



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1017/S0144686X1800168X](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X1800168X)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Maun, E., Glaser, K., & Corna, L. (2019). Co-resident care-giving and problematic sleep among older people: evidence from the UK Household Longitudinal Study. *Ageing and Society*, 1-28. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X1800168X>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Co-resident caregiving and problematic sleep among older people: evidence from the UK Household Longitudinal Study

Abstract

In light of current pressures within formal social care services, informal carers assume an important role in meeting the care needs of a growing number of older people. Research suggests relationships between caregiving and health are complex and not yet fully understood. Recently, wide-ranging associations between sleep and health have been identified, however, our understanding of the links between caregiving and sleep is limited at present. This study assesses longitudinal patterns in co-resident caregiving and problematic sleep among older people in the UK.

Our sample included 2,470 adults aged 65 years and older from the UK Household Longitudinal Study. Problematic sleep was defined as two or more problems in going to sleep, staying asleep or sleep quality. Using logistic regression models, we assessed how co-resident caregiving status, intensity and transitions, influences the likelihood of problematic sleep in the following year, adjusting for potential confounding factors.

Adjusted analyses found co-resident caregivers were 1.49 (CI 0.95: 1.06 - 2.08) times more likely to report problematic sleep in the following year, relative to those not providing care. Caregiving over 20 hours per week, and continuous co-resident caregiving also significantly increased the odds of problematic sleep. This suggests older co-resident caregivers may be at greater risk of incurring sleep problems than non-caregivers. Further longitudinal research is needed to investigate caregiver-specific consequences of poor sleep.

Introduction

Informal care by friends and relatives is a central pillar of English social care, critical to meeting the needs of a growing number of older adults at a time of intense financial and systemic pressures (Vlachantoni *et al.* 2011; Pickard, King and Knapp 2016). Defined as ‘providing unpaid support for someone with ... ill health, disability or needs due to old age’ (Vlachantoni 2010), informal care was provided by over 10% of the UK population in 2011, 1.3 million of whom were aged 65 and older (Office for National Statistics 2011).

Supporting individuals to continue to provide care, while maintaining their health and wellbeing, is being given more prominence in legislation (Care Act 2014). Yet while understanding the implications of caregiving for health is an important research topic, evidence is mixed, with patterns that are not fully understood. One under-explored possible explanation for these diverse results is differential sleep patterns, as sleep has been linked to a wide range of health outcomes (Ferrie *et al.* 2011). Our study contributes to literatures on caregiver health and caregiver sleep and provides the first longitudinal assessment of patterns and temporal associations between co-resident caregiving (status, hours and transitions) and sleep in a representative sample of adults aged 65 years and over in the UK. Four waves of data from the UK Household Longitudinal Study (UKHLS) are used, and analysis is set in the context of a modified caregiver stress process framework (Pearlin *et al.* 1990). The analysis is a preliminary step in investigating caregiver sleep as a potential stressor influencing health outcomes.

Background

Caregiver health

An extensive literature exists exploring the effects of caregiving on health. Relatively consistent findings have identified particular groups of caregivers that are more likely to

suffer poorer psychosocial outcomes compared to non-caregivers (Capistrant 2016). These include caregivers of people with dementia (Brodaty and Donkin 2009), individuals providing care for 20 hours or more per week (Hirst 2005), spousal and child caregivers (Rafnsson, Shankar and Steptoe 2017) and co-resident caregivers (Caputo, Pavalko and Hardy 2016; Kaschowitz and Brandt 2017). Caregiver physical health has been studied less frequently but is an area of increasing interest, as a nuanced picture has emerged from studies investigating links to biomarkers, health behaviours, morbidity and mortality (Capistrant 2016). Certain groups of caregivers are more likely to suffer negative physical health outcomes, for instance, caregivers of people with dementia were found to have significantly higher levels of stress hormones, and lower levels of antibodies compared to non-caregivers (Vitaliano, Zhang and Scanlan 2003). However, among more general samples of caregivers, physical health outcomes are mixed. For instance, using UK Census data from 2001 and 2011, the majority of caregivers reported better self-rated health than non-caregivers in all but those ceasing caring after providing heavy care (Vlachantoni *et al.* 2016). Similarly, caregiving was found to be associated with reduced risk of mortality and lower incidence of chronic disease in five recent population-based studies (Roth, Fredman and Haley 2015). Selection bias out of caregiving among individuals with poorer health, and the positive benefits of providing lower levels of care are some of the potential explanations for these findings. However, at present there is an incomplete understanding of caregiver health.

Sleep and health linkages

One possible explanation for variation in caregiver health outcomes that has received little attention is sleep. A burgeoning literature has found associations between poor sleep and a variety of negative physical and mental health outcomes, including among older adults (for instance Jackowska, Kumari and Steptoe 2013). Associations have been found between poor

sleep and increased risk of mortality (Dew *et al.* 2003) and diabetes (Cappuccio *et al.* 2010), negative cardiovascular health outcomes (Cappuccio *et al.* 2011), and less consistently, poorer cognitive function (Devore, Grodstein and Schernhammer 2016). Caregiver health studies have as yet rarely included sleep as a possible explanatory factor. The limited existing evidence suggests sleep may be important for caregiver physical function (Spira *et al.* 2010) and for older caregivers' quality of life (Cupidi *et al.* 2012). Poor sleep may also have direct implications for continuation of caregiving: sleep disturbance has been cited as reason for transitioning care recipients to nursing and residential homes. For instance, approximately one third of German, Dutch and Swedish carers surveyed cited sleep and night-time behaviour disorders of the person they cared for as a main reason for subsequent institutionalisation, in an eight-European country study (Afram *et al.* 2014). These few studies suggest potential linkages between poor sleep, caregiver health, and continued ability to care that might be explored further, with relevance to understandings of the health implications of providing care, and for social policy aiming to support caregivers and maintain their health (Care Act 2014). An initial step in exploring such linkages is to understand how caregiving may affect sleep, as there is at present a relatively modest existing literature.

Existing evidence of associations between caregiving and sleep

A relatively small but growing number of cross sectional studies have explored the relationship between caregiving and sleep. For instance, adult caregivers have been found to have significantly higher odds of reporting sleep disturbance than non-caregivers in a 58-country cross-sectional study using World Health Survey data (Koyanagi *et al.* 2018). However, this finding is not consistent across all studies. For instance, Gibson *et al.* (2015) found no significant association between caregiving status and sleep in analysis of nationally

representative data of older people from New Zealand, though caregivers were significantly more likely to report feeling tired all the time. These two studies compared all caregivers to non-caregivers, however, more often particular characteristics of caregiving or the caregiver have been linked to poor sleep. For instance, a number of cross sectional studies have found positive associations between caregiving intensity in hours per week and problematic sleep (Happe and Berger 2002 and Arber and Meadows 2011a), among particular vulnerable groups including spousal carers (Kochar *et al.* 2007; Creese *et al.* 2008), carers of people with dementia (Cupidi *et al.* 2012), and co-residential, but not non-residential, caregivers (Arber and Meadows 2011a). Qualitative studies highlight a number of caregiving-related activities and habits that can cause sleep disruption. These include provision of physical night-time care, emotional support to the care recipient, or delaying going to bed and experiencing very light, alert sleep, in anticipation of night-time needs (Arber and Venn 2011; Gibson, Gander and Jones 2014; Martin and Bartlett 2007; Bianchera and Arber 2007). Of specific research interest is the extent to which caregiving contributes to negative sleep outcomes compared to other possible factors. Previous research has controlled for a wide but inconsistent variety of demographic, health and social factors. Age has been found to have differing relationships depending on the measure of sleep (Arber and Meadows 2011b). Other factors found to be associated with poor sleep have included being female (Arber and Meadows 2011a and b) and widowed, divorced or separated (Arber and Meadows 2011b); and having lower household wealth (Kumari, Green and Nazroo 2010), poor mental (Brummett *et al.* 2006; von Kaenel *et al.* 2014, Creese *et al.* 2008) and physical health (Wilcox and King 1999, Kumari, Green and Nazroo 2010, Arber and Meadows 2011b).

