medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307612; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

# Cross-sectional study assessing the feasibility of measuring residents' Quality of Life in English care homes and assessing the construct validity and internal consistency of measures completed by staff-proxy.

Towers, Ann-Marie* (A.Towers@kent.ac.uk ) University of Kent, Centre for Health Services Studies (CHSS), Kent, UK. ORCID: 0000-0003-3597-1061

Rand, Stacey. University of Kent, Personal Social Services Research Unit (PSSRU), Kent, UK. ORCID: 0000-0001-9071-2842

Allan, Stephen. University of Kent, Personal Social Services Research Unit (PSSRU), Kent, UK. ORCID: 0000-0002-1208-9837

Webster, Lucy. University of Kent, Centre for Health Services Studies (CHSS), Kent, UK. ORCID: 0000-0001-9152-4990

Palmer, S. University of Kent, Personal Social Services Research Unit (PSSRU), Kent, UK. ORCID: 0000-0001-8106-3078

Carroll, Rachael E. Academic Unit of Injury, Recovery and Inflammation Sciences, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK. ORCID 0009-0007-1838-1699

Gordon, Adam L, Academic Unit of Injury, Recovery and Inflammation Sciences, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK. NIHR Applied Research Collaboration-East Midlands (ARC-EM), Nottingham, UK. ORCID: 0000-0003-1676-9853

Akdur, Gizdem, Centre for Research in Public Health and Community Care (CRIPACC), University of Hertfordshire, College Lane, Hatfield, AL10 9AB, UK . ORCID: 0000-0001-7326-4750

Smith, Nick. University of Kent, Centre for Health Services Studies (CHSS), Kent, UK. ORCID: 0000-0001-9793-6988

Burton, Jenni. Institute of Cardiovascular and Medical Sciences, University of Glasgow, New Lister Building, Glasgow Royal Infirmary, Glasgow G31 2ER, UK. ORCID: 0000-0002-4752-6988

Killett, Anne. School of Health Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich, NR4 7TJ, UK. ORCID:0000-0003-4080-8365

Hanratty, Barbara. Population Health Sciences Institute, University of Newcastle. NE4 6BE ORCID 000-0002-3122-7190

Meyer, J. National Care Forum, Coventry, UK. School of Health Sciences, Division of Nursing, City University of London, London, UK ORCID: 0000-0001-5378-2761

Spilsbury, Karen. School of Healthcare, Faculty of Medicine and Health, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK. NIHR Applied Research Collaboration Yorkshire and Humber (YHARC). ORCiD 0000-0002-6908-0032

Goodman, Claire. Centre for Research in Public Health and Community Care (CRIPACC), University of Hertfordshire, College Lane, Hatfield, AL10 9AB, UK

*Corresponding author

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307612; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .


## ABSTRACT

**Objectives:** To assess the feasibility of capturing older care home residents' quality of life (QoL) in digital social care records (DSCRs) and the construct validity (hypothesis testing) and internal consistency (Cronbach's Alpha) of four QoL measures. **Design:** Cross-sectional data collected in wave one of the DACHA (**D**eveloping resources **A**nd minimum dataset for **C**are **H**omes' **A**doption) Study, a mixed-methods pilot of a prototype minimum dataset (MDS) [1]. **Setting:** Care homes (with or without nursing) registered to provide care for older adults (>65 years) and/or those living with dementia. All homes used a DSCR system from one of two suppliers.. **Participants:** Data were extracted for 748 residents. All permanent residents, aged 65 years or older, were eligible to participate, including those lacking capacity to consent. Temporary residents and residents in their last weeks of life were excluded. **Outcome measures and analysis:** The English language versions of: ASCOT-Proxy-Resident, ICECAP-O, EQ-5D-5L proxy and the QUALIDEM were added to the DSCRs. As there have not been any previous studies of the structural validity of the English language version of the QUALIDEM, ordinal Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was applied for this measure only. Feasibility (% missing by software provider and measure), % floor/ceiling effects (>15% at lower/upper end of the scales), convergent or divergent construct validity (criterion of >75% of hypotheses accepted) and internal consistency (Cronbach's Alpha ≥.7) were assessed for all four measures. **Results:** The ordinal EFA of QUALIDEM did not replicate the findings of previous research. A six factors (36 items) solution was proposed and used in all subsequent analyses. There were low rates of missing data (<5%) for all items, except ASCOT-Proxy-Resident Control (5.1%) and Dignity (6.2%) and QUALIDEM item 35 (5.1%). Ceiling effects were observed for the ASCOT-Proxy-Resident and two of the QUALIDEM subscales. None of the scales had floor effects. Cronbach's alpha indicated adequate internal consistency (α≥.70) for the ASCOT-Proxy-Resident, ICECAP-O and EQ-5D-5L proxy. There were issues with two QUALIDEM subscales. Construct validity for all measures was adequate. **Conclusions:** The findings support the use of EQ-5D-5L, ASCOT-Proxy-Resident and the ICECAP-O in care homes for older people. Choice of measure will depend on the construct(s) of interest. More research is needed to establish the psychometric properties of the QUALIDEM in an English care home setting.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307612; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

**Key words**: Quality of Life, older adults, care homes, validity, feasibility, proxy.

**Strengths and limitations**

- This is the first time that quality of life measures have been piloted in routine data collection from care home digital social care records (DSCRs) in England.
- Findings support previous research that resident self-report leads to high levels of missing data. We present new evidence that collecting data through staff-proxy instead is feasible.
- Psychometric evidence supported the construct validity and internal consistency of the ASCOT-Proxy-Resident, ICECAP-O and EQ-5D-5L-Proxy.
- Missing demographic data held about residents in DSCRs meant that we were unable to describe, or assess the representativeness, of residents in the sample.
- We did not ask staff to record whether they completed the measures alone or asked the opinions of residents, family members or colleagues before making their ratings.

**Funding statement**

This project is funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Health Service Research and Delivery programme (HS&DR NIHR127234) and supported by the NIHR Applied Research Collaboration (ARC) East of England.

AMT, ALG, BH, KS, GP, AK, and CG are supported by the NIHR Applied Research Collaborations in Kent, Surrey and Sussex; East Midlands; North East and North Cumbria; Yorkshire and Humber and East of England respectively.

CG, ALG and KS are NIHR Senior Investigators.

The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

**Competing interests statement**

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose. Authors Towers, Rand, Allan and Smith are part of the developer team for the ASCOT. ALG has received honoraria from Gilead Sciences and Pfizer for consultancy work undertaken in relation to COVID-19 in care homes.

**Acknowledgments**

We would like to acknowledge and thank the Public Involvement and Engagement Panel members, software providers, care homes, care staff and residents for participating in the study, as well as the wider DACHA study team whose work informed the development of the DACHA (**D**eveloping resources **A**nd minimum dataset for **C**are **H**omes' **A**doption) Minimum Data Set and contributed to the selection of the quality of life measures included in the pilot.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307612; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

## INTRODUCTION

Quality of life (QoL) is an important, person-centred indicator of the quality and effectiveness of long-term social care services and support, including for older people living in care homes [2–6]. In England, there are 314,577 people living in care homes for older adults and/or dementia care [7]. Despite substantial amounts of data being held about care home residents' health and care needs, and their use of different parts of the health and social care system, these data are not yet available in an accessible, aggregated form to inform policy, service delivery or user choice [8,9]. However, the context is changing rapidly in England, with the implementation of a data strategy for health and social care [10], aiming to drive digitalisation [11] and standardise data collected by registered social care providers, with a view to improving interoperability and to facilitate quality care delivery [12].

The DACHA Study (**D**eveloping resources **A**nd minimum dataset for **C**are **H**omes' **A**doption) [13,14] aimed to develop and test a minimum dataset (MDS) for care homes in England. In this context, an MDS is defined as a standardised account of the demographic, social, and health characteristics and needs of older people living in long-term care (care home) settings [13]. Other countries (e.g. United States, Canada, New Zealand, and regions of the Netherlands and Belgium) have introduced or mandated MDSs for care homes. Equivalent systems have not yet been successfully adapted for the UK context [8]. Established international instruments, such as the interRAI (formerly known as the Resident Assessment Instrument) [15] were developed as a crucial tool for assessing and planning care for residents in long-term care facilities, ensuring quality care and compliance with reimbursement requirements. They historically focused on health outcomes. However, there is growing recognition of the importance of routinely capturing residents' experiences and wellbeing [13,14,16,17] and care homes can now purchase interRAI Quality of Life (QoL) Surveys for self-report and family proxies [18].

In the UK, most care homes do not yet capture and summarise residents' experiences and QoL in a systematic or standardised way [14]. There is also a lack of consensus around which constructs of QoL are most relevant for this population [19]. A multitude of potential instruments measure different QoL constructs, e.g. dementia, health-related and social care-related QoL [3,19]. However, relatively few QoL instruments have been developed and evaluated with the specific needs and characteristics of care home residents in mind [4]. A recent systematic review of QoL instruments used with older adults in care homes found that, of 29 instruments identified, only 14 had been psychometrically evaluated with a care home population [3]. Of these, only two, the Adult Social Care Outcomes Toolkit (ASCOT) [20] and EuroQoL-5 Dimensions EQ-5D [21], had evidence relating to their ability to detect clinically important interventional changes (responsiveness) [3]. The review also stated that no single instrument stood out as best suited to care homes for older people [3].

