

Table 1. Summary of works on the Caregivers Reaction Assessment instrument

| Study | Sample size | Care-receiver | Caregiver | Mean age (yrs) | Female (%) | Spouse (%) | Anal. | Model | Factor structures |
|----------------------------------|-------------|---|--|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------|---|--|
| Given, et al., 1992 | 377 | 267 cancer patients 64+; 110 Alzheimer's patients 55+ Colorectal cancer surgery patients from 10 hospitals with survival estimate of 6+ months | Family member providing most of care | Cancer 55.1; Alz. 63.1. | Cancer 81.4; Alz. 64.1 | Cancer 55.4; Alz. 79.0 | EFA & CFA | Original 24-item 5-factor | CE (12, 15, 19, 21, 10, 4, 6), LFS (13, 11, 3, 9, 17), IS (1, 7, 20, 14, 16), IF (22, 23, 24), IH (18, 8, 5, 2) |
| Nijboer et al. 1999 | 181 | Metastatic cancer patients with survival estimate of 4+ months | Partner | 55-65 (46), > 65 years (43) | 65.0 | 100 | EFA | Five-factor 24 items | CE (10, 19, 12, 6, 4, 15), IS (14, 20, 7, 16, 1; 8, 5, 18), LFS (13, 11, 17, 9, 3), IF (23, 24, 22; 21, 3), IH (2, 8, 5, 18) |
| Grov et al. 2006 | 85 | Metastatic cancer patients with survival estimate of 4+ months | Primary caregiver | 55.7 | 47.1 | 80 | EFA | Five-factor 24 items | CE (12, 15, 19, 10, 4, 6, 5, 2), LFS (11, 3, 9, 17), IF (22, 24, 23), IS (1, 7, 20, 14, 16, 18, 8), F5 (19) |
| Hudson & Hayman-White, 2006 | 106 | Cancer patients receiving home-based palliative care at one hospital in Australia | | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | EFA | Five-factor 17 items (items 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 16, 18 excluded) | CE (6, 12, 19, 10, 4, 21), LFS (11, 17, 13, 3), IS (7, 20, 14), IF (23, 24), IH (5, 2) |
| Bachner O'Rourke, & Carmel, 2007 | 236 | Cancer patients of four hospitals in Israel | Care-givers w. relative dying of cancer at 59 + yrs in past yr | 55.37 | 77.5 | 45 | EFA & CFA | Five-factor 17 items (substantial changes in items and factors) | n.a. |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|--|----------------------------|------|------|----|-----------------|---|---|
| Misawa et al., 2009 | 57 | Community-dwelling advanced cancer patients (> 20 years) | Primary family caregiver | 57 | 77.0 | 52 | EFA | Five-factor 18 items (items 2, 3, 5, 15, 22 and 18 excluded) | IS (1, 7, 14, 16, 20), CE (6, 12, 19, 10, 4), LFS (11, 17, 13, 9), IH (8, 18), IF (23, 24) |
| Ge et al., 2011 | 312 | Cancer patients (lukemia 40.1%, gynecological 36.2%, colon 9.3%, lung 8.3%, breast 6.1%) | Primary family caregiver | 46.6 | 51.3 | 50 | EFA & CFA | Five-Factor 24 items | IS (1, 7, 8 , 14, 16, 18 , 20), LFS (3, 9, 11, 13, 15 , 17), IH (2, 4 , 5), IF (22, 23, 24), CE (6, 10, 12, 19, 21) |
| Persson, Wennman- Larsen, Sundin & Gustavsson, 2008 | 209 | Malignancy (151 patients), dementia (12), impairment (42), unknown disease (4) | | 60 | 55.5 | 78 | EFA & CFA | Five-Factor 23 item (item 12 excluded) | IH (18, 8, 5, 2) CE (12, 15, 19, 10, 4, 6), IF (22, 23, 24), LFS (13, 11, 3, 9, 17), IS (7, 20, 14, 1, 16) |
| Malhotra et al., 2012 | 1211 | Community-dwelling Singaporeans 75 + receiving assistance for at least one ADL | Primary informal caregiver | 55.6 | 60.2 | 16 | CFA & EFA | Four-Factor 21 items (items 2, 15, and 22 excluded): | IFS (1, 7, 14, 16, 20, 5, 8, 18), IF (24, 23), LFS (3, 9, 11, 13, 17), CE (4, 6, 10, 12, 19, 21) |

Note: Numbers after the factor name stand for item number adopted by Nijboer et al. (1999). Item numbers in boldface type stand for out-of-place loadings in the original CRA instrument.