The collection of sleep data has only relatively recently become a part of prominent longitudinal surveys (Arber and Meadows 2011b). Consequently, only a handful of studies

have investigated temporal relationships between caregiving and sleep, one of which, based on a clinical sample from the University of California, San Diego's (UCSD) Alzheimer's Caregiver Study (Von Kaenel *et al.* 2012), found no longitudinal link between caregiving and sleep, but ceasing caregiving following the death of a spouse was associated with a significant increase in sleep disturbance. Most recently, the only longitudinal caregiver sleep study based on nationally representative data sampled Swedish people in employment aged 16-64 years. This study found caregiving for five hours or more per week across two survey waves was associated with greater sleep disturbance compared to continuous non-caregiving; and, counter to von Kaenel *et al.* (2012), ceasing caregiving was associated with a reduction in sleep disturbance (Sacco, Leineweber and Platts 2018). The small pool of studies including only one longitudinal study based on nationally representative data of Swedish carers in employment, suggests there is scope for further research on longitudinal patterns between informal caregiving and sleep, particularly to widen the evidence base using representative samples in country contexts other than Sweden and among older non-working as well as working caregivers.

The caregiver stress framework

Several reviews of caregiver sleep research have highlighted the limited explicit identification of theoretical frameworks shaping analysis (for instance Peng and Chang 2013). Therefore, we make explicit the theoretical framework underpinning our analysis: viewing caregiver sleep in the context of the caregiver stress process framework (Pearlin *et al.* 1990).

The stress process perspective describes the conditions in which stress can arise and which factors may be important in influencing its effect on physical and mental health (Pearlin *et al.*

1990). Pearlin and colleagues conceptualised caregiving as a type of mutual assistance, a natural part of many close supportive relationships. They suggested that stress is produced when the extent of reciprocity in a relationship declines and caregiving becomes a dominant aspect and upsets the balance of other relationship dimensions (Pearlin *et al.* 1990). This research analyses caregiver sleep in the context of a modified caregiver stress framework (Pearlin *et al.* 1990). This framework has been used extensively in the caregiver literature, applying stress theory initially to understand caregiving for people living with Alzheimer's disease, but now used more widely.

Despite sleep disturbance being a common symptom of Alzheimer's disease (Crowley 2011), sleep was not explicitly included in the original framework. However, Simpson and Carter (2013) have since modified the original framework, conceptualising sleep as arising indirectly from caregiving, as a secondary stressor. This study modifies the model further to include sleep both as a secondary stressor and previous sleep problems as a background characteristic of the caregiver, Figure 1. The analysis is a preliminary step in investigating caregiver sleep as a potential stressor influencing health outcomes. Background characteristics are defined in the framework as contextual factors such as sociodemographic and financial characteristics. Provision of co-residential care, hours of caregiving and co-residential caregiving transitions between two survey waves are modelled as primary stressors of caregiving.

< Insert Figure 1 here >

In the context of co-residential care, disturbed sleep may be a bi-product of caregiving patterns such as night-time monitoring, potentially inducing stress-related health

consequences. It may also be a manifestation of stress caused by a changing relationship with the care receiver for instance giving rise to sleeplessness due to worry; or circumstances less directly linked or unrelated to caregiving (Pearlin *et al.* 1990). The caregiver stress framework accounts for the diversity in caregiver circumstances, enabling the study of combinations of factors that may produce stress. As sleep has both biological, cultural and social aspects (Arber and Meadows 2011b) the framework is particularly appropriate for the identification of variables that may confound or mediate the relationship between caregiving and sleep.

The inclusion of factors in this study's analytical model derive from the caregiver stress framework, and existing literature. Potential confounding variables included in the analysis are age, gender, marital status, income, caregiver health and caregiver distress. Potential moderation by income and bidirectional relationships between physical and mental health and sleep are not considered in this study.

Research question and hypotheses

This research addresses the specific research question, how do co-resident caregiving, caregiving hours per week, and co-resident caregiving transitions, relate to subjectively perceived sleep problems over time in adults aged 65 years and over, adjusting for possible confounding characteristics?

The hypotheses tested are, firstly, provision of co-resident care is temporally associated with an increased likelihood of reporting problematic sleep in the subsequent survey wave, adjusted for confounding variables. Second, as caregiving intensity (in hours per week) increases, the likelihood of reporting problematic sleep increases in the subsequent wave.

Finally, transitions into and out of co-resident caregiving, as well as continuous co-resident caregiving, between the two prior survey waves increase the likelihood of problematic sleep compared to non-caregivers.

Methods

Study sample

This study used data from waves one to four of the UK Household Longitudinal Survey (UKHLS), an annual, nationally representative household panel survey of over 40,000 households in the UK (Buck and McFall 2012). The UKHLS collects detailed social, economic and health data (Knies 2017), and sampling strategy, weighting and response rate details are publicly available (Buck and McFall 2012). Sleep items were included at wave one (2009-2010) and wave four (2012-2013). Wave 1 sleep data provided a baseline, and wave 4 sleep data provided the problematic sleep outcome. Co-resident caregiving status and hours of care per week at wave three were used to assess the temporal relationship between caregiving and sleep outcomes one year after. Co-resident caregiving transitions were measured using data from waves two and three, assessing sleep outcomes in the following year. Cross-sectional analysis of baseline characteristics at wave 1 included all individuals aged 65 years and over with complete data for all caregiving, sleep and health variables, N=5,821. After merging data across waves 2, 3 and 4, our final longitudinal analytical sample included individuals with full sleep, care and health data for waves one to four (N=2,470). Analyses including the distress variable have a slightly smaller N due to missing data, see tables 3 and 4. The appropriate weights were applied for each analysis indicated in table footnotes (Knies 2017).

Sample quality

Sleep questions were included in the self-completion questionnaire in wave 1 resulting in high levels of non-response (31% of individuals in wave 1 had incomplete sleep data for the three sleep questions used in this study). Sleep items were moved to the main questionnaire in wave 4 and non-response dropped to 0.1%. Analysis of cases excluded due to sleep item non-response in wave one found they were more likely to be female, older, in poorer health and with lower income than the sample used for this study. The loss of these cases therefore may introduce some bias, in part mitigated using the appropriate longitudinal self-completion weight.