Based on this review and scoping of measures available, we identified ASCOT and EQ-5D and three other instruments as potentially appropriate for inclusion in the DACHA MDS: the ICEPop Capability measure for older people (ICECAP-O) [22], designed for use in economic evaluations; the DEMQOL [23], which is a measure of health-related QoL for people living with dementia; and the QUALIDEM [24], developed specifically for people with mild to severe dementia and designed for staff completion based on ratings of observable behaviour [25]. Although ICECAP-O has not yet been psychometrically assessed specifically with care home residents, it has been used with older people and another systematic review of studies reporting its psychometric properties concluded that it has good construct validity and responsiveness [26]. DEMQOL-Proxy has been widely used to measure

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307612; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

the QoL of people living with dementia, but its psychometric properties are not as well supported as the original self-report measure [23,27,28] and concerns have been raised about the interpretation of staff proxy responses without an interviewer present [28]. A new DEMQOL-CH (care home) measure has been developed but requires further development and testing [28]. Reviews of the evidence around QUALIDEM indicate evidence of validity and reliability of the tool, but not in England [3,4].

The mode of completion (self-complete/proxy) is critical: response rates to QoL measures amongst care home residents are very low, with relatively few residents able to self-report [4,29–31] highlighting a significant methodological challenge regarding the routine measurement of QoL in care/nursing homes for older adults. Staff acting as proxies for residents can be controversial when measuring QoL, mostly due to concerns of bias [32,33], despite staff frequently collecting data about residents' physical, psychological and social status to inform assessments and care planning [34]. Previous research has explored the level of agreement between resident and proxy-ratings using different QoL scales and, in general, the consensus is that agreement is at best 'fair' [35,36]. Indeed, staff sometimes worry about judging residents' 'subjective state', both for psychological outcomes, such as QoL [33,37,38], and for physical outcomes, such as pain [30]. Nonetheless, use of proxy perspectives from care professionals to inform the administration of pain medication, while not considered the 'gold standard', is generally accepted [30].

Ideally, multi-method approaches drawing on observations and adapted qualitative interviews with residents could inform proxy-ratings and provide some information about residents' feelings and experiences [29,30,35,39]. These methods require time and training to ensure ratings are reliable, with a degree of standardisation between individuals and services [30]. Previous research has identified a range of barriers to implementation of tools, such as lack of time and resources, and staff turnover [40]. Consequently, proxy-reporting by staff was chosen for the DACHA study to reflect a need to adopt a feasible and acceptable data collection method that would enable good coverage of data, for all residents (especially in terms of data collection burden for staff and equity for residents without close family or friends). Proxy-perspectives are not the same as self-report, they do however offer important insights into QoL of people who would otherwise be excluded [38] They have the potential to be low-burden (staff time) and easy to integrate into routine data collection using digital social care records (DSCRs), both of which are key to successful implementation of a care home MDS [40,41].

A detailed description of how the instruments were selected for inclusion in the DACHA MDS is reported elsewhere [42]. Consultations were conducted with stakeholders, including people working in and with care homes and those with lived experience (e.g. family members of residents). Four multi-item measures were chosen to represent the different QoL constructs that stakeholders told us were important to them: health-related (EQ-5D-5L-Proxy); social care-related (ASCOT-Proxy); older people's capability wellbeing (ICECAP-O); and dementia-specific (QUALIDEM) [42]. Selection was informed by evidence of psychometric properties [3], suitability for proxy completion by staff and consideration of administrative burden (time to complete) [3]. Consultations were particularly important in selecting one dementia-specific QoL measure, with stakeholders choosing QUALIDEM over DEMQOL [42]. In response to feedback that it was important to give residents' an opportunity to rate their own QoL, a single item QoL measure was also included: staff were asked to support residents to complete this themselves, where possible.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307612; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

## AIM

To assess the feasibility of capturing residents' QoL in DSCRs and assess the construct validity and internal consistency of the four QoL measures, collected by staff-proxy.

## METHODS AND ANALYSIS

### Study design

This analysis draws on cross-sectional data from residents' DSCRs collected in wave one of the DACHA Study, which was a mixed-methods pilot of a prototype MDS (see study protocol for full details [1]). The study was granted ethical approval from the London Queen's Square Research Ethics Committee (22/LO/0250).

### Public involvement in the DACHA study

Public involvement (PI) informed the design, conduct and dissemination of the DACHA study. For this study important public perspectives were taken to be those of people living in care homes, family members of people living in care homes, care workers and care home managers. A family member was a part of the team of people who developed the study and was a co-applicant for the research funding. Additionally the Public Involvement in Research Group (PiRG) at University of Hertfordshire commented on early versions of the study plan.

Throughout the study a PI team focussed on supporting public involvement and coordinating involvement with the stages of the project. The PI team was made up of the family member co-applicant, 2 academic researchers, and a Director of a care provider advocate organisation.

Involvement of care home residents was facilitated by activity providers based in care homes who met researchers online to co-produce involvement activities that would allow residents to give their opinions and perspectives to key points of the study, including data sharing, priority of different types of data for an MDS and meaning of quality of life [43]. Involvement of family members, care staff and care home managers was facilitated through an online panel, which met quarterly throughout the project. The team consulted the panel on key issues for the project in a timely way to allow the perspectives of the panel members to influence the iterative work of the project. Key issues included: priorities for an MDS; the current data environment in care homes; interpretation of findings of reviews; trusted sources of data; QoL measures; methods for recruitment and support of care homes and their residents; determining audiences for findings from the study and accessible means to communicate key messages.

### Participants

Data were extracted from the DSCRs of 748 older care home residents. Care homes (with or without nursing) were registered to provide care for older adults (>65 years) and/or those living with dementia and were located in one of three participating integrated care systems (ICSs), representing a range of geographic, socio-economic and organisational contexts [1]. ICSs are regional partnerships between NHS organisations, local government and others including third sector and social enterprises, which are responsible for co-ordinating and paying for care in England. As described in the protocol [1], all homes were using one of two DSCR systems (referred to as Provider 1 and Provider 2 hereafter). Both systems were on NHS Digital's (now, NHS England) 'assured solutions list' for DSCR systems at the time of writing [44].

Within participating homes, all permanent residents aged 65 years or older were eligible to take part, including those lacking capacity to consent. Where residents were not able to consent for

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307612; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

themselves, a nominated or personal consultee was consulted to represent their views and offer advice about participation on their behalf, as recommended by the Mental Capacity Act [45]. Residents in their last weeks of life (judged by staff) were excluded.

## Measures

Four QoL measures and a single item QoL rating scale were incorporated into the software of two DSCR providers who had agreed to participate in the study (see study protocol for full details [1]). All measures were in English.

### Quality of life

*Single item QoL rating scale*. A single item QoL rating scale, taken from the Adult Social Care Survey in England [46] was added to software. The question asks respondents to rate their overall QoL, with responses ranging from very good (1) to very bad (7). Where possible, we asked residents to report their own QoL using this item but, where that was not possible, they could receive help or staff could answer on their behalf. To help us interpret responses, we also asked staff to tick a box indicating the type of help the resident had: no help; someone read the question to them; someone translated the question for them; someone talked through the question with them; or someone answered on their behalf (proxy).

*ASCOT-Proxy***.** This is an instrument designed to measure social care-related quality of life (SCRQoL), which forms part of the ASCOT suite of measures [20,38]. It was developed for proxy completion by unpaid carers or care staff on behalf of adults using social care services, who are unable to self-report [38]. Proxy respondents are asked to rate eight questions (items) that correspond to the ASCOT SCRQoL attributes: Control over daily life, Social participation, Occupation (doing things I value and enjoy), Personal safety, Accommodation comfort and cleanliness, Personal comfort and cleanliness, Food and drink and Dignity.

Each attribute was rated according to the proxy's own opinion (ASCOT-Proxy-Proxy) and the proxy's view of what they think the person would say (ASCOT-Proxy-Person) against four response statements, which correspond to the ideal state, no needs, some needs and high-level needs. The dual proxy perspectives were designed to reduce any bias associated with the proxy perspective gap, i.e. differences in ratings due to proxies spontaneously adopting different approaches to proxy response [47,48], as well as, specifically for the ASCOT-Proxy, to improve acceptability of the questions to proxy respondents [38]. Based on these two proxy perspectives, the ASCOT-Proxy provides two measures of SCRQoL, the ASCOT-Proxy-Proxy and the ASCOT-Proxy-Person (here, called ASCOT-Proxy-Resident). As Preference weights for the ASCOT-Proxy instrument are not yet available we applied the weights developed for ASCOT-SCT4, which range from -.17 (worst possible) to 1 (best possible) [20].