Table 2. Biases in the age distribution of family caregivers (percentage of sample)

| Age of caregivers (years) | National Survey (2010) | | | Author's sample (2011) | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------|--------|------------------------------|------|--------|
| | | Male | Spouse | | Male | Spouse |
| Less than 40 | 2.9 | 1 | 0.1 | 20.3 | 8.9 | 0.5 |
| 40~49 | 8.3 | 2.9 | 0.2 | 29.4 | 13.6 | 1.3 |
| 50~59 | 26.6 | 6.9 | 1.8 | 32 | 14.1 | 1.7 |
| 60~69 | 29.3 | 7.5 | 8.8 | 15.7 | 7.5 | 2 |
| 70~79 | 20.6 | 6 | 17.2 | 2.4 | 1.7 | 1.5 |
| More than 80 | 12.3 | 6.3 | 11.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Total in sample | 100.0 | 30.6 | 40.1 | 100.0 | 46.1 | 7.2 |

Note: Data are from Comprehensive Survey of Living Conditions (2010).

Table 3. Caregiver Reaction Assessment instrument

| FCRP ^a item number | Nijboer's item number | Items |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 1 | 12 | I feel privileged to care for ____. |
| 2 | 13 | Others have dumped caring for ____ onto me. |
| 3 | 22 | My financial resources are adequate to pay for things that are required for caregiving. ^b |
| 4 | 1 | My activities are centered around care for ____. |
| 5 | 18 | Since caring for ____, it seems like I'm tired all of the time. It is very difficult to get help from my family in taking care of |
| 6 | 11 | _____. |
| 7 | 15 | I resent having to take care of ____. ^b |
| 8 | 7 | I have to stop in the middle of work. |
| 9 | 19 | I really want to care for ____. |
| 10 | 8 | My health has gotten worse since I've been caring for ____. |
| 11 | 20 | I visit family and friends less since I have been caring for ____. |
| 12 | 21 | I will never be able to do enough caregiving to repay ____. |
| 13 | 3 | My family works together at caring for ____. ^b I have eliminated things from my schedule since caring for |
| 14 | 14 | ____. ^b |
| 15 | 5 | I have enough physical strength to care for ____. ^b |
| 16 | 9 | Since caring for ____, I feel my family has abandoned me. |
| 17 | 10 | Caring for ____ makes me feel good. The constant interruptions make it difficult to find time for |
| 18 | 16 | relaxation. |
| 19 | 2 | I am healthy enough to care for ____. ^b |
| 20 | 4 | Caring for ____ is important to me. |
| 21 | 24 | Caring for ____ has put a financial strain on the family. My family (brothers, sisters, children) left me alone to care for |
| 22 | 17 | _____. |
| 23 | 6 | I enjoy caring for ____. |
| 24 | 23 | It's difficult to pay for ____ 's health needs and services. |

^a From the Family Care Research Program, Michigan State University.

(<http://www.thecarenet.ca/docs/CaregiverReactionAssessmentForm.pdf>)

^b These are reverse score items.

Table 4. J-ZBI_8 Items (Arai et al., 2003)

| Original Zarit item number | Factors ^a | Items |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 4 | P | I feel embarrassed over his/her behavior. |
| 5 | P | I feel angry when I am around the person I care for |
| 6 | R | I feel that he/she currently affects my relationship with other family members or friends in a negative way. |
| 9 | P | I feel strained when I am around the person I care for. I feel that my social life has suffered because I am caring for this person. |
| 12 | R | I feel uncomfortable about having friends over because of him/her. |
| 13 | R | |
| 18 | P | I wish I could leave the care of this person to someone else. |
| 19 | P | I feel uncertain about what to do about the person I care for. |

^aFactor P is J-ZBI_8 'personal strain'; Factor R is J-ZBI-8 'role strain.'