In addition to high levels of missing sleep data, comparison of UKHLS carers for wave 3, with 2011 census data which collects caregiving status and intensity (Office for National Statistics 2011), suggests there may be under-representation of caregivers providing longer hours of care in the overall UKHLS sample. The total proportion of carers (both co-residential and non-residential) in UKHLS wave 3 is slightly higher overall than in the census (21% compared to 14%); but caregivers providing over 20 hours of care per week, and over 50 hours of care per week are under-represented (online appendix available). This is not a surprising finding given general issues of retention in longitudinal surveys, and the challenges higher intensity caregiving may present for participation in a survey such as the UKHLS. However, there may be important differences between those higher intensity caregivers participating in the survey, and those who do not participate. These sample quality issues will be considered in interpreting the study results.

Measures

Sleep

Sleep is a complex phenomenon (Arber and Meadows 2011b), and aspects of sleep can be subjectively measured and combined in different forms. Sleep items similar to the well validated Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index, PSQI (Buysse *et al.* 1989) are included in the UKHLS (Arber and Meadows 2011b). Analysis using this validated instrument is not possible however as UKHLS does not include the complete set of items in the scale. Instead, researchers have used a variety of different alternative measures of sleep, for instance sleep disturbance: incorporating difficulties falling asleep, staying asleep or waking up feeling tired (Jackowska, Kumari, & Steptoe, 2013; Di Gessa *et al.*, 2017), and analysis of individual measures of sleep duration, quality and medication (Tang *et al.* 2017). This study uses the conceptualisation of sleep problems articulated by Arber and Meadows (2011a) that combines difficulty falling asleep, staying asleep and subjective sleep quality. The inclusion of subjective sleep quality is particularly relevant for older people as it incorporates the social expectation of poorer sleep among some older people (Arber and Meadows, 2011b), and findings that older people may not be able to achieve the same amount or quality of sleep as younger people (Crowley 2011). Arber and Meadows (2011a) conceptualisation of problematic sleep is defined as two or more problems with going to sleep, staying asleep and sleep quality. Problems with going to sleep (sleep latency) was measured by the question 'During the past month how often have you had trouble sleeping because you cannot get to sleep within 30 minutes?', while the ability to stay asleep (sleep maintenance) was assessed with 'During the past month how often have you had trouble sleeping because you wake up in the middle of the night or early in the morning'. The five response categories for both these questions ranged from 'Not during the past month' to 'More than once most nights'. A sleep problem was regarded as a response of 'Three or more nights per week' or 'More than once most nights'. Subjective sleep quality was measured by the question 'During the past month, how would you rate your sleep quality overall?', with responses of 'Very good',

‘Fairly good’, ‘Fairly bad’ or Very bad’. A response of ‘Fairly bad’ or ‘Very bad’ was regarded as a sleep problem. As in the previous study (Arber and Meadows 2011a), a sleep problems variable was constructed with a response range of 0 (no sleep problems) to 3 (three sleep problems), and then dichotomised. The dichotomised variable reference category, no overall sleep problem, includes all respondents reporting none or one sleep problem; those reporting two or more sleep problems were categorised as having problematic sleep.

Caregiving

Co-resident caregiving status and caregiving hours were derived from three questions: ‘Is there anyone living with you who is sick, disabled or elderly whom you look after or give special help to?’, identifying co-resident caregivers; ‘Do you provide some regular service or help for any sick, disabled or elderly person not living with you?’, identifying non-resident caregivers; and the linked question ‘Now thinking about everyone who you look after or provide help for both those living with you and not living with you - in total, how many hours do you spend each week looking after or helping (him/her/them)?’. Co-resident caregivers were coded as anyone providing some co-resident care, this included a small number of individuals who also provided non-resident care (29 individuals in wave 3). Caregiving status was derived comparing those who provided co-resident care, who provided non-resident care, and those who did not provide care (reference group). While caregiving hours are more usually separated into care under or over 20 hours per week (for instance, Hirst 2005), 50 hours or more per week was considered more relevant to possible problematic sleep, assuming increasing hours of care may lead to sleep disturbance either due to direct night-time caring activities, or due to worry for instance about caring conflicting with other responsibilities. Caregiving hours was categorised into those providing no care (reference category), those providing non-resident care, co-resident carers providing 0-49 hours care per

week and co-resident carers providing 50 or more hours care per week. However, analysis using this categorisation showed unusual results, thought to be linked to the low sample size of co-resident caregivers providing over 50 hours of care per week. Therefore, a second caregiving hours variable with the more conventional categorisation of under 20 hours and 20 hours or more per week was also used for logistic regression of problematic sleep by caregiving hours (table 5). A co-resident caregiving transition variable was coded for co-resident caregiving transitions made between waves two and three. Co-resident caregiving transitions was the focus of interest therefore caregiving categories were: no care in either wave (reference group), non-resident caregiving in either wave, entry into co-resident caregiving, continuous co-resident caregiving and exit from co-resident caregiving. Individuals moving from non-resident caring to co-resident caring were coded as entering into co-resident care, and individuals moving from co-resident care to non-resident caring were coded as exiting co-resident caregiving. This analytic strategy captures transitions through change in status each year. Mid-year breaks in caregiving, or short-term caregiving episodes not collected in the annual questionnaire were not captured.

Socioeconomic and demographic variables

Age, gender, marital status and income were considered in the analysis. Respondents between the ages of 65 and 74 were distinguished from those 75 years and over. Women were compared to men; and marital status was recoded into two categories, not married or married/in a civil partnership. Equivalised household net monthly income was chosen as an indicator of socioeconomic status at an individual level. This included individual employment income net of taxes, benefits and pension incomes, without housing wealth and equivalised using the OECD modified scale (Knies 2017). Income quintiles were used to

describe the sample as well as a binary version comparing incomes above the median (reference category) to incomes at or below the median.

Physical and mental health

Subjectively perceived health was assessed using the self-rated health item from the Short Form-12 index. A dichotomous health variable was used for logistic regressions, with categories 'fair' or 'bad' health, and 'good' or 'better' health (reference category). A binary distress variable was created from the short form of the General Health Questionnaire, GHQ-12 to assess caregiver mental health following accepted methods (Booker and Sacker 2011).

Statistical analysis

We first present baseline descriptive and bivariate statistics stratifying the sample by problematic sleep (Table 1) and by co-resident caregiving status (Table 2) at wave 1. Pearson Chi-square was used to test bivariate associations between categorical variables. Tests for continuous variables are provided in the footnotes for each table. As the problematic sleep outcome variable is binary, a logistic regression model was used in multivariate analyses, investigating the odds of reporting problematic sleep based on co-resident caregiving (and non-resident caregiving) characteristics compared to not caregiving, and adjusting for potential confounding variables. The contribution each variable makes to predicting the outcome variable is reported through odds ratios, significance levels and confidence intervals. Log likelihood -2 LL, and the Cox and Snell statistic are reported, and were used to identify best model fit. Variables were added sequentially, starting with the explanatory variable of interest, the caregiving characteristic. Possible confounding (and untested potential mediating) variables were then added, starting with baseline sleep. Only variables previously found to be statistically significant in predicting the problematic sleep outcome in the prior

analyses were added. The final model excluded variables which did not contribute significantly to model fit (Hosmer, Lemeshow and Sturdivant 2013), indicated in footnotes for each table.

In a household panel study design, measures of sleep between individuals of the same household may not be independent. This study did not account for this, for instance through multilevel analysis, and instead referred to the work of Meadows and Arber (2015) who compared multilevel and individual level analyses of their data and found negligible differences in results in similar sleep research using data from the UKHLS.

