 Post graduate	26 (17.4%)	46.50			
6.3 61-70 kg	59 (39.3 %)				7. Occupation	22 (14.6%)	43.81			
6.4 >70 kg	23 (15.4 %)				7.1 Unemployed	2 (1.4%)	43.00			
7. Monthly Expenditure					7.2 Private job					
7.1 1000-5000 rps	46 (30.7 %)	5.27	4/145	0.00*	7.3 Selfemploye d/business	14 (9.3%)	44.85	1.14	6/143	0.34 NS
7.2 6000-10000 rps	67 (44.7 %)				7.4 Farmer	23 (15.4%)	44.26			
7.3 11000-15000 rps	24 (16 %)				7.5 Labour	11 (7.3%)	44.34			
7.4 16000-20000 rps	12 (8 %)				7.6 Government job	4 (2.6%)	42.36			
7.5 >20000 rps	1 (0.6 %)				7.7 Home maker	6 (4%)	53.75			
8. Visit to hospital in a month					8. Income	69 (46%)	45.59			
8.1 Yes	83 (55.4 %)	0.55	148	0.58 NS	8.1 1000-5000 rps	14 (9.3%)	47.57	2.63	4/145	0.03*
8.2 No	67 (44.6 %)				8.1 1000-5000 rps	32 (21.3%)	48.25			
9. Any Permanent disability					8.2 6000-10000 rps	38 (25.4%)	44.05			
9.1 Yes	1 (0.7 %)	0.03	148	0.04*	8.2 6000-10000 rps	32 (21.4%)	44.46			
9.2 No	149 (99.3 %)				8.3 11000- 15000 rps	34 (22.6%)	42.26			
10. Any Health Insurance					8.4 16000- 20000 rps	100 (66.6%)	44.17	1.62	148	0.10 NS
10.1 Yes	105 (70 %)	2.83	148	0.29*	8.5 >20000 rps	50 (33.4%)	46.54			
10.2 No	45 (30 %)				9. Type of Family	4 (2.7%)	44.99	0.28	148	0.77 NS
					9.1 Nuclear	146 (97.3%)	43.75			
					9.2 Joint					
					10. Use of any relaxation technique	112 (74.6%)	45.66	1.60	2/147	0.20 NS
					10.1 Yes	27 (18%)	43.25			
					10.2 No	11 (7.4%)	42.00			
					11. Average time spent for care of patient	23 (15.3%)	43.95	1.32	4/145	0.26 NS
					11.1 8-10 hrs	21 (14%)	41.61			
					11.2 12-16 hrs	38 (25.3%)	45.05			
					11.3 >16 hrs	29 (19.4%)	46.41			
					12. Daily sleep hours	39 (26%)	44.96			0.26 NS

*Significant p value ≤0.05 NS Not significant p value >0.05

Table no. 2 shows there was no association of care giving burden score with selected patient variables except for any permanent disability, average expenditure on health service, duration of illness, marital status, age and diagnosis of patient.

Table 3 ANOVA/t value showing association among caregiver burden with selected care giver variables.

N=150

Care Giver Variables	f (%)	Mean	F/t	df	pvalue
1. Relationship with patient					
1.1 Spouse	69 (46 %)	45.17	3.58	3/146	0.15 NS

12.1 3-4 hrs	23 (15.3%)	43.95	1.32	4/145	0.26 NS
12.2 4-5 hrs	21 (14%)	41.61			
12.3 5-6 hrs	38 (25.3%)	45.05			
12.4 6-7 hrs	29 (19.4%)	46.41			
12.5 7-8 hrs	39 (26%)	44.96			
13. Any comorbid illness	143 (95.4%)	45.13	1.12	148	0.26 NS
13.1 No	7 (4.6%)	41.42			
13.2 Yes					

* Significant p value ≤ 0.05 ^{NS} Not significant p value > 0.05

Table no. 3 shows association of care giving burden with selected caregiver variables and there is no association of care giving burden score with selected care giver variable except for income of family (pvalue 0.03).

Conflict of Interest

There is no conflict of interest.

Funding

Self Funding

Ethical Consideration

Formal administrative approval was obtained from the Institutional Ethical Committee of MMIMS&R, Hospital, Mullana, Ambala to conduct the study.

DISCUSSION

In current study, more than half of care givers (62.6%) were females and most were married (88.6%). These findings were consistent with the results of study conducted by **Nimisha.K.Parekha, Shamita Shahb et al** which showed the most number of care givers were females (66.9%) and majority of them were married (87.7%).⁵ Another study conducted by **Sharon L.Lewis, Denise Miner-Williams et al** which showed that majority of the care givers (81.3%) were married.⁶

While the other study conducted by **Ajay Kumar Kondeti, Ambedkar Yadala, N,Rajya Laxmi et al** showed contradiction with our study result showing most number of care givers were males (52.1%).⁷

In the study conducted by **Mashakyekh, F, Pilevarzadeh &Rafati, F, et al** showed that there was significant relationship between the patients gender and care giver burden score (pvalue =0.00) which contradicted with our study findings that showed no significant association between patients gender and care giver burden score (pvalue=0.53).⁸

Acknowledgement

The authors express their whole hearted thanks to Dr. Jyoti Sarin, Director and Principal, Maharishi Markandeshwar, Mullana, Haryana for his invaluable suggestions.

REFERENCES

1. Pinquart M, Sorensen S (2013). Differences between caregivers and no caregivers in psychological health and physical health: a meta-analysis. *Psychol Aging*;18:2250-267
2. Clark AM, Reid ME ,(2018). The complex Nature of informal care in home based heart failure management. *J Adv Nurs*.;61:373-383 (Pubmed:2276631)
3. Lim JW,Zebrack B(2019). Caring for family members with Chronic physical illness : A critical review of caregiver literature. *Health Qual Life outcomes*;2:50
4. Nguyen DL,Chao D, Ma G, Morgan T(2018). Quality of life and factors predictive of burden among primary caregivers of Chronic liver disease patients. *Ann Gastroenterol*.;28:124-129.
5. Myaskovsky L, Dew MA, (2012). Quality of life and coping strategies among lung transplant candidates and family caregivers of demented adults. *Gerontologist*;26:253-259 (PubMed :3721232)
6. Burton AM, Sautter JM, (2019). Burden and we'll being among diverse sample of cancer , CHF and COPD caregivers. *J pain symptoms Manage*;44:410 – 420. (PubMed:22727950)
7. Myaskovsky L, Dew MA, (2015). Quality of life and coping strategies among lung transplant candidates and family caregivers. *Soc sci Med*;60:2321-32.
8. Atagun MI, Balaban OD,(2018). Caregiver Burden in Chronic Diseases. *Current Approaches in Psychiatric*;3 (3):513-52.