Table 5. Socioeconomic characteristics of my survey samples

| | | Survey year | | |
|---------------------------------|------|-------------|--------|--------|
| | | 2011 | 2012 | Total |
| Sample Size | | 1878 | 1183 | 3061 |
| Caregivers | | | | |
| Male (% of sample) | | 0.470 | 0.505 | 0.484 |
| Age (years) | mean | 48.90 | 50.70 | 49.60 |
| | sd | 11.10 | 10.95 | 11.10 |
| Relationship (% of sample) | | | | |
| Spouse | | 0.081 | 0.072 | 0.077 |
| Parents | | 0.597 | 0.643 | 0.615 |
| Parents-in-law | | 0.092 | 0.076 | 0.086 |
| Grandparents | | 0.045 | 0.034 | 0.041 |
| Others | | 0.144 | 0.128 | 0.138 |
| Primary Caregiver (% of sample) | | 0.380 | 0.411 | 0.392 |
| Married (% of sample) | | 0.567 | 0.572 | 0.569 |
| Education (% of sample) | | | | |
| High school | | 0.323 | 0.330 | 0.326 |
| College or more | | 0.629 | 0.631 | 0.630 |
| Other | | 0.048 | 0.039 | 0.048 |
| Care-receivers | | | | |
| Male (% of sample) | | 0.312 | 0.307 | 0.310 |
| Age (years) | mean | 74.700 | 77.000 | 75.600 |
| | sd | 18.800 | 16.900 | 18.100 |
| Care need (% of sample) | | | | |
| Independent | | 0.022 | 0.015 | 0.019 |
| Support 1 | | 0.063 | 0.060 | 0.062 |
| Support 2 | | 0.089 | 0.093 | 0.091 |
| Grade 1 | | 0.156 | 0.141 | 0.150 |
| Grade 2 | | 0.177 | 0.199 | 0.186 |
| Grade 3 | | 0.158 | 0.158 | 0.158 |
| Grade 4 | | 0.106 | 0.115 | 0.109 |
| Grade 5 | | 0.096 | 0.111 | 0.102 |
| Non-certified | | 0.132 | 0.108 | 0.123 |
| Instruments | | | | |
| CRA Scale | mean | 68.40 | 68.10 | 68.30 |
| | sd | 10.10 | 10.40 | 10.20 |
| JZBI_8 | mean | 21.90 | 21.40 | 21.70 |
| | sd | 7.00 | 6.90 | 7.00 |
| CES_D | mean | 20.00 | 19.10 | 19.70 |
| | sd | 10.80 | 10.70 | 10.80 |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|------|------|------|
| ADL | mean | 2.30 | 2.10 | 2.20 |
| | sd | 2.20 | 2.10 | 2.10 |
| Care hours | mean | 2.71 | 2.81 | 2.75 |
| | sd | 2.76 | 2.89 | 2.81 |
| Paid by family | mean | 0.42 | 0.38 | 0.41 |
| | sd | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.49 |
| Self-evaluated burden | mean | 6.06 | 6.09 | 6.07 |
| | sd | 2.42 | 2.42 | 2.42 |
| Self-evaluated health | mean | 2.92 | 2.86 | 2.90 |
| | sd | 0.87 | 0.86 | 0.86 |
| In_law | mean | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.15 |
| | sd | 0.37 | 0.35 | 0.36 |
| Secondary | mean | 0.30 | 0.33 | 0.31 |
| | sd | 0.46 | 0.47 | 0.46 |

Table 6. Internal consistency of original CRA scale (2121 observations)

| Subscales | Cronbach's alpha |
|------------------------|------------------|
| Impact on schedule | 0.876 |
| Impact on health | 0.654 |
| Impact on finance | 0.805 |
| Lack of family support | 0.834 |
| Caregiver's esteem | 0.863 |
| Overall CRA scale | 0.894 |

Table 7. Results of test-rest by item (N = 247)