All statistical analyses were carried out using IBM SPSS Statistics version 23, and statistical tests were two-tailed and p values $p < 0.05$ were taken to be statistically significant.

Results

Descriptive findings

The characteristics of the sample at wave one can be found in Table 1, which presents the distribution of explanatory factors and covariates by self-reported problematic sleep. Twenty four percent of the sample reported problematic sleep and almost one in ten reported providing co-resident care, of whom 30% provided 50 hours of care or more per week. The majority reported low distress (85%) and good or better self-rated health (65%). Just over half of the sample were women (55%), with a higher proportion aged 65-74 years (55%) compared to those 75 years or older, and fifty eight percent of the sample was married.

< Insert Table 1 about here >

Table 1 also shows that individuals reporting problematic sleep were significantly more likely to report providing co-resident care for 50 or more hours per week, significantly poorer subjective physical and mental health and to be female. The same group were less likely to be married or have net incomes in the highest income quintile. There were no significant age differences between those with and without problematic sleep.

Table 2 presents bivariate relationships between co-resident caregiving hours, problematic sleep and relevant covariates.

< Insert Table 2 about here >

Co-resident caregivers were significantly more likely to suffer problematic sleep only when providing fifty hours or more of co-resident care. There were also significant differences in the distribution of self-rated health and distress reports among those not providing care, non-resident caregivers, and co-resident caregivers providing under 50 hours and 50 hours or more of care per week. Co-resident caregivers were also significantly more likely to report incomes in the lowest quintile relative to their counterparts providing non-resident care, and they were more likely to be married. There were no significant differences in age between co-resident caregivers and individuals not providing care, but non-resident caregivers were significantly more likely to be younger than both these groups. There were no significant differences in gender.

Multivariate analyses

The results of logistic regression are shown in a series of nested models in Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6. Each table shows the results of analysis by a different caregiving characteristic, caregiving

status, hours or transitions, as shown in the analytical model (Figure 1). Table 3 shows the results of logistic regression analyses using cross sectional data at baseline (wave 1). Model 1 shows the results by caregiving status, but this is not a significant predictor of problematic sleep outcomes. On the other hand, caregiving hours is modelled in Model 2, and these results show that individuals providing higher hours of co-resident care (fifty hours or more) had significantly greater odds of reporting problematic sleep in the same wave (OR 1.71, CI 0.95 1.18-2.50) compared to those not providing care. The lower odds of reporting problematic sleep when providing less than fifty hours of co-resident care, or when providing non-resident care were not significant. These preliminary results showing no significant cross-sectional association between co-resident caregiving status and sleep, but a significant association between higher hours of care and problematic sleep are consistent with studies finding particular characteristics of caregiving associated with sleep (for instance Arber and Meadows 2011a).

<Insert table 3 about here >

Hypothesis 1: co-resident caregivers are more likely to suffer problematic sleep the following year, than non-caregivers, independent of other covariates.

Table 4 shows the results of logistic regression of problematic sleep at wave four by co-resident caregiving status (at wave three). Unlike the cross-sectional analysis, model 0 shows that compared to non-caregivers, those who provided co-resident care at wave three were nearly 1.5 times more likely to report problematic sleep at wave four. This effect was not attenuated following adjustment for baseline sleep in Model 1. Unsurprisingly, those who reported sleep problems at Wave 1 were nearly nine times more likely to report problematic sleep at Wave 4. The effect of co-resident caregiving on problematic sleep was not

attenuated in subsequent models when health, distress, marital status and gender were added; health and gender were both independently associated with problematic sleep. No significant association was found for non-residential caregivers. Null hypothesis one can therefore be rejected as co-resident caregivers had significantly higher odds of reporting problematic sleep after one year than those not providing care, independent of potential confounding variables.

Studies using repeated measurements have found similar significant associations between caregiving and sleep over a period of seven days (Rowe *et al.* 2008) and two years (Sacco, Leineweber and Platts 2018); though not among all studies (von Kaenel *et al.* 2012; Song *et al.* 2017). The present study found 27% of co-resident caregivers suffered problematic sleep, in comparison to 24% of non-caregivers (table 2). These differences are similar to those found by Kumari, Green and Nazroo (2010) in a sample of adults aged over 50 from the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing, ELSA.

< Insert Table 3 and 4 about here >

Hypothesis 2: as hours of co-resident caregiving increase the likelihood of reporting problematic sleep in the following year increases

Table 5 shows the odds ratio of having problematic sleep for non-residential caregiving and two different categorisations of co-resident caregiver hours: under 50 hours, and 50 hours or more of care per week (models 0 and 1); and under 20 hours, and 20 hours or more of care per week (models 2 and 3), compared to non-caregiving. Caregiving for less than 50 hours per week was a significant predictor of problematic sleep after the addition of baseline sleep problems to the model (Model 1), however, caregiving for 50 hours or more per week did not show significantly greater odds of reporting problematic sleep. A handful of studies have

analysed caregiving intensity and sleep (Arber and Meadows 2011a, Happe and Berger 2002, Wilcox and King 1999 and Song *et al.* 2017). Unlike any previous study, these initial results indicated a significant association between lower intensity caregiving (under 50 hours per week), but not higher intensity caregiving (50 hours and over), and problematic sleep. This finding is counter-intuitive, particularly for those caregivers providing very long hours of care per week (100+ hours), and cross-sectional analysis of wave 1 data in Table 3 found the opposite result. The small longitudinal sample size is likely to have reduced statistical power in this analysis, with a small group of caregivers providing 50 hours of care or more (64 respondents). For this reason, we ran a further set of logistic regressions using the more conventional categorisation, under 20 hours and 20 or more hours of care per week. Using this variable, lower intensity caregiving (0-19 hours) was not associated with greater odds of problematic sleep; but higher intensity caregiving (20 or more hours per week), showed greater odds of problematic sleep compared to non-caregivers. This effect was not attenuated in subsequent models with the addition of baseline sleep, health or gender, and the final model indicated that those caregivers providing 20 hours or more care per week were 1.67 times (CI 0.95: 1.11 - 2.51) more likely to report problematic sleep than non-caregivers. This suggests the null hypothesis can be rejected partially as higher intensity hours of care provided per week, measured at 20 hours or more per week, significantly increased the odds of problematic sleep.

< Insert Table 5 about here >

Hypothesis 3: transitions in co-resident caregiving, and continuous co-resident caregiving between the previous two waves increase the likelihood of reporting problematic sleep in the following year, compared to those who continue to be non-caregivers

Table 6 presents the results from adjusted and unadjusted logistic regression models assessing the association between caregiving transitions between waves 2 and 3, and problematic sleep at wave 4.

< Insert Table 6 about here >

Model 0 shows continuous co-resident caregiving between waves 2 and 3 was associated with a significant increase in the odds of reporting problematic sleep (OR = 1.59, 95% CI=1.14 - 2.24) compared to individuals not providing care. This suggests those providing continuous co-resident caregiving for one year have almost 1.6 times the likelihood of reporting problematic sleep in the following year, compared to those not caregiving. The odds of reporting problematic sleep were not significantly higher for individuals entering into caregiving between waves 2 and 3, or for individuals providing only non-resident care. However, there was a significant increase in the odds of reporting problematic sleep for individuals ceasing caregiving between waves 2 and 3 compared to individuals providing no care (OR = 2.23, 95% CI=1.38 - 3.70).