The ASCOT-Proxy has not previously been used with care home residents as a standalone instrument. However, an adapted version for proxy-report by staff (without the use of dual proxy perspectives) is included in the care homes version (CH4) of ASCOT. This is a feasible, valid and reliable measure, with a higher % completion and better coverage than family carer proxy report [29,30]. Two recent studies of the ASCOT-Proxy completed by family carers of people with dementia, living at home, and also with care home residents using the DACHA study sample, have found that of the two measures, only the ASCOT-Proxy-Person/Resident has the same structural characteristics as the original ASCOT self-completion version (SCT4) from which the ASCOT-Proxy was adapted [49,50]. From these studies, it was concluded that the ASCOT-Proxy-Proxy perspective is still useful to include, as it may improve the instrument's acceptability and face validity to proxy respondents, giving them an opportunity to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307612; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

express their own views as well as what they think the person feels [38]. However, the findings indicate that the ASCOT-Proxy-Resident should be the focus of future analyses.

*ICECAP-O*. The ICECAP-O is a measure of capability wellbeing of older adults developed for use in the economic evaluation of health and social care interventions [22]. The measure comprises five items that correspond to the following attributes: attachment, security, role, enjoyment and control [51]. UK preference weights were applied to derive a score from zero (no capability) to one (full capability) [52]. The measure has not been specifically designed or adapted for proxy report. However, it has been applied in the context of older adult care homes as a proxy-report instrument with the recommendation (pending further evidence) that it ought to be completed by professional staff, rather than family members [53].

*EQ-5D-5L Proxy Version 2*. The EQ-5D-5L is a five-level version of the EQ-5D, a measure of health-related QoL. The 5L version was developed from the original 3-level (3L) version to increase reliability and sensitivity, as well as reduce ceiling effects [21]. It includes the same five dimensions as the EQ-5D-3L, i.e., mobility, self-care, usual activities, pain/discomfort and anxiety/depression. The Proxy Version 2 of the EQ-5D-5L was designed for adults who are not able to self-report due to i.e. cognitive impairment. It asks the (proxy) respondent to rate what they think the person would say (i.e. the proxy-person perspective). In this study, the instrument was rated by care staff. Due to concerns raised about the original UK value set for the EQ-5D-5L [54], there is an ongoing UK valuation study [55]. Given this, the recommended mapping function to convert to EQ-5D-3L scores was applied, with UK values applied to generate the index score [56].

*QUALIDEM* is a measure (developed in the Netherlands) of dementia-specific QoL, based on the concept of adaptation to the perceived consequences of dementia: the original Dutch version has been validated and reported in the literature [24,25]. The questionnaire was translated into English and is available for use [25], but psychometric studies have focused on the original Dutch version or translations into German [57] or Danish [58]. The instrument comprises 40 items, which are proxy-reported by care staff on behalf of older adults with mild to severe dementia living in care homes. Of the full list of items, 37 items have previously been found to be scalable onto nine (eight strong and one weak) unidimensional subscales for people with mild to severe dementia [24,25]. Of these 37 items, 21 are suitable for people with very severe dementia that relate to six of the nine subscales [24,25]. In this study, all 40 items were included in the care home software system for completion by care staff. Each item is rated on a four-point Likert scale (never to frequently), with indicative items scoring zero for 'never' and contra-indicative items scoring three for 'never', such that higher scores always indicate better QoL in each subscales. The developers advise against calculating overall scores because subscales differ in content (between 2 and 7 items) [24].

### Cognitive performance

Residents' cognitive performance was one of the DACHA MDS variables identified as being important but missing from routine data collection in DSCRs [1]. Cognitive performance was measured using the Minimum Data Set Cognitive Performance Scale (MDSCPS) [59]. The scale consists of five items: dementia diagnosis, short-term memory problems, cognitive skills, ability to communicate and whether or not the person can eat and drink independently. Scores range from 0 (severe impairment)to 6 (intact cognition).

### Functional ability

Although care notes within the DSCRs capture residents' ability to carry out activities of daily living, they were not routinely captured in a standardised and consistent format suitable for quantitative analysis. We therefore added the Barthel Index [60] to the software, which measures the degree of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307612; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

assistance required with ten everyday tasks, including: feeding, bathing, grooming, dressing, continence of bowel, continence of bladder, toilet use, transfers (bed to chair and back), mobility of level surfaces and stair negotiation. Items are scored individually (0=unable to do independently; 1=needs assistance; 2= independent) and then summed and multiplied by five, to produce an overall score ranging from 0 (total dependency) to 100 (completely independent).

## Data collection

Staff completed the instruments between March and June 2023. They were instructed to complete the measures on behalf of residents, except for the single QoL item, which allowed for self-report (with or without help) or proxy report, depending on residents' ability. Data were extracted by the software providers, in one batch (Provider 1) and four batches (Provider 2) between June and October 2023. Other health and care data pertaining to variables in the DACHA MDS (e.g. demographics, delirium, length of stay,) were also extracted (see, [1] for full description). Coded data on residents' demographics were largely missing from DSCRs in a format suitable for quantitative analysis (despite systems being able to record this) and are therefore not reported here. Completeness of the DSCR data and the feasibility of linking it to other sources of administrative, health and care data for the purposes of populating a care home MDS, is described in full elsewhere [61].

## Statistical analysis

Complete case analyses were conducted to assess measurement properties, with the sample size for each analysis reported. First, we considered the structural validity [24] of the forty QUALIDEM items using ordinal exploratory factor analysis (EFA) on polychoric correlation matrices [62,63]. Ordinal EFA was applied because there have not been any previous studies of the structural validity of the English language version, against the original Dutch measure (37 items, 9 subscales) [24]. We did not conduct or report EFA for EQ-5D-5L and ICECAP-O, since they are formative measures and EFA/CFA is not appropriate [64], nor ASCOT-Proxy-Resident, since EFA and Rasch analysis has already been conducted and reported elsewhere [30]. For the ordinal EFA with QUALIDEM items, we applied Horn's parallel analysis, using principal component analysis, without rotation, to estimate randomly generated eigenvalues in 5,000 random correlation matrixes, using the 95th percentile [65–68]. Factors were retained when the observed exceeded the random principal component eigenvalues [65,69]. When two or more factors were retained, promax rotation was applied. Items were taken to load onto a factor if the factor loading (rotated for ≥2 factors) was ≥.40 [70].

Descriptive statistics were reported for all measures (informed by the EFA for the QUALIDEM), alongside indicators of data completeness (% missing). Overall, missing data (including non-completion of whole tools) were reported to indicate the feasibility of the methods used in this study. These are reported separately by software provider because the two systems handled missing data in different ways (Provider 1 forced completion and Provider 2 did not). In both cases, there are issues with using non-completion as an indicator of feasibility, which relate to each system's functionality[1], which need to be considered in data interpretation. As such, feasibility of care staff completing the QoL instruments on behalf of residents was assessed by examining % missing data when at least one item in a scale had been completed.

[1] Specifically: **Provider 1**'s system required forced completion for items in ICECAP-O, QUALIDEM, EQ-5D-5L; for ASCOT-Proxy only, it was possible to select 'don't know', coded as missing data. For **Provider 2**, the system did not require completion of all items. There was no user prompt if items were not completed. Therefore, it was possible to only partially complete each measure, due to either deliberate non-completion (i.e. due to item acceptability or feasibility) or user error of omission.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307612; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Percentage floor (lowest score) and ceiling (highest score) was also considered for each measure, with a floor or ceiling effect indicated if reported by ≥15% of respondents [71]. For QUALIDEM, we report descriptives, completeness, floor and ceiling only for those residents rated as having 'borderline' to 'severe' cognitive impairment on the MDS CPS [59] because only six of the nine original QUALIDEM subscales are recommended for people with 'very severe impairment' [24]. Since there were only n=79 residents rated 'very severe' on the MDS CPS, we were unable to run the analysis for these cases separately.

Construct (convergent or divergent) validity of the QoL measures was assessed by hypothesis testing about expected relationships with other outcomes measures, using Spearman rank correlation (p-value less than 0.01). Correlation coefficients were interpreted as weak (<.3), moderate (.3 to .5) or strong (>.5) [72]. These hypotheses were based on previous studies using the ASCOT-Proxy or other ASCOT measures (SCT4, CH4), or developed *a priori* based on the measurement constructs (see **Table 5**). A criterion of >75% of hypotheses accepted was considered as sufficient evidence of construct validity [73].

Internal consistency was considered using Cronbach's alpha, with a value of ≥.7 taken to be acceptable [74]. COSMIN reporting guidance advises that an assessment of internal consistency is not required for formative measures [64]. Preference-based measures (EQ-5D-5L, ASCOT and ICECAP) are generally accepted to be formative [75], however for comparability with previous research [26,29,35], we have assessed internal consistency in this study.

We used the COSMIN Study Design Checklist rule of thumb for adequacy of sample size for EFA, internal consistency and construct validity by hypothesis testing. In all cases, >100 participants is 'very good' [64].