| Subscales | Items | Mean | | Sd | | Corr. Coeff. |
|-----------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------------|
| | | 2011 | 2012 | 2011 | 2012 | |
| IS | | 16.186 | 16.117 | 4.279 | 4.517 | 0.772 |
| | Item 1 | 3.251 | 3.263 | 1.109 | 1.100 | 0.669 |
| | Item 7 | 3.109 | 3.202 | 1.040 | 1.122 | 0.584 |
| | Item 14 | 3.547 | 3.449 | 0.957 | 1.010 | 0.624 |
| | Item 16 | 3.032 | 3.065 | 1.096 | 1.132 | 0.673 |
| | Item 20 | 3.247 | 3.138 | 1.155 | 1.178 | 0.644 |
| IF | | 8.223 | 8.332 | 3.003 | 3.129 | 0.794 |
| | Item 22 | 2.980 | 2.976 | 1.231 | 1.220 | 0.568 |
| | Item 23 | 2.619 | 2.672 | 1.094 | 1.152 | 0.710 |
| | Item 24 | 2.623 | 2.684 | 1.183 | 1.195 | 0.709 |
| LFS | | 12.267 | 12.328 | 4.272 | 4.528 | 0.855 |
| | Item 3 | 2.741 | 2.733 | 1.122 | 1.141 | 0.702 |
| | Item 9 | 2.032 | 2.077 | 0.910 | 0.940 | 0.691 |
| | Item 11 | 2.526 | 2.551 | 1.147 | 1.174 | 0.711 |
| | Item 13 | 2.405 | 2.417 | 1.100 | 1.137 | 0.671 |
| | Item 17 | 2.563 | 2.551 | 1.153 | 1.167 | 0.730 |
| IH | | 11.113 | 11.028 | 2.982 | 30.680 | 0.781 |
| | Item 2 | 2.389 | 2.381 | 0.871 | 0.875 | 0.568 |
| | Item 5 | 2.729 | 2.668 | 0.943 | 0.977 | 0.639 |
| | Item 8 | 2.753 | 2.769 | 1.122 | 1.119 | 0.735 |
| | Item 18 | 3.243 | 3.211 | 1.088 | 1.121 | 0.678 |
| CE | | 20.798 | 20.672 | 5.509 | 5.216 | 0.848 |
| | Item 4 | 3.462 | 3.502 | 0.936 | 0.864 | 0.667 |
| | Item 6 | 2.324 | 2.300 | 0.975 | 0.967 | 0.643 |
| | Item 10 | 2.672 | 2.696 | 0.912 | 0.865 | 0.553 |
| | Item 12 | 2.692 | 2.721 | 0.995 | 0.912 | 0.654 |
| | Item 15 | 3.526 | 3.425 | 1.150 | 1.197 | 0.743 |
| | Item 19 | 2.964 | 2.838 | 1.094 | 1.023 | 0.663 |
| | Item 21 | 3.158 | 3.190 | 1.124 | 1.055 | 0.752 |
| CRA | 24 items | 68.470 | 38.590 | 10.390 | 9.730 | 0.816 |

Table 8. Construct validity of original CRA: Coefficients of correlation with selected variables (N = 2121)

| | Hours per day | ADL_ score | Self- evaluated health | Self- evaluated burden | jZ_8 | CES_D | In_ law | Paid by family | Secondary caregiver |
|-------|------------------|---------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| IS24 | 0.384 | -0.285 | -0.309 | 0.638 | 0.655 | 0.453 | 0.049 | 0.044 | -0.083 |
| IF24 | 0.099 | -0.155 | -0.240 | 0.420 | 0.442 | 0.401 | 0.012 | 0.257 | 0.078 |
| LFS24 | 0.144 | -0.082 | -0.234 | 0.436 | 0.493 | 0.407 | 0.074 | -0.027 | -0.126 |
| IH24 | 0.305 | -0.243 | -0.359 | 0.682 | 0.725 | 0.524 | 0.084 | 0.035 | -0.080 |
| CE24 | 0.153 | -0.076 | 0.141 | -0.314 | -0.467 | -0.264 | -0.215 | 0.058 | 0.033 |

Note. Variables in column 1 are predicted values of the corresponding latent variables in Fig. 1. Figures in boldface type stand for the highest absolute values of coefficients of correlation in each column.