When baseline sleep at wave 1 was added (Model 1), the association between continuous caregiving and problematic sleep at wave 4 was not attenuated, suggesting co-resident caregivers providing care over a one-year period were more likely to report problematic sleep, independent of previous sleep patterns, than non-caregivers. The odds of reporting problematic sleep decreased for those ceasing caregiving when previous sleep problems at baseline was added, and the odds ratio became non-significant. Model 2 added health and gender; and the significantly increased odds of reporting problematic sleep among continuous caregivers remained, while baseline sleep, health and gender were all independently

associated with the wave 4 sleep outcome. Based on these results, null hypothesis 3 cannot be rejected, as only continued caregiving, rather than either entry into or exit from caregiving were found to increase the likelihood of problematic sleep.

In summary, providing co-resident caregiving was found to significantly increase the odds of reporting problematic sleep in the following year, compared to non-caregivers, net of baseline sleep, gender and health. Similarly, continuous co-resident caregiving over a one-year period was associated with increased odds of problematic sleep in the following year, compared to those not providing care, controlling for the same covariates. Small sample size, resulting in reduced statistical power hampered analyses by caregiving hours and caregiving transitions, and may be important contributing factors to unexpected results. Individuals reporting higher intensity caregiving, measured at 20 or more hours per week, but not 50 or more hours per week, had greater odds of reporting problematic sleep in the following year. Finally, no significant associations with problematic sleep were found among non-resident caregivers, and individuals entering into and exiting from co-resident caregiving.

Discussion

Recent research into differences in caregiver health outcomes has questioned the long-held view that provision of care contributes to poor mental and physical health (Capistrant 2016). Underlying mechanisms are not yet fully understood, and a possible explanatory variable, sleep, has rarely been investigated among caregivers. To date, four studies have investigated caregiving and sleep over time, only one using nationally representative data sampling working carers; and none sampling the full range of older carers and using data from the UK (Sacco, Leineweber and Platts 2018; Song *et al.* 2017; von Kaenel *et al.* 2012; von Kaenel *et al.* 2014). The present study therefore makes an important contribution to caregiver sleep research with its use of longitudinal data and a representative UK sample to explore the relationship between co-resident caregiving and problematic sleep among older people over time. It also addresses a preliminary step in investigating whether caregiver sleep may contribute to caregiver health outcomes. Results showed that co-resident caregivers experience an increased likelihood of problematic sleep in the following year, compared to those not providing care, after accounting for baseline sleep and other covariates. Being female and having poorer health both independently contributed to an increased likelihood of problematic sleep, in addition to having previously reported problematic sleep. Continuous caregiving in the two years prior was also a significant predictor of problematic sleep in the subsequent year. Higher intensity caregiving (20 or more hours of care per week) was associated with significantly greater odds of reporting problematic sleep in the following year compared to non-caregivers, though this result was not found when analysing individuals providing care for fifty or more hours per week. Non-resident caregiving and transitions into and exits from co-resident caregiving between waves two and three did not significantly increase the odds of having problematic sleep compared to non-caregivers.

Qualitative research has consistently documented a range of caregiving-specific sources of poor sleep, such as care recipient night time wandering and caregiver monitoring activities that might contribute to this increased risk of problematic sleep (for instance Gibson *et al.* 2014). Our findings are consistent with these accounts and with the conceptualisation of problematic sleep arising as a secondary stressor as a result of being a caregiver within our theoretical model, the modified caregiver stress framework (Figure 1). The results suggest co-resident caring in a previous wave, and continuous co-resident caregiving between the two previous waves was associated with higher odds of reporting problematic sleep the following year. Caregiving has been characterised as a form of unforeseen career, with different stages experienced by the individuals involved (Pearlin 2010). These results suggest caregivers continue to be more likely to experience problematic sleep as they move through their caregiving ‘career’ (Pearlin and Aneshensel 1994), at least over a period of several years. Our research did not test the relationship between problematic sleep among caregivers and the negative mental and physical health outcomes that Pearlin *et al.* (1990) assert are the result of the stress process. However, existing research among the general older population suggests that individuals experiencing poor sleep are more likely to suffer such negative outcomes (for instance Jackowska and Poole 2017).

Unexpectedly, analysis by caregiving hours gave differing results when hours per week were categorised by 20 or more hours or 50 or more hours per week. Individuals providing care for 20 hours or more per week, and less than fifty hours per week had higher odds of reporting problematic sleep in the following year compared to non-caregivers. However, providing less than twenty hours per week, or 50 hours or more per week were not significantly associated with problematic sleep. This contrasts with the cross-sectional analysis of wave 1 data which found fifty hours of care or more associated with problematic

sleep. The finding is surprising given high prevalence of “round the clock” caregiving among older caregivers (Vlachantoni 2010) and qualitative findings highlighting the night-time activities that disrupt caregiver sleep. However, it accords with wider evidence pointing to greater difficulties experienced among caregivers providing over 20 hours of care per week (for instance Hirst 2005). Explanations include the possibility that individuals providing between 20 and 50 hours of care per week may be subject to additional pressures that affect sleep. These may include the need to balance caregiving with employment (Sacco, Leineweber and Platts 2018) or grandchild care, which may disrupt sleep through worry. Alternatively, individuals providing fifty or more hours of care may receive state-funded or other support that allows them to provide long hours of care without experiencing problematic sleep. Indeed, Pickard, King and Knapp (2016) highlight the high proportion of older caregivers providing long hours of care among those receiving state support. However, analysis by caregiving hours is also likely to have been limited by the small sample size and lower statistical power available to identify significant associations. In addition to the small available sample, the sample may include underlying bias, as carers providing longer hours of care are underrepresented in the UKHLS sample, and these individuals, along with individuals with missing sleep data in wave 1, may be more likely to suffer sleep disruption.

Small sample size and resulting reduced statistical power may also have affected analyses of caregiving transitions. Transitions, and their influence on stress outcomes is an important concept at the heart of the stress process (Pearlin 2010). Previous research has found ceasing caregiving was associated with reduced sleep problems (Sacco, Leineweber and Platts 2018), but von Kaenel *et al.* (2012) found increased sleep disturbance after 3 months, where ceasing caregiving was as a result of spousal death. Our analyses found neither entering into caregiving nor ceasing caregiving had significantly different odds of reporting problematic

sleep in the following year compared to non-caregivers. The finding was less surprising for entering into caregiving, as the caregiver stress process framework suggests caregiving is a natural part of normal relationships, not inherently stressful and potentially initially less arduous (Pearlin *et al* 1990). Researchers are indeed increasingly interested in the benefits providing care can bring (Brown and Brown 2014). Explanations accounting for the lack of associations between ceasing caregiving and problematic sleep may be more wide-ranging. Although ceasing caregiving has been associated with increased levels of distress (Hirst 2005); evidence is mixed among caregivers who institutionalised the person they care for; studies finding decreased levels of burden (Bleijlevens 2014) yet also significant levels of anxiety and poor sleep (Washington *et al.* 2018). Von Kaenel *et al.*'s (2012) analysis of the impact of ceasing caregiving due to institutionalisation or death of the spouse; and Sacco, Leineweber and Platts' (2018) contrasting results among younger working carers indicates a need for close attention to be paid to the characteristics of the caregiver and the circumstances of ceasing care. No significantly differing odds compared to non-caregivers may suggest ceasing caregiving alleviates any problems of physical night-time care or may indicate differing effects dependent on circumstance. Methodologically however, measuring sleep outcomes one year after measuring the care transition may also be too long to pick up any shorter-term problems with sleep.