All analyses were conducted in STATA 16 [76].

## RESULTS

### *Structural validity of QUALIDEM*

This is reported first because the findings inform other analyses and reporting. The ordinal EFA of QUALIDEM did not replicate the nine-factor structure proposed by the original developers, i.e. 37 items relating to nine subscales of dementia-related QoL [24,25]. First, we had to omit two items (33-Criticizes the daily routine and 37 - Indicates feeling worthless) due to linear dependencies that led to indefinite matrices when conducting ordinal EFA. With the remaining 38 items, Horn's parallel analysis indicated a six-factor solution, for which 36 items loaded onto at least one of the six factors with loading ≥.40 (see **Table 1)**. These six factors (36 items) related to positive and negative affect (including mood and behaviour) (Subscale 1. 15 items), restlessness, tension and agitation (Subscale 2. 5 items), enjoyment of meals/food (Subscale 3. 2 items), boredom and disengagement (Subscale 4. 6 items), social engagement (Subscale 5. 5 items) and anxiety or low mood (Subscale 6. 3 items). Items 17 and 26 did not load on to any of these six factors. This six-subscale (36 item) solution is used in all subsequent analyses.

### *Feasibility*

Missing data are reported in **Table 2.** Overall, % missing data were higher for Provider 2, compared to Provider 1. Differences in the two software systems for providers - specifically, Provider 1 required forced completion, but Provider 2 did not - were likely to have partly influenced variations in data completion. It may also have been affected by the longer period between consent and data completion for Provider 2 due to delays in finalising and releasing the instruments to care homes: due

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307612; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

to participants no longer being resident (i.e., due to hospitalization or death). This is supported by the higher % of residents where no data were completed for Provider 2, compared to Provider 1.

Due to these data limitations, the feasibility of care staff completing the QoL instruments on behalf of residents was assessed by examining % missing data when at least one item in a scale had been completed (see **Tables 2** and **3**). Apart from QUALIDEM item 1, which was omitted in the first release of the software to care homes by Provider 1, none of the QoL items had % missing data ≥7%. There were low rates of missing data (<5%) for all items in the multi-item QoL instruments, except ASCOT-Proxy-Resident Control (5.1%) and Dignity (6.2%) and QUALIDEM item 35 (5.1%) Overall, this indicates that the multi-item QoL instruments were feasible for care home staff to complete.

Of the n=613 cases (81%) where the single item ASCS QoL item was completed, 14.9% (n=91) were completed by the resident without help and 27.8% (n=170) were completed by staff proxy, without any involvement of the resident. The remaining responses, except one case of missing data, (57.3%, n=351) were completed by the resident with assistance from care staff, e.g. to read, talk through and/or translate questions.

### *Floor and ceiling effects*

Descriptive statistics and summary of the psychometrics, including % floor/ceiling, are reported in **Table 4.** Social care-related QoL, measured by the ASCOT-Proxy-Resident, was higher than expected with a mean of 0.83 and a ceiling effect, i.e., >15% at upper end of the scale. Previous research using ASCOT in care homes has used the mixed-methods tool (ASCOT-CH4), in which trained researchers rate residents' SCRQoL after conducting structured observations, staff interviews and speaking to residents [29,77]. In studies using this method of data collection, residents' mean SCRQoL scores ranged from 0.74-0.77 [30].

There were no floor or ceiling effects for the ICECAP-O, measuring capability wellbeing. We cannot compare mean scores with previous research because ICECAP-O has not previously been used in British care homes. However, the DACHA sample had a lower proxy-reported mean QoL score compared to a community sample of older people (>65 years) in England (0.73 vs 0.81), which is consistent with differences in the functional ability of the two samples [78].

Two of the QUALIDEM subscales had ceiling effects (2, 3) with >15% at the upper end of the scale. The subscales we identified in this study differ from the subscales identified by the developers based on the original Dutch version [22], as applied also to the Danish version [55], or German translations [54]. Therefore, there is no comparable data on subscales means.

Staff used the full scale to capture residents' health-related QoL using the EQ-5D-5L proxy with less than 2% of scores at the top and bottom of the range. There was a mean score of 0.33, which is in line with previous research [29].

Mean Barthel and cognitive performance scores were as expected for this population based on previous research, and indicate severe dependency [77,79]. Although we do not have demographic information, these are reassuring indicators of the representativeness of the sample to the care home population of each ICS [40].

### *Internal consistency*

Cronbach's alpha indicated adequate internal consistency (α≥.70) for the ASCOT-Proxy-Resident, ICECAP-O, EQ-5D-5L proxy and QUALIDEM, except for QUALIDEM Subscale 4 (boredom and disengagement) based on the EFA conducted for this study (α≤.70, **Table 1**). QUALIDEM Subscale 1

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307612; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

(positive and negative affect) also had very high internal consistency (α≥.90), which may indicate redundancy of items.

### *Construct validity*

The construct validity analysis by hypothesis testing is reported in Table 5. As >75% of the proposed hypotheses were accepted for each set of hypotheses, there is evidence of adequate construct validity.

## DISCUSSION

This study sought to explore the feasibility of routinely capturing QoL data about care home residents and assessed the construct validity and internal consistency of four QoL measures, completed by staff proxies. The measures were integrated into two DSCR systems, both of which were on the NHS Digital 'assured solutions' list, yet the two systems differed in their tolerance of missing data and how they implemented the measures in participating homes. Forced completion of the items within the measures led to less missing data overall. Delays finalising and releasing the instruments to care homes for Provider 2, led to a longer gap between resident recruitment and completion of the measures and reduced the time staff had to complete the measures before data extraction. This also contributed to higher rates of non-completion, due to participants no longer being resident in the care home (i.e., due to hospitalization or death).

Implementation issues aside, once staff began to complete the QoL measures they were likely to finish them, indicating completion by staff proxy is a feasible method of collecting QoL data for the purposes of a care home MDS. Only the ASCOT-Proxy-Resident Dignity item had more than 6% missing data. This item is important when capturing the impact of social care on people's QoL [20] and was acceptable during the development of the ASCOT-Proxy [38], yet staff and family proxies alike appear to find this more difficult to judge than the other domains [38,50]. ASCOT-Proxy-Resident Dignity asks the proxy to rate the effect of help from paid carers on how the resident thinks and feels about themselves (from the resident's perspective). This involves several empathetic perspective shifts, which proxies may find difficult to navigate cognitively and/or judge through their day-to-day interactions with the person. Qualitative interviews and focus groups with staff exploring their experiences of completing the measures have been undertaken and will be reported separately [1].

Previous reviews have proposed the QUALIDEM as among the best QoL measures for use in data collection in care homes for older people [4,80]. It was the dementia QoL scale that achieved the most support from stakeholders for the DACHA study, hence its inclusion in the study [42]. However, the mixed nature of prior evidence of its psychometric properties have been noted [80]. The developers of the original measure, in Dutch, indicated some issues with scalability and internal reliability, for some subscales; furthermore, assessment of the structural validity of the German translation did not support the original subscales [57,81]. Here, we present the first EFA on the English tool, which indicated a six-factor solution, using 36 of the original 40 items. These do not correspond to the original Dutch or German translation subscales [25,81]. There were also issues with the internal consistency for two of the subscales: boredom and disengagement (subscale 4), which did not meet the criteria (α≤.70, **Table 1**) and positive and negative affect (subscale 1), which had very high internal consistency (α≥.90), potentially indicating redundancy of items. Despite adequate construct validity, the mixed evidence for structural validity and internal consistency, both in this study and previous studies, means that we are not able to recommend the inclusion of QUALIDEM in a UK care home MDS at this time. Future research should explore the replicability of these findings in the English language.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307612; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Overall, the psychometric evidence (internal consistency, construct validity and also, structural validity, where appropriate) supported the use of the other three multi-item measures. These were also the measures that had the best psychometric evidence when considering the measures to include in the DACHA MDS, as well as alignment to the constructs of (social/long-term) care-related and health-related QoL that are most useful in reflecting on the quality and effectiveness of care delivered in the care home context [3]. The ASCOT-Proxy-Resident had a ceiling effect, but this is common and reflects the fact that ASCOT captures the impact of social care on QoL – if good quality care is being delivered and meeting people's needs and preferences, they will score highly, and this is a desirable state. This is supported by the findings of previous research in care homes showing a positive association between residents' SCRQoL and care home quality ratings [30,82,83].

Most residents required help (e.g. to read or talk through the question) to complete the single-item QoL scale, with over a quarter completed by staff-proxy with no resident input at all. Only 15% of residents in this study completed this question without any help at all. This is in line with previous research in English care homes for older adults, which found that less than 25% of residents could give their views of their own care-related QoL using a structured ASCOT questionnaire, whereas around 60% could talk about the care-related QoL if questions were asked in a flexible, qualitative interview [77]. It is likely that if residents had self-completed the longer QoL measures in DACHA, we would have had substantial missing data, affecting the ability to generate overall scores and interpret the results.