Table 9. Results of Factor Analysis of the original 24 items of CRA scale: Principal factors method

| Factor | Factor analysis/correlation | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | Eigenvalue | Difference | Proportion | Cumulative |
| Factor 1 | 6.872 | 3.683 | 0.534 | 0.534 |
| Factor 2 | 3.189 | 1.706 | 0.248 | 0.782 |
| Factor 3 | 1.483 | 0.079 | 0.115 | 0.897 |
| Factor 4 | 1.404 | 0.806 | 0.109 | 1.006 |
| Factor 5 | 0.598 | 0.132 | 0.047 | 1.053 |
| Factor 6 | 0.466 | 0.302 | 0.036 | 1.089 |
| Factor 7 | 0.163 | 0.053 | 0.013 | 1.102 |
| Factor 8 | 0.110 | 0.022 | 0.009 | 1.110 |
| Factor 9 | 0.088 | 0.049 | 0.007 | 1.117 |
| Factor 10 | 0.039 | 0.033 | 0.003 | 1.120 |
| Factor 11 | 0.006 | 0.040 | 0.001 | 1.120 |
| Number of observations | | 937 | | |
| Number of parameters | | 209 | | |
| Retained factors | | 11 | | |
| Rotation: unrotated | | | | |

Table 10. Results of EFA: Item factor loadings (rotated factor pattern; N = 937)

| Subscale | Variable | Factor_1 | Factor_2 | Factor_3 | Factor_4 |
|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| IS | Item 1 | 0.74 | 0.08 | -0.02 | -0.04 |
| | Item 7 | 0.66 | -0.09 | 0.15 | 0.01 |
| | Item 14 | 0.78 | 0.08 | -0.02 | 0.02 |
| | Item 16 | 0.61 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.10 |
| | Item 20 | 0.73 | -0.01 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| IF | Item 22 | 0.07 | -0.07 | -0.06 | 0.63 |
| | Item 23 | 0.14 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.72 |
| | Item 24 | 0.11 | 0.15 | 0.04 | 0.72 |
| LFS | Item 3 | -0.10 | -0.17 | 0.53 | -0.02 |
| | Item 9 | 0.02 | -0.01 | 0.60 | 0.18 |
| | Item 11 | 0.11 | 0.02 | 0.80 | -0.05 |
| | Item 13 | 0.10 | -0.17 | 0.64 | 0.02 |
| | Item 17 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.81 | -0.01 |
| IH | Item 2 | -0.15 | -0.42 | -0.02 | 0.45 |
| | Item 5 | -0.05 | -0.39 | -0.04 | 0.44 |
| | Item 8 | 0.51 | -0.13 | 0.15 | 0.28 |
| | Item 18 | 0.70 | -0.17 | 0.11 | 0.08 |
| CE | Item 4 | 0.12 | 0.72 | -0.07 | -0.07 |
| | Item 6 | -0.24 | 0.73 | -0.01 | 0.11 |
| | Item 10 | -0.06 | 0.57 | 0.15 | 0.05 |
| | Item 12 | -0.02 | 0.82 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| | Item 15 | -0.17 | 0.42 | -0.43 | -0.09 |
| | Item 19 | -0.04 | 0.78 | -0.07 | 0.05 |
| | Item 21 | 0.04 | 0.67 | -0.06 | -0.02 |
| Eigenvalue | | 4.61 | 4.47 | 4.40 | 3.11 |
| Proportion | | 0.36 | 0.35 | 0.34 | 0.24 |

Note: Item numbers in column 2 follow the numbering of Nijboer et al. (1999). The figures in boldface type stand for the largest absolute values for each row (i.e. each item).

Table 11. Construct validity of 21-item four-factor CRA: Coefficients of correlation with selected variables (N = 2121)

| | Hours per day | ADL_ score | Self- evaluated health | Self- evaluated burden | jZ_8 | CES_D | In_ law | Paid by family | Secondary caregiver |
|-------|---------------------|---------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| ISH21 | 0.337 | -0.292 | -0.355 | 0.643 | 0.708 | 0.492 | 0.080 | 0.032 | -0.071 |
| IF21 | 0.156 | -0.167 | -0.227 | 0.416 | 0.434 | 0.371 | 0.027 | 0.257 | 0.070 |
| LFS21 | 0.160 | -0.098 | -0.282 | 0.428 | 0.560 | 0.447 | 0.112 | -0.007 | -0.106 |
| CE21 | 0.182 | -0.080 | 0.156 | -0.271 | -0.425 | -0.252 | -0.228 | 0.058 | 0.028 |

Note. Variables in column 1 stand for predicted values of the corresponding latent variables in Fig. 2. The figures in boldface type stand for the largest absolute values for each column.