Limitations

The findings presented here must be considered in the context of a number of limitations. There is no one accepted conceptualisation or measure of poor sleep in the current caregiver sleep literature. Here, we used a binary indicator of the presence or absence of problematic sleep, following Arber and Meadows (2011a). This measure was used as the full validated sleep scale, PSQI, was not available in the dataset, and the combination of questions included

in the measure used is particularly relevant to older caregivers, as described in the methodology section of this article. Future studies of caregiver sleep might usefully carry out more extensive comparisons of different measures to evaluate the most appropriate for purpose, for instance disturbed sleep (Jackowska, Kumari and Steptoe 2013), or individual measures of sleep (Tang *et al.* 2017).

While the caregiver stress process framework has provided a useful theoretical structure for analysis, and most results seem consistent with its assumptions and assertions, further research might develop more sophisticated analyses with a wider range of factors, to deepen understanding of caregiver sleep, and crucially its links to health.

Most importantly, the sample on which this study is based under-represents caregivers providing 20 hours and particularly 50 hours and over per week and lost a high proportion of potential cases due to missing sleep data at wave one. These groups may differ significantly from the study sample, for instance, being more likely to be higher intensity caregivers, and in the case of missing sleep data, more likely to be female, having less than median income and older age as discussed in the methods section of this article. As a result, the study findings may underestimate the association between caregiving and problematic sleep. Future studies would benefit from identifying larger samples of caregivers to conduct analyses on caregiving hours and transitions.

Policy implications

In investigating the patterns and possible contributory factors to problematic sleep among older co-resident caregivers, this research contributes findings that may be useful to policy makers and practitioners to protect and improve the health of older caregivers. The results

point to the greater risk of problematic sleep among older co-resident caregivers, but not non-resident caregivers. Poorer sleep has been linked to a variety of poor health outcomes (Ferrie *et al.* 2011) and may be a factor in moves from informal care to institutionalisation (Afram *et al.* 2014, Pollak and Perlick 1991). This research therefore adds to evidence of the significant challenges to wellbeing experienced by many older caregivers (for instance Rafnsson, Shankar and Steptoe 2017). The findings have policy and practical implications for the UK where access to formal state-funded home care and institutional care settings has been decreasing, and informal family care represents an essential pillar of social care (Vlachantoni *et al.* 2011).

In a recent review of interventions for caregivers of people with dementia, sleep was identified as an important contributor to caregiver resilience through physical health, and coping strategies (Parkinson *et al.* 2016). Carer needs assessments can include questions on sleep problems, however Carers UK found only 38% of older carers were offered an assessment in 2016 (Carers UK 2016). In addition to the limited coverage of carer assessments, reviews of interventions to improve caregiver sleep have identified only mixed success (Lee and Thomas 2011). Indeed, some research suggests respite away from the home can be counter-productive in disrupting care recipient sleep patterns following the respite period (Lee and Thomas 2011). These findings suggest further piloting and evaluation of promising sleep interventions, in addition to increasing opportunities to identify caregiver sleep problems may be useful developments.

Considering potential research directions, with an increasing body of evidence pointing to the negative health consequences of poor sleep for the wider adult population, the study's findings raise questions of what caregiving-specific consequences an increased likelihood of

problematic sleep may have; and what can be done to mitigate the factors leading to problematic sleep in caregivers.

Conclusion

Exploration of the impact of caregiving on health has yet to fully understand underlying mechanisms for a range of diverse outcomes. One potential factor may be differences in caregiver sleep patterns, as current research is uncovering consistent patterns in the influence of sleep on many aspects of health. Circumstances in which caregivers may find themselves may include physical night-time care, monitoring activities, worry and stress that could lead to sleep disturbance (Arber and Venn 2011). While a cross-sectional relationship between caregiving and sleep has been relatively consistently established, only a handful of studies have sought to investigate whether this relationship persists over time, and only one study has used a representative sample, using data from the Swedish Longitudinal Occupational Survey of Health (Sacco, Leineweber and Platts 2018). This research provides evidence for a longitudinal association between co-resident caregiving and problematic sleep, using a large-scale UK data set with a probability sample. The results suggest co-resident caregiving is temporally associated with problematic sleep, as older co-resident caregivers are more likely to report problematic sleep in the subsequent year than non-caregivers even when other covariates are taken in to account. It finds caregiving over 20 hours per week, and continuous co-resident caregiving over a period of one year increases the likelihood of problematic sleep in the subsequent year compared to non-caregivers. Entries into and exits from co-resident caregiving, as well as non-resident caregiving were not found to be significant, though smaller sample sizes may have masked any underlying association. These findings suggest increasing opportunities to identify caregiver sleep problems, and test potentially supportive interventions would be appropriate. Finally, the research findings

support assertions that further longitudinal research into the factors associated with problematic sleep and potential caregiver-specific outcomes of poor sleep are required.




Figure 1. Hypothesized variable relationships

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of sample by problematic sleep at wave 1

	Total sample N=5,821 [#]	No sleep problem at wave 1 N=4,431 (76.1%)	Problematic sleep at wave 1 N=1,390 (23.9%)	Chi square and p values ^{###}
Gender %				
Male	45.4	48.8	34.7	84.8 p<0.001
Female	54.6	51.2	65.3	
Mean age (CI 0.95)	74.6 (74.4 - 74.7)	74.4 (74.2 - 74.6)	75.0 (74.6 - 75.4)	t=-2.8 p=0.005 [†]
Age %				
65-74 years	55.1	55.7	53.3	2.3 p=0.13
75 years and over	44.9	44.3	46.7	
Marital status %				
Married/civil partner	57.7	60.1	50.0	43.6 p<0.001
Not married	42.3	39.9	50.0	
Co-resident caring %				
Not a carer	82.1	81.9	82.8	9.1 p=0.01
Non-resident carer	8.6	9.2	6.8	
Co-resident carer	9.3	8.9	10.4	
Number of hours per week of co-resident care %				
No care	82.1	81.9	82.8	20.6 p=0.001
Non-resident care	8.6	9.2	6.8	
0-49 hours co-resident care	6.5	6.6	6.2	
50+ hours co-resident care	2.8	2.3	4.2	
Subjective health status %				
Excellent	10.7	13.1	3.2	508.3 p<0.001
Very good	26.5	29.7	16.6	
Good	27.3	28.5	23.5	
Fair	23.1	20.7	30.4	
Poor	12.3	7.9	26.3	
Distress level, GHQ-12 caseness % [#]				
Low distress	85.1	91.4	64.4	585.0 p<0.001
High distress	14.9	8.6	35.6	

Median income (IQR)	£1,118.80 (768.82)	£1,133.76 (791.33)	£1,064.90 (696.89)	p<0.001 ⁱⁱⁱ
Income quintile %				
Highest	20.0	21.2	16.3	23.8
2 nd highest	20.0	19.8	20.6	p<0.001
Middle	20.0	20.4	18.7	
2 nd lowest	20.0	19.2	22.8	
Lowest	20.0	19.5	21.7	

ⁱ Independent t-test (unequal variance) was used to test for differences in mean age

ⁱⁱ N for analysis including the distress level variable was smaller due to the larger number of missing values, N=5,673

ⁱⁱⁱ Mann Whitney-U was used to test for differences in median income

ⁱⁱⁱⁱ Cross-sectional weight applied; significance unchanged with the application of design weights.

Table 2. Baseline characteristics by hours of care wave 1

	Not a carer N=4,779 (82.1%)	Non-resident care N=501 (8.6%)	Co-resident caregiving		Chi square and p values ^{***}
			0-49 hours per week N=378 (6.5%)	50+ hours per week N=163 (2.8%)	
Gender %					
Male	45.3	43.5	50.7	43.6	5.2
Female	54.7	56.5	49.3	56.4	p=0.16
Mean age (CI 0.95)	74.9 (74.7 – 75.1)	71.7 (71.1 – 72.3)	74.2 (73.5 – 74.8)	74.2 (73.3 – 75.2)	37.5 p<0.001 †
Age %					
65-74 years	52.9	73.9	58.6	54.6	82.68
75 years and over	47.1	26.1	41.1	45.4	p<0.001
Marital status %					
Married/civil partner	53.9	58.1	91.2	90.2	273.2
Not married	46.1	41.9	8.8	9.8	p<0.001
Problematic sleep %					
No overall problem	75.9	81.0	77.2	63.8	20.6
Problematic sleep	24.1	19.0	22.8	36.2	p=0.001
Subjective health status %					
Excellent	10.5	16.8	8.5	4.3	80.6
Very good	26.1	32.5	25.1	25.2	P<0.001
Good	27.1	28.5	25.9	34.4	
Fair	23.2	19.0	25.7	25.8	
Poor	13.1	3.2	14.8	10.4	

Distress level GHQ-12 caseness % ⁱⁱ					
Low distress	85.3	87.8	81.7	76.8	14.7
High distress	14.7	12.2	18.3	23.2	p=0.002
Monthly net income					
Median income	£1,105.72	£1,312.60	£1,138.00	£1,083.32	p<0.001 ⁱⁱⁱ
(Interquartile range)	(768.42)	(1,026.76)	(677.25)	(570.08)	
Income quintile %					
Highest	19.3	31.4	16.2	12.9	68.0 p<0.001
2 nd highest	19.5	21.8	23.1	22.1	
Middle	20.0	15.6	23.1	27.0	
2 nd lowest	20.4	16.4	20.2	20.2	
Lowest	20.8	14.8	17.5	17.8	

ⁱ Homogeneity of variance assumption was violated (Levene statistic=19.6, p<0.001) so the Welch statistic used to test for differences in mean age

ⁱⁱ N for analysis including the distress level variable was smaller due to the larger number of missing values, N=5,673

ⁱⁱⁱ Kruskal-Wallis was used to test for differences in median income

ⁱⁱⁱⁱ Cross-sectional weight applied; significance unchanged with the application of design weights.

Table 3. Cross sectional analysis: logistic regression of problematic sleep by caregiving, co-resident caregiving hours per week, and covariates at wave 1 odds ratios (confidence interval 0.95)

N=5,673 [‡]	Model 1	Model 2
Caregiving (wave 1)		
Not a caregiver	1.00	
Non-resident caregiver	0.86 (0.67 – 1.11)	
Co-resident caregiver	1.12 (0.88 – 1.42)	
Co-resident caregiving hours (wave 1)		
Not a caregiver		1.00
Non-resident care		0.86 (0.67 – 1.11)
0-49 hours per week		0.92 (0.69 - 1.22)
50 hours or more per week		1.71** (1.18 - 2.50)
Baseline covariates (wave 1)		
Health good	1.00	1.00
Health poor	2.51*** (2.19 - 2.88)	2.53*** (2.20 - 2.90)
Income above median	1.00	1.00
Income below median	1.09 (0.95 - 1.25)	1.09 (0.95 - 1.24)
Distress (GHQ-12 caseness) low	1.00	1.00
Distress (GHQ-12 caseness) high	4.46*** (3.79 - 5.25)	4.45*** (3.78 - 5.24)
Male	1.00	1.00
Female	1.70*** (1.48 - 1.96)	1.70*** (1.47 - 1.96)
65-74 years	1.00	1.00
75 years and over	0.77*** (0.66 – 0.88)	0.76*** (0.66 – 0.88)
Married	1.00	1.00
Not married	1.18* (1.02 – 1.37)	1.19* (1.02 – 1.37)
Log likelihood -2 Log	5,431	5,423
Cox and Snell	0.13	0.13

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

Weighted by wave 1 cross sectional self-completion weight

[‡] N is smaller than bivariate analyses in Tables 1 and 2 due to the larger number of missing values for the distress level variable

Table 4 Logistic regression of problematic sleep at wave 4 by caregiving at wave 3, odds ratios (confidence interval 0.95)

N=2,470 [‡]	Model 0	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3 (final)
Caregiving (Wave 3)				
Not a caregiver	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Non-resident caregiver	1.07 (0.79 – 1.44)	1.07 (0.77 – 1.48)	1.24 (0.88 – 1.73)	1.21 (0.86 – 1.68)
Co-resident caregiver	1.47* (1.09 - 1.98)	1.47* (1.05 - 2.04)	1.56* (1.09 – 2.23)	1.49* (1.06 - 2.08)
Baseline sleep (wave 1)				
No sleep problem		1.00	1.00	1.00
Problematic sleep		8.87*** (7.14 - 11.02)	7.04*** (5.57 – 8.91)	7.13*** (5.70 – 8.91)
Baseline covariates (wave 1)				
Health good			1.00	1.00
Health poor			2.01*** (1.60 - 2.54)	2.22*** (1.78 – 2.77)
Distress (GHQ-12 caseness) low [‡]			1.00	
Distress (GHQ-12 caseness) high			1.13 (0.83 – 1.54)	
Male			1.00	1.00
Female			1.54*** (1.22 – 1.93)	1.63*** (1.31 - 2.03)
65-74 years			1.00	
75 years and over			1.01 (0.80 – 1.28)	
Married			1.00	
Not married			1.13 (0.88 – 1.28)	
Log likelihood -2 Log	2,638	2,230	2,114	2,163
Cox and Snell	0.003	0.15	0.17	0.18

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

[‡] N for analysis including the distress level variable was smaller due to the larger number of missing values (N=2,416)

Income variable excluded as non-significant in cross-sectional analyses. Longitudinal self-completion weight applied.

Table 5 Logistic regression of problematic sleep (wave 4) by caregiving hours at wave 3, odds ratios (confidence interval 0.95)

N=2,470	Model 0	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Co-resident caregiving hours (wave 3)				
Not a caregiver	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Non-resident caregiver	1.07 (0.79 – 1.44)	1.07 (0.77 – 1.44)	1.07 (0.77 – 1.44)	1.21 (0.86 – 1.68)
0-49 hours per week	1.43* (1.09 - 2.04)	1.51* (1.02 - 2.25)		
50 hours or more per week	1.55 (0.94 - 2.56)	1.37 (0.78 - 2.41)		
0-19 hours per week			1.24 (0.72 - 2.14)	1.20 (0.69 – 2.09)
20 hours or more per week			1.60* (1.07 - 2.40)	1.67* (1.11 - 2.51)
Baseline sleep (wave 1)				
No sleep problem		1.00	1.00	1.00
Problematic sleep		8.88*** (7.15 - 11.03)	8.85*** (7.13 - 11.00)	7.10*** (5.68 – 8.89)
Baseline covariates (wave 1)				
Health good				1.00
Health poor				2.28*** (1.78-2.78)
Male				1.00
Female				1.63*** (1.31 – 2.03)
Log likelihood -2 Log	2,638	2,230	2,229	2,181
Cox and Snell	0.003	0.15	0.16	0.17

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

Distress, age and marital status variables were excluded as non-significant in longitudinal analyses presented in table 4.

Longitudinal self-completion weight applied.

Table 6 Logistic regression of problematic sleep (wave 4) by co-resident caregiving transition between wave 2 and wave 3, odds ratios (confidence interval 0.95)

N=2,446	Model 0	Model 1	Model 2
Caregiving transition (wave 2-wave 3)			
Continued not a caregiver	1.00	1.00	1.00
Non-resident caregiver	0.99 (0.76 – 1.31)	1.03 (0.77 – 1.39)	1.14 (0.84 – 1.54)
Entry into co-resident caregiving	1.27 (0.71 - 2.25)	1.16 (0.61 - 2.06)	1.21 (0.64 - 2.30)
Continued co-resident caregiving	1.59** (1.14 - 2.24)	1.62* (1.11 - 2.36)	1.63* (1.11 - 2.40)
Exit from co-resident caregiving	2.23** (1.38 - 3.70)	1.62 (0.92 - 2.85)	1.56 (0.88 - 2.78)
Baseline sleep (wave 1)			
No sleep problem		1.00	1.00
Problematic sleep		8.78*** (7.06 - 10.91)	7.08*** (5.66 - 8.86)
Baseline covariates (wave 1)			
Health good			1.00
Health poor			2.19*** (1.75 - 2.74)
Male			1.00
Female			1.65*** (1.32 - 2.05)
Log likelihood -2 Log	2,628	2,226	2,161
Cox and Snell	0.007	0.16	0.18

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

Longitudinal self-completion weight applied.

References

Afram B., Stephan A., Verbeek H., Bleijlevens M.H.C., Suhonen R., Sutcliffe C., Raamat K., Cabrera E., Soto M.E., Hallberg I.R., Meyer G., Hamers J.P.H. & RightTimePlaceCare Consortium. (2014). Reasons for Institutionalization of People With Dementia: Informal Caregiver Reports From 8 European Countries. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association* **15**, 108-116.

Arber, S., and Meadows, R. (2011a). Sociology of sleep: Caregiving, gender and sleep problems. *Finnish Journal of Social Medicine* **48**, 100-13.

Arber, S., and Meadows, R. (2011b). Social and health patterning of sleep quality and duration. In: McFall, S.L., and Garrington, C., (eds), *Understanding Society: Early findings from the first wave of the UK's household longitudinal study*. Colchester: Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex.

Arber, S., and Venn, S. (2011). Caregiving at night: Understanding the impact on carers. *Journal of Aging Studies* **25**, 155-65.

Bianchera, E., and Arber, S. (2007). Caring and sleep disruption among women in Italy. *Sociological Research Online* **12**.

Bleijlevens, M. (2014). Changes in caregiver burden and health-related quality of life of informal caregivers of older people with dementia: Evidence from the European RightTimePlaceCare prospective cohort study. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* **71**, 1378-91.

Booker, C.L., and Sacker, A. (2011). Health over the life course: Associations between age, employment status and well-being. In: McFall, S.L., and Garrington, C. (eds), *Early findings from the first wave of the UK's household longitudinal study*. Colchester: Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex.

Brodsky, H., and Donkin, M. (2009). Family caregivers of people with dementia. *Dialogues in clinical neuroscience* **1**, 217-28.

Brown, R.M., and Brown, S.L. (2014). Informal caregiving: A reappraisal of effects on caregivers. *Social Issues and Policy Review* **8**, 74-102.

Brummett, B., Babyak, M., Siegler, I., Vitaliano, P., Ballard, E., Gwyther, L., Williams, R. (2006). Associations among perceptions of social support, negative affect, and quality of sleep in caregivers and noncaregivers. *Health Psychology* **25**, 220-5.

Buck, N., and McFall, S. (2012). Understanding society: Design overview. *Longitudinal and Life Course Studies* **3**, 5-17.

Buysse D.J., Reynolds III C.F., Monk T.H., Berman S.R. & Kupfer D.J. (1989). The Pittsburgh sleep quality index: A new instrument for psychiatric practice and research. *Psychiatry research* **28**, 193-213.

Capistrant, B.D. (2016). Caregiving for Older Adults and the Caregivers' Health: an Epidemiologic Review. *Current Epidemiology Reports* **3**, 72-80.

Cappuccio, F.P., D'Elia, L., Strazzullo, P., Miller, M.A. (2010). Quantity and quality of sleep and incidence of type 2 diabetes - A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetes Care* **33**, 414-20.

Cappuccio, F.P., Cooper, D., D'Elia, L., Strazzullo, P., Miller, M.A. (2011). Sleep duration predicts cardiovascular outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective studies. *European Heart Journal* **32**, 1484-92.

Caputo, J., Pavalko, E.K. and Hardy, M.A., (2016). The Long-Term Effects of Caregiving on Women's Health and Mortality. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, **78**, 1382-98.

Care Act (2014), London: The Stationery Office (TSO). Available for download at <http://www.legislation.gov.uk>

Carers UK. (2016). *State of caring 2016*. London: Carers UK.

Creese, J., Bedard, M., Brazil, K., Chambers, L. (2008). Sleep disturbances in spousal caregivers of individuals with Alzheimer's disease. *International Psychogeriatrics* **20**, 149-61.

Crowley, K. (2011). Sleep and sleep disorders in older adults. *Neuropsychological Review* **21**, 41-53.

Cupidi, C., Realmuto, S., Lo Coco, G., Cinturino, A., Talamanca, S., Arnao, V., Perini, V., D'Amelio, M., Savettieri, G., Lo Coco, D. (2012). Sleep quality in caregivers of patients with Alzheimer's disease and Parkinson's disease and its relationship to quality of life.

International Psychogeriatrics **24**, 1827-35.

Devore, E.E., Grodstein, F., Schernhammer, E.S. (2016). Sleep duration in relation to cognitive function among older adults: A systematic review of observational studies.

Neuroepidemiology **46**, 57-78.

Dew, M., Hoch, C., Buysse, D., Monk, T., Begley, A., Houck, P., Hall, M., Kupfer, D., Reynolds, C. (2003). Healthy older adults' sleep predicts all-cause mortality at 4 to 19 years of follow-up. *Psychosomatic Medicine* **65**, 63-73.

Ferrie J.E., Kumari M., Salo P., Singh-Manoux A., Kivimäki M. (2011). Sleep epidemiology-a rapidly growing field. *International journal of epidemiology*, **40**, 1431-7

Di Gessa, G., Corna, L. M., Platts, L. G., Worts, D., McDonough, P., Sacker, A., Glaser, K. (2017). Is being in paid work beyond state pension age beneficial for health? Evidence from England using a life-course approach. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, **71**.

Gibson, R.H., Gander, P.H., Jones, L.M. (2014). Understanding the sleep problems of people with Dementia and their family caregivers. *Dementia*, **13**, 350-65.

Gibson, R., Gander, P