A limitation of this study is that, despite expecting staff to complete the measures by proxy, we cannot be sure of the extent to which staff discussed the questions with residents before/while completing them [84]. We only collected this information for the single item QoL question. Ideally, in future data collection, detail on exactly how proxies completed the measure (i.e. on their own, after speaking with the resident, or by asking the resident to give their own view) should be captured and considered in analyses. Another limitation of this study is that most care homes did not complete the demographic fields in the DSCRs. Consequently, information about gender, ethnicity, age and other demographic data were missing from the data extraction. However, the psychometric analysis reported in this paper did not require these data and further analysis using the data to better understand the quality of life of care home residents has used the complete DACHA MDS [61], in which demographic data has been populated through linkage with NHS data [61,85]. The linked data has been compared to the overall care home resident population in England to explore representativeness: findings indicate that the DACHA MDS sample is comparable by sex and type of care home but the very old and 'White' ethnic group are over-represented [86].

For DSCR data to be consistently used to populate a care home MDS, greater standardisation of the approach to missing data should be considered. Nonetheless, the evidence reported here indicates that it is feasible to routinely capture data about residents' QoL through staff-proxies. The study has demonstrated that it is not feasible to consistently collect data from care home residents through self-report alone. Most residents will require help in the form of reading the questions, talking through the responses and marking the answers. A substantial proportion would be excluded entirely without using proxy-report. Three of the four QoL measures piloted had good psychometric properties for internal consistency and construct validity by hypothesis testing: the EQ-5D-5L (health-related QoL), the ASCOT-Proxy-Resident (social care-related QoL) and the ICECAP-O (capability wellbeing). As a key purpose of measuring resident QoL is to assess care quality and effectiveness; it is vital that the QoL measures included in the MDS are responsive to the quality, safety and effectiveness of care. This should be explored in future research.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307612; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

This study is the first to pilot the inclusion of QoL measures in DSCRs in England. It was not possible to make specific recommendations about which of the three QoL measures with satisfactory performance should be prioritised for inclusion in an MDS. Each measures a different QoL construct and, as such, further work would be required with key stakeholders, if a choice was required. Multiple QoL measures add to question burden in an MDS but, uniquely, bring person-centred outcomes to otherwise largely clinical and process-oriented datasets. There may be a strong case for including more than one. Staff were not given training or detailed guidance beforehand, only the written instructions already included by the authors of the scales. Despite this, most measures were completed in full once staff made a start. The ASCOT-Proxy-Resident had slightly higher levels of missing data for some items (e.g. dignity). This may also indicate that staff would benefit from more guidance or support to interpret and complete these items as part of routine care. Ongoing work to support the use of ASCOT in care planning in care homes in Sweden [87] indicates that these issues can be addressed by training key members of staff to be QoL champions, mentoring other staff. The care planning approach, which involves conversations with residents and family members, also better integrates QoL into routine care by identifying how practice will maintain or improve QoL. This is one of the core principles of the DACHA MDS [14] and may be useful when considering the implementation of QoL measures in DSCRs in the future.

.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307612; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

## REFERENCES


1 Towers AM, Gordon A, Wolters AT, *et al.* Piloting of a minimum data set for older people living in care homes in England: protocol for a longitudinal, mixed-methods study. *BMJ Open* 2023;**13**:1–8. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2023-071686

2 World Health Organisation. Rebuilding for sustainability and resilience: strengthening the integrated delivery of long-term care in the European region. Copenhagen: 2022. https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/353912

3 Siette J, Knaggs GT, Zurynski Y, *et al.* Systematic review of 29 self- - report instruments for assessing quality of life in older adults receiving aged care services. *BMJ Open* 2021;**11**. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2021-050892

4 Aspden T, Bradshaw SA, Playford ED, *et al.* Quality-of-life measures for use within care homes: a systematic review of their measurement properties. *Age Ageing* 2014;**43**:596–603. doi:10.1093/AGEING/AFU089

5 Hughes LJ, Farina N, Page TE, *et al.* Psychometric properties and feasibility of use of dementia specific quality of life instruments for use in care settings: a systematic review. *Int Psychogeriatrics* 2021;**33**:917–31. doi:10.1017/S1041610218002259

6 Bulamu NB, Kaambwa B, Ratcliffe J. A systematic review of instruments for measuring outcomes in economic evaluation within aged care. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2015;**13**:1–23. doi:10.1186/s12955-015-0372-8

7 Office for National Statistics (ONS). Dataset: Care homes and estimating the self-funding population, England. 2023.https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/socialcare/datasets/carehomesandestimatingtheselffundingpopulationengland

8 Hanratty B, Burton JK, Goodman C, *et al.* Covid-19 and lack of linked datasets for care homes. *BMJ* 2020;**369**.

9 Towers A-M. Using linked health and social care data to understand service delivery and planning and improve outcomes. *Age Ageing* 2022.

10 Department of Health and Social Care. Data saves lives: reshaping health and social care with data (Updated 15 June 2022). *UK Gov* 2022;:1–65.https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/data-saves-lives-reshaping-health-and-social-care-with-data/data-saves-lives-reshaping-health-and-social-care-with-data

11 Department of Health and Social Care. People at the Heart of Care: adult social care reform. 2021. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/people-at-the-heart-of-care-adult-social-care-reform-white-paper/people-at-the-heart-of-care-adult-social-care-reform

12 Department of Health and Social Care. Care data matters: a roadmap for better adult social care data. 2023.https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/care-data-matters-a-roadmap-for-better-adult-social-care-data

13 Musa MK, Akdur G, Brand S, *et al.* The uptake and use of a minimum data set (MDS) for older people living and dying in care homes: a realist review. *BMC Geriatr 2022 221* 2022;**22**:1–14. doi:10.1186/S12877-021-02705-W

14 Burton J, Wolters A, Towers A-M, *et al.* Developing a minimum data set for older adult care homes in the UK: exploring the concept and defining early core principles. *Lancet Heal Longev*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307612; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

2022;**3**:E186–93.

15 Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Long-Term Care Facility Resident Assessment Instrument 3.0 User's Manual. 2015.

16 Kehyayan V, Hirdes JP, Tyas SL, *et al.* Residents' self-reported quality of life in long-term care facilities in Canada. *Can J Aging* 2015;**34**:149–64. doi:10.1017/S0714980814000579

17 Spilsbury K, Charlwood A, Thompson C, *et al.* Relationship between staff and quality of care in care homes : StaRQ mixed methods study. *Heal Soc Care Deliv Res* 2024;**12**. doi:https://doi.org/10.3310/GWTT8143

18 Morris JN, James ML, Fries BE, *et al.* interRAI Self-Reported Quality of Life (QOL) Surveys and User's Manual, (Standard English Edition), 9.4.0. 2023;:100. doi:ISBN 978-1-62255-227-6

19 Rodríguez-Martínez A, De-la-Fuente-Robles YM, Martín-Cano M del C, *et al.* Quality of Life and Well-Being of Older Adults in Nursing Homes: Systematic Review. *Soc Sci* 2023;**12**. doi:10.3390/socsci12070418

20 Netten A, Burge P, Malley J, *et al.* Outcomes of social care for adults: developing a preference-weighted measure. *Health Technol Assess (Rockv)* 2012;**16**. doi:10.3310/hta16160

21 EuroQol Research Foundation. EQ-5D-5L User Guide. 2019.

22 Coast J, Peters T, Natarajan L, *et al.* An assessment of the construct validity of the descriptive system for the ICECAP capability measure for older people. *Qual Life Res* 2008;**17**. doi:10.1007/s11136-008-9372-z

23 Smith SC, Lamping DL, Banerjee S, *et al.* Development of a new measure of health-related quality of life for people with dementia: DEMQOL. *Psychol Med* 2007;**37**:737. doi:10.1017/S0033291706009469

24 Dichter MN, Ettema TP, Schwab C, *et al.* QUALIDEM: User Guide. itten/Amsterdam: 2016. https://www.dementiaresearch.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/QUALIDEM_User_Guide.pdf

25 Ettema TP, Dröes RM, De Lange J, *et al.* QUALIDEM: Development and evaluation of a Dementia Specific Quality of Life Instrument. Scalability, reliability and internal structure. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry* 2007;**22**:549–56. doi:10.1002/GPS.1713

26 Proud L, Mcloughlin C, Kinghorn P. ICECAP-O , the current state of play : a systematic review of studies reporting the psychometric properties and use of the instrument over the decade since its publication. *Qual Life Res* 2019;**28**:1429–39. doi:10.1007/s11136-019-02114-y

27 Smith SC, Lamping DL, Banerjee S, *et al.* Measurement of health-related quality of life for people with dementia: development of a new instrument (DEMQOL) and an evaluation of current methodology HTA Health Technology Assessment NHS R&D HTA Programme. *Health Technol Assess (Rockv)* 2005;**9**.http://www.ncchta.org (accessed 7 Jan 2019).

28 Hughes LJ, Farina N, Page TE, *et al.* Adaptation of the DEMQOL-Proxy for routine use in care homes: a cross-sectional study of the reliability and validity of DEMQOL-CH. *BMJ Open* 2019;**9**:e028045. doi:10.1136/BMJOPEN-2018-028045

29 Towers AM, Rand S, Collins G, *et al.* Measuring quality of life in care homes when self-report is challenging: the construct validity, structural characteristics and internal consistency of the mixed-methods adult social care outcomes toolkit. *Age Ageing* 2023;**52**:1–8. doi:10.1093/ageing/afad168

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307612; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

30 Towers A-M, Smith N, Allan S, *et al.* Care home residents' quality of life and its association with CQC ratings and workforce issues: the MiCareHQ mixed-methods study. *Heal Serv Deliv Res* 2021;**9**:1–188. doi:10.3310/HSDR09190

31 Aznar C, Blake M, Mackie M, *et al.* Representativeness of Adult Social Care Surveys: Main Report. 2021. https://www.ipsos.com/sites/default/files/ct/news/documents/2021-04/Social_Care_Survey_Review_Main_Report.pdf (accessed 9 May 2021).

32 Usman A, Lewis S, Hinsliff-Smith K, *et al.* Measuring health-related quality of life of care home residents: comparison of self-report with staff proxy responses. *Age Ageing* 2019;**48**:407–13. doi:10.1093/ageing/afy191

33 Kelly C, Hulme C, Graham L, *et al.* Inter-rater reliability of care home staff's proxy judgements with residents' assessments of their own health-related quality of life: An analysis of the PATCH trial EQ-5D data. *Age Ageing* 2021;**50**:1314–20. doi:10.1093/ageing/afab053

34 Shiells K, Diaz Baquero AA, Štěpánková O, *et al.* Staff perspectives on the usability of electronic patient records for planning and delivering dementia care in nursing homes: A multiple case study. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak* 2020;**20**:1–14. doi:10.1186/s12911-020-01160-8

35 Griffiths AW, Smith SJ, Martin A, *et al.* Exploring self-report and proxy-report quality-of-life measures for people living with dementia in care homes. *Qual Life Res* 2020;**29**:463–72. doi:10.1007/s11136-019-02333-3

36 Robertson S, Cooper C, Hoe J, *et al.* Proxy rated quality of life of care home residents with dementia: A systematic review. *Int Psychogeriatrics* 2017;**29**:569–81. doi:10.1017/S1041610216002167

37 Caiels J, Rand S, Crowther T, *et al.* Exploring the views of being a proxy from the perspective of unpaid carers and paid carers: Developing a proxy version of the Adult Social Care Outcomes Toolkit (ASCOT). *BMC Health Serv Res* 2019;**19**:201. doi:10.1186/s12913-019-4025-1

38 Rand S, Caiels J, Collins G, *et al.* Developing a proxy version of the Adult social care outcome toolkit (ASCOT). *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2017;**15**:108. doi:10.1186/s12955-017-0682-0

39 Brooker D, Surr CA. Dementia Care Mapping (DCM): initial validation of DCM 8 in UK field trials. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry* 2006;**21**:1018–25. doi:10.1002/gps.1600

40 Surr CA, Walwyn REA, Lilley-Kelly A, *et al.* Evaluating the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of Dementia Care Mapping™ to enable person-centred care for people with dementia and their carers (DCM-EPIC) in care homes: Study protocol for a randomised controlled trial. *Trials* 2016;**17**. doi:10.1186/s13063-016-1416-z

41 Peryer G, Kelly S, Blake J, *et al.* Contextual factors influencing complex intervention research processes in care homes: a systematic review and framework synthesis. *Age Ageing* 2022;**51**. doi:10.1093/ageing/afac014

42 Akdur G, Irvine L, Rand SE, *et al.* National stakeholder consultation on how to measure care home residents' quality of life (in review). *NIHR Journals Libr Publ*

43 Micklewright K, Killett A, Akdur G, *et al.* Activity provider-facilitated patient and public involvement with care home residents. *Res Involv Engagem* 2024;**10**:1–12. doi:10.1186/s40900-023-00537-z

44 Digitising Social Care. Assured solutions for digital social care records.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307612; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

https://beta.digitisingsocialcare.co.uk/assured-solutions (accessed 22 Mar 2024).

45 Mental Health Capacity Act. Mental Health Capacity Act. London: 2005. https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2005/9/contents

46 NHS Digital. Personal Social Services: Survey of Adult Carers in England: Information and guidance for the 2021-22 survey year. London, UK: 2021. https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/data-collections-and-data-sets/data-collections/social-care-user-surveys/adult-social-care-user-survey-ascs-2021-22-guidance-and-materials-for-councils

47 Pickard AS, Knight SJ. Proxy evaluation of health-related quality of life: a conceptual framework for understanding multiple proxy perspectives. *Med Care* 2005;**43**:493–9.

48 Rand SE, Caiels J. Using proxies to assess quality of life: A review of the issues and challenges. Canterbury: Personal Social Services Research Unit, University of Kent: 2015.

49 Rand S, Towers A-M, Allan S, *et al.* Exploratory factor analysis and Rasch analysis to assess the structural validity of the Adult Social Care Outcomes Toolkit Proxy version (ASCOT-Proxy) completed by care home staff. *Qual Life Res* Published Online First: 2024. doi:10.1007/s11136-024-03631-1

50 Silarova B, Rand S, Towers AM, *et al.* Feasibility, validity and reliability of the ASCOT-Proxy and ASCOT-Carer among unpaid carers of people living with dementia in England. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2023;**21**:1–23. doi:10.1186/s12955-023-02122-0

51 Grewal I, Lewis J, Flynn T, *et al.* Developing attributes for a generic quality of life measure for older people: preferences or capabilities? *SocSciMed* 2006;**62**.

52 Coast J, Flynn TN, Natarajan L, *et al.* Valuing the ICECAP capability index for older people. *Soc Sci Med* 2008;**67**. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.05.015

53 Makai P, Brouwer WBF, Koopmanschap MA, *et al.* Capabilities and quality of life in Dutch psycho-geriatric nursing homes: An exploratory study using a proxy version of the ICECAP-O. *Qual Life Res* 2012;**21**:801–12. doi:10.1007/s11136-011-9997-1

54 Devlin NJ, Shah KK, Feng Y, *et al.* Valuing health-related quality of life: An EQ-5D-5L value set for England. *Heal Econ (United Kingdom)* 2018;**27**:7–22. doi:10.1002/hec.3564

55 Rowen D, Mukuria C, Bray N, *et al.* UK Valuation of EQ-5D-5L, a Generic Measure of Health-Related Quality of Life: A Study Protocol. *Value Heal* 2023;**26**:1625–35. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2023.08.005

56 Van Hout B, Janssen MF, Feng YS, *et al.* Interim scoring for the EQ-5D-5L: mapping the EQ-5D-5L to EQ-5D-3L value sets. *Value Health* 2012;**15**:708–15. doi:10.1016/J.JVAL.2012.02.008

57 Dichter M, Bartholomeyczik S, Nordheim J, *et al.* Validity, reliability, and feasibility of a quality of life questionnaire for people with dementia. *Z Gerontol Geriatr* 2011;**44**:405–10. doi:10.1007/s00391-011-0235-9

58 Lauridsen HH, Mau M, Midtiby SL, *et al.* Validity and reliability of the Danish version of QUALIDEM. *Scand J Caring Sci* 2023;**37**:534–48. doi:10.1111/SCS.13139

59 Morris JN, Fries BE, Mehr DR, *et al.* The MDS Cognitive Performance Scale. *J Gerontol* 1994;**49**:174–82.

60 Mahoney FI, Barthel DW. Functional evaluation: the Barthel Index. *Md State Med J* 1965;**14**:56–61.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307612; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .


61 Gordon AL, Rand S, Allan S, *et al.* Piloting a minimum data set for older people living in care homes in England: a developmental cohort study. *medRxiv* 2024.

62 Holgado -Tello FP, Chacón -Moscoso S, Barbero -García I, *et al.* Polychoric versus Pearson correlations in exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis of ordinal variables. *Qual Quant 2008 441* 2008;**44**:153–66. doi:10.1007/S11135-008-9190-Y

63 Kolenikov S. Polychoric, by any other 'namelist'. In: *Stata Conference 2016*. Chicago: : StataCorp, L.P 2016. https://www.stata.com/meeting/chicago16/slides/chicago16_kolenikov.pdf

64 Mokkink LB, Prinsen CA, Patrick DL, *et al.* COSMIN Study Design checklist for Patient-reported outcome measurement instruments. Amsterdam: 2019. www.cosmin.nl

65 Dinno A. Implementing Horn's Parallel Analysis for Principal Component Analysis and Factor Analysis. *Stata J* 2009;**9**:291–8. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/1536867X090090020

66 Fabrigar LR, MacCallum RC, Wegener DT, *et al.* Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychol Methods* 1999;**4**:272–99. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.4.3.272

67 Horn JL. A rationale and technique for estimating the number of factors in factor analysis. *Psychometrika* 1965;**30**:179–85.

68 Humphreys LG, Montanelli RG. An investigation of the parallel analysis criterion for determining the number of common factors. *Multivariate Behav Res* 1975;**10**:193–205.

69 Glorfeld LW. An improvement on Horn's parallel analysis methodology for selecting the correct number of factors to retain. *Educ Psychol Meas* 1995;**55**:377–93. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164495055003002

70 Hair JF, Tatham RL, Anderson RE, *et al. Multivariate data analysis*. 5th ed. London: : Prentice-Hall 1998.

71 Terwee CB, Bot SDM, de Boer MR, *et al.* Quality criteria were proposed for measurement properties of health status questionnaires. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2007;**60**:34–42. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2006.03.012

72 Cohen J. A power primer. *Psychol Assess* 1992;**112**:155–9. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155

73 Mokkink LB, Prinsen CA, Patrick DL, *et al.* COSMIN manual for systematic reviews of PROMs: user manual. 2018;:1–78.https://www.cosmin.nl/wp-content/uploads/COSMIN-syst-review-for-PROMs-manual_version-1_feb-2018.pdf

74 Cronbach LJ. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika* 1951;**16**:297–334. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555

75 Rand S, Towers A-M, Malley J, *et al.* Exploring the structural characteristics of the Adult Social Care Outcomes Toolkit (ASCOT) and ASCOT-Carer. *NIHR Open Res 2023 221* 2023;**2**:21. doi:10.3310/nihropenres.13259.2

76 StataCorp. Stata Statistical Software: Release 16. 2019.

77 Towers A, Smith N, Allan S, *et al.* Care home resident's quality of life and its association with CQC ratings and workforce issues: the MiCareHQ mixed methods study. *Heal Serv Deliv Res* 2021;**9**:222. doi:10.3310/hsdr09190

78 Hackert MQN, Exel J Van, Brouwer WBF. Does the ICECAP-O cover the physical , mental and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307612; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

social functioning of older people in the UK ? *Qual Life Res* 2019;**28**:761–70. doi:10.1007/s11136-018-2042-x

79 Hodgson P, Greaves J, Cook G, *et al.* A study to introduce National Early Warning Scores (NEWS) in care homes: Influence on decision-making and referral processes. *Nurs Open* 2022;**9**:519–26. doi:10.1002/nop2.1091

80 Hughes LJ, Farina N, Page TE, *et al.* Psychometric properties and feasibility of use of dementia specific quality of life instruments for use in care settings: a systematic review. Published Online First: 2018. doi:10.1017/S1041610218002259

81 Dichter MN, Dortmann O, Halek M, *et al.* Scalability and internal consistency of the German version of the dementia-specific quality of life instrument QUALIDEM in nursing homes - a secondary data analysis. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2013;**11**:1–13. doi:10.1186/1477-7525-11-91/TABLES/5

82 Towers A-M, Palmer S, Smith N, *et al.* A cross-sectional study exploring the relationship between regulator quality ratings and care home residents' quality of life in England. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2019;**17**. doi:10.1186/s12955-019-1093-1

83 Netten A, Trukeschitz B, Beadle-Brown J, *et al.* Quality of life outcomes for residents and quality ratings of care homes: is there a relationship? *Age Ageing* 2012;**41**:512–7. doi:10.1093/ageing/afs050

84 Carroll R, Smith N, Palmer S, *et al.* Piloting a Minimum Data Set (MDS) in English care homes: a qualitative focus group and interview study of professional perspectives on implementation and use. *medRxiv* 2024.

85 Allan S, Vadean F. The Association between Staff Retention and English Care Home Quality. *J Aging Soc Policy* 2021;**33**:708–24. doi:10.1080/08959420.2020.1851349

86 Allan S, Rand SE, Towers A, *et al.* Factors associated with care home resident quality of life: Demonstrating the value of a pilot Minimum Data Set using cross-sectional analysis from the DACHA study. *medRxiv* 2024.

87 Nilsson M, Grahm A. Attendo's experiences from implementing ASCOT in nursing homes. In: *ASCOT 10th Anniversary Webinar Series (online)*. Canterbury, UK: : University of Kent 2023. https://www.pssru.ac.uk/ascot/webinar-series/

88 Rand S, Malley J, Towers A-M, *et al.* Validity and test-retest reliability of the self-completion adult social care outcomes toolkit (ASCOT-SCT4) with adults with long-term physical, sensory and mental health conditions in England. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2017;**15**:163. doi:10.1186/s12955-017-0739-0

89 Van Leeuwen KM, Bosmans JE, Jansen APD, *et al.* Comparing measurement properties of the EQ-5D-3L, ICECAP-O, and ASCOT in frail older adults. *Value Health* 2015;**18**:35–43. doi:10.1016/J.JVAL.2014.09.006

**Table 1. Exploratory Factor Analysis of QUALIDEM (n=540)**

| | Factor 1 loadings | Factor 2 loadings | Factor 3 loadings | Factor 4 loadings | Factor 5 loadings | Factor 6 loadings | Uniqueness |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Is cheerful | .93 | | | | | | 0.19 |
| 2. Makes restless movements | | .93 | | | | | 0.30 |
| 3. Has contact with other residents | (.51) | | | | .54 | | 0.35 |
| 4. Rejects help from nursing assistants | .53 | | | | | | 0.21 |
| 5. Radiates satisfaction | .77 | | | | | | 0.44 |
| 6. Makes an anxious impression | | | | | | .73 | 0.30 |
| 7. Is angry | .47 | (.45) | | | | | 0.25 |
| 8. Is capable of enjoying things in daily life | .65 | | | | | | 0.27 |
| 9. Does not want to eat | | | .93 | | | | 0.15 |
| 10. Is in a good mood | .91 | | | | | | 0.19 |
| 11. Is sad | | | | | | .70 | 0.27 |
| 12. Responds positively when approached | .81 | | | | | | 0.15 |
| 13. Indicates that he or she is bored | | | | .60 | | | 0.52 |
| 14. Has conflicts with nursing assistants | .52 | | | | | | 0.18 |
| 15. Enjoys meals | | | .91 | | | | 0.15 |
| 16. Is rejected by other residents | | .67 | | | | | 0.41 |
| 17. Accuses others | | | | | | | 0.38 |
| 18. Takes care of other residents | | | | | .87 | | 0.25 |
| 19. Is restless | | .98 | | | | | 0.19 |
| 20. Openly rejects contact with others | .43 | | | | | | 0.33 |
| 21. Has a smile around the mouth | .88 | | | | | | 0.24 |
| 22. Has tense body language | | .51 | | | | | 0.45 |
| 23. Cries | | | | | | .50 | 0.48 |
| 24. Appreciates help he or she receives | .71 | | | | | | 0.17 |
| 25. Cuts himself/herself off from environment | (.42) | | | .59 | | | 0.40 |
| 26. Finds things to do without help from others | | | | | | | **0.60** |

| | Factor 1 loadings | Factor 2 loadings | Factor 3 loadings | Factor 4 loadings | Factor 5 loadings | Factor 6 loadings | Uniqueness |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 27. Indicates he or she would like more help | | | | .83 | | | 0.40 |
| 28. Indicates feeling locked up | | | | .41 | | | 0.41 |
| 29. Is on friendly terms with one or more | | | | | .61 | | 0.24 |
| 30. Likes to lie down | | | | .48 | (.42) | | 0.59 |
| 31. Accepts help | .57 | | | | | | 0.30 |
| 32. Calls out | | | | | .40 | | 0.42 |
| 33. Criticizes the daily routine (omitted) | | | | | | | Omitted |
| 34. Feels at ease in the company of others | .67 | | | | | | 0.41 |
| 35. Indicates not being able to do anything | | | | .66 | | | 0.40 |
| 36. Feels at home on the ward | .74 | | | | | | 0.46 |
| 37. Indicates feeling worthless (omitted) | | | | | | | Omitted |
| 38. Enjoys helping with chores on the ward | | | | | .51 | | **0.71** |
| 39. Wants to get off the ward | | .44 | | | | | 0.41 |
| 40. Mood can be influenced in positive sense | .74 | | | | | | 0.41 |

Only factors loading ≥.40 are reported. Items with uniqueness ≥.60 shown in **bold**

**Table 2. % missing data**

| | Overall % missing data software provider 1 † | Overall % missing data software provider 2 † | Non-completion of scale % of sample Provider 1 † | Non-completion of scale % of sample Provider 2 † | % missing data <5% for all items where ≥1 items completed? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ASCOT-Proxy-Resident | 15.3% | 37.9% | 9.4% | 24.2% | **No**[1] |
| ICECAP-O | 8.8% | 26.0% | 8.8% | 25.4% | Yes |
| EQ-5D-5L Proxy 2 | 7.7% | 14.7% | 7.6% | 12.3% | Yes |
| QUALIDEM 1: Positive or negative affect | 91.6%* | 22.8% | 11.2% | 13.7% | **No**[1] |
| QUALIDEM 2: Restlessness, tension and agitation | 12.6% | 18.6% | 11.2% | 13.7% | Yes |
| QUALIDEM 3: Enjoys meals/food | 12.6% | 20.7% | 11.2% | 14.4% | Yes |
| QUALIDEM 4: Boredom and disengagement | 15.4% | 26.6% | 11.2% | 13.7% | **No**[1] |
| QUALIDEM 5: Social engagement | 12.6% | 18.8% | 11.2% | 13.7% | Yes |
| QUALIDEM 6: Anxiety and low mood | 12.6% | 16.9% | 11.2% | 13.7% | Yes |
| ASCS Overall QoL (single item) | 8.2% | 20.9% | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**Bold text** indicates that the criterion for psychometric evaluation was not met.

† Overall sample *n*=748
Provider 1 *n*=170
Provider 2 *n*=578

For QUALIDEM only, we excluded residents with very severe dementia on the Minimum Data Set Cognitive Performance Scale (MDS CPS) (n=79) to leave an overall sample of *n*=669 split between provider 1 *n*=143 and provider 2 *n*=526.

[1] Full details reported in Table 3.
*Due to missing item in the software provider system.

**Table 3. Missing data by item, where ≥1 item completed**

| Measure | % Missing |
|---|---|
| **ASCOT-Proxy-Resident (*n*=592)** | |
| 1. Food & drink | 3.4% |
| 2. Home comfort & clean | 3.4% |
| 3. Personal comfort & clean | 2.2% |
| 4. Social participation | 3.9% |
| 5. Occupation | 4.9% |
| 6. Control over daily life | **5.1%** |
| 7. Personal safety | 3.2% |
| 8. Dignity | **6.8%** |
| **QUALIDEM 1. Positive or negative affect (*n*=574)** | |
| 1. Is cheerful | **19.9%**[1] |
| … All other items | <2% |
| **QUALIDEM 4. Boredom and disengagement (*n*=574)** | |
| 13. Indicates he or she is bored | 3.3% |
| 25. Cuts him/herself off of environment | <2% |
| 27. Indicates he or she would like more help | 2.6% |
| 28. Indicates feeling locked up | 3.5% |
| 30. Likes to lie down | 2.1% |
| 35. Indicates not being able to do anything | **5.1%** |

[1] Due to omission of item in first release of the measure in software provider 1's system. If those cases affected by this error are not considered, the % missing is <2%.

**Table 4. Descriptive Statistics and Internal Consistency**

| | Mean, Std. Dev | Range | N †† | % floor | % ceiling | Cronbach's α (no. of items) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ASCOT-Proxy-Resident † | .83, .19 | -.17 to 1.00 | 503 | <2% | **17.7%** | .83 (8) |
| ICECAP-O | .73, .21 | 0 to 1 | 583 | <2% | 3.4% | .81 (5) |
| EQ-5D-5L Proxy 2 | .33, .35 | -.59 to 1 | 650 | <2% | <2% | .74 (5) |
| QUALIDEM 1: Positive or negative affect | 35.52, 7.50 | 11 to 45 | 418 | 0% | 7.4% | .92 (15) |
| QUALIDEM 2: Restlessness, tension and agitation | 10.87, 3.42 | 1 to 15 | 553 | 0% | **19.7%** | .78 (5) |
| QUALIDEM 3: Enjoys meals/food | 4.65, 1.37 | 0 to 6 | 542 | <2% | **38.8%** | .72 (2) |
| QUALIDEM 4: Boredom and disengagement | 12.24, 3.58 | 1 to 18 | 507 | 0% | 6.7% | **.66 (6)** |
| QUALIDEM 5: Social engagement | 7.78, 3.44 | 0 to 15 | 552 | <2% | <2% | .72 (5) |
| QUALIDEM 6: Anxiety and low mood | 5.65, 2.12 | 0 to 9 | 562 | <2% | 9.3% | .75 (3) |
| ASCS Overall QoL item from best (1) to worst (7) | 3.16, 1.08 | 1 to 7 | 613 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Barthel Index from lowest (0) to highest (100) independence | 41.49, 30.19 | 0 to 100 | 630 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| MDS CPS from very severe impairment (0) to intact (6) | 3.10, 2.01 | 0 to 6 | 582 | n/a | n/a | n/a |

**Bold text** indicates that the criterion for psychometric evaluation was not met.

† The descriptive statistics and psychometrics are only reported further for the ASCOT-Proxy-Resident, using preference weights developed for the ASCOT-SCT4 (Netten et al, 2012). For further discussion and justification of our focus on ASCOT-Proxy-Resident, not –Proxy-Proxy (see Rand et al, 2024; Silarova et al, 2023).

†† Overall sample *n*=748
Provider 1 *n*=170
Provider 2 *n*=578

For QUALIDEM only, we excluded residents with very severe dementia on the Minimum Data Set Cognitive Performance Scale (MDS CPS) (n=79) to leave an overall sample of *n*=669 split between provider 1 *n*=143 and provider 2 *n*=526.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307612; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

**Table 5. Construct validity by hypothesis testing**

| | Hypotheses | Spearman rank correlation (N) | Hypothesis accepted? |
|---|---|---|---|
| **ASCOT-Proxy-Resident** | **Strong positive association**: | | |
| | ICECAP-O – based on previous research which found a strong positive association between ASCOT-SCT4 and ICECAP-O for older adults receiving social care [88]. | .60** (441) | Yes |
| | **Strong negative association:** | | |
| | ASCS Overall QoL Item (negatively scored) – based on previous research using ASCOT, which has found strong associations with overall quality of life [88]. | -.54** (497) | Yes |
| | **Moderate positive association**: | | |
| | EQ-5D-5L Proxy 2 - based on previous research with care home residents, which found moderate positive associations when using the ASCOT-CH4 (mixed-methods) toolkit [29] | .32** (488) | Yes |
| | QUALIDEM subscales based on EFA reported in this study – based on conceptual similarities with ASCOT items, particularly Food and drink, Social participation, Occupation (meaningful activity), Control over daily fife and known associations between ASCOT and overall QoL scales in previous research [88]. | | |
| | QUALIDEM 1: positive and negative affect [1] | .49** (309) | Yes |
| | QUALIDEM 2: restlessness, tension and agitation [1] | .49** (426) | Yes |
| | QUALIDEM 3: enjoys meals/food [1] | .33** (418) | Yes |
| | QUALIDEM 4: boredom and disengagement [1] | .41** (398) | Yes |
| | QUALIDEM 5: social engagement [1] | .39** (426) | Yes |
| | QUALIDEM 6: anxiety and low mood [1] | .37** (435) | Yes |
| | Barthel index of independence - based on previous research with care home residents, which found moderate positive associations when using the ASCOT-CH4 (mixed-methods) toolkit [29] | .34** (456) | Yes |
| | MDS Cognitive performance scale - based on previous research with care home residents, which found moderate positive associations when using the ASCOT-CH4 (mixed-methods) toolkit [27] | .45** (468) | Yes |
| **ICECAP-O** | *See above for ASCOT-Proxy-Resident* | | |
| | **Strong negative association:** | | |
| | ASCS Overall QoL Item (negatively scored) – based on previous international research involving older adults, which has found moderate to strong associations between the ICECAP-O and other measures of self-reported quality of life [26]. | -.53** (527) | Yes |
| | **Moderate to strong positive association:** | | |
| | EQ-5D-5L Proxy - based on previous international research involving older adults, which has found moderate to strong associations with the EQ-5D measures [26]. | .60** (565) | Yes |
| | QUALIDEM 5: social engagement [1] - based on conceptual similarities between the items in this subscale and items in the ICECAP-O (i.e. attachment, enjoyment). | .40** (485) | Yes |
| | Barthel index of independence - based on previous research which has found strong positive associations between the ICECAP-O and the Barthel [89] | .55** (510) | Yes |
| | MDS Cognitive performance scale - based on previous international research involving older adults, which has found moderate to strong associations with the cognitive functioning [26]. | .49** (549) | Yes |
| **EQ-5D-5L Proxy 2** | *See above for ASCOT-Proxy and ICECAP-O* | | |
| | **Moderate negative association:** | | |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.20.24307612; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | ASCS Overall QoL Item (negatively scored) – based on the hypothesis that self-rated QoL will be associated with health-related quality of life (measured by EQ-5D-5L) but not strongly because residents are receiving care to compensate for the impact of their health and care needs on their QoL. | -.28** (592) | **No** |
| | **Moderate positive associations:** | | |
| | MDS Cognitive performance scale - based on previous research conducted with care home residents in England indicating many residents have impaired physical and cognitive functioning [77]. | .40** (612) | Yes |
| | **Strong positive associations:** | | |
| | Barthel index of independence – based on previous research conducted with care home residents in England [77] and because both scales assess residents' functional ability. | .84** (565) | Yes |
| **QUALIDEM** | *See above for ASCOT-Proxy-Resident and ICECAP-O and EQ-5D-5L Proxy 2* | | |

*p<.01, **p<.001

[1] Only including respondents, whose MDS CPS score was not 'very severely impaired'.