Table 12. Descriptive statistics of the two groups of female caregivers

| | | Natural parents | In-law parents | Total |
|-----------------------|---------|-----------------|----------------|---------|
| Sample size | | 808 | 341 | 1149 |
| Caregivers | | | | |
| Age (<u>yrs</u>) | mean | 50.139 | 51.044 | 50.407 |
| | sd | 9.437 | 8.775 | 9.251 |
| Primary caregivers | | 0.719 | 0.73 | 0.722 |
| Married*** | | 0.448 | 0.971 | 0.56877 |
| Education | | | | |
| High school | | 0.339 | 0.372 | 0.326 |
| Some college or more | | 0.622 | 0.613 | 0.63 |
| Other | | 0.039 | 0.015 | 0.048 |
| Care-receiver | | | | |
| Male | | 0.199 | 0.199 | 0.199 |
| Age (<u>yrs</u>) | mean*** | 78.97 | 81.55 | 79.73 |
| | sd | 10.59 | 11.77 | 11.02 |
| Care need | | | | |
| Independent | | 0.016 | 0.018 | 0.017 |
| Support 1 | | 0.047 | 0.047 | 0.047 |
| Support 2 | | 0.093 | 0.1 | 0.095 |
| Grade 1 | | 0.157 | 0.188 | 0.166 |
| Grade 2 | | 0.211 | 0.235 | 0.219 |
| Grade 3 | | 0.158 | 0.173 | 0.163 |
| Grade 4 | | 0.113 | 0.111 | 0.112 |
| Grade 5 | | 0.113 | 0.067 | 0.099 |
| Non-certified | | 0.092 | 0.062 | 0.083 |
| Instruments | | | | |
| CRA scale | mean*** | 70.06 | 67.3 | 69.25 |
| | sd | 10.25 | 8.92 | 9.95 |
| JZBI_8 | mean*** | 22.94 | 24.9 | 23.52 |
| | sd | 7.09 | 6.79 | 7.06 |
| CES_D | mean*** | 20.57 | 18.36 | 19.91 |
| | sd | 11.36 | 10.61 | 11.18 |
| ADL | mean | 2.28 | 2.11 | 2.26 |
| | sd | 2.11 | 2.12 | 2.11 |
| Care hours | mean | 3.1 | 2.94 | 3.05 |
| | sd | 2.84 | 2.64 | 2.78 |
| Paid by family | mean | 0.365 | 0.482 | 0.356 |
| | sd | 0.334 | 0.472 | 0.479 |
| Self-evaluated burden | mean* | 6.41 | 6.67 | 6.5 |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Self-evaluated health | sd | 2.36 | 2.38 | 2.37 |
| | mean* | 2.84 | 2.94 | 2.87 |
| Secondary | sd | 0.89 | 0.8 | 0.86 |
| | mean | 0.239 | 0.234 | 0.238 |
| | sd | 0.427 | 0.424 | 0.426 |

* Significant at 10%.

** Significant at 5%.

*** Significant at 1%.

|

Table 13. Test results of group-invariance (biological daughters vs. daughters-in-law)

| Subscales | 18-Items | Model 1: Different slopes, different intercepts | | Model 2: Common slopes, different intercepts | | Model 2 vs. Model 1 |
|-----------------|----------------------|---|-------|--|---------------------|---------------------|
| | | df | chi 2 | df | chi 2 | P-value |
| ISH | 7, 14, 16, 20, 8, 18 | 18 | 93.05 | 23 | 93.61 | 0.99 |
| IF | 22, 23, 24 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1.8 | 0.407 |
| LFS | 9, 11, 13, 17 | 4 | 9.69 | 7 | 13.87 | 0.249 |
| CE ^a | 4, 6, 10, 19, 21 | 10 | 36.79 | 14 | 40.39 | 0.463 |
| | | Model 3: Common slopes, common intercepts | | Model 3 vs. Model 2 | Model 3 vs. Model 1 | |
| | | df | chi2 | P-value | P-value | |
| ISH | 7, 14, 16, 20, 8, 18 | 28 | 99.42 | 0.325 | 0.173 | |
| IF | 22, 23, 24 | 4 | 2.6 | 0.67 | 0.627 | |
| LFS | 9, 11, 13, 17 | 10 | 49.08 | 0 | 0 | |
| CE ^a | 4, 6, 10, 19, 21 | 18 | 67.63 | 0 | 0 | |

^a Without item 12 from the 18-item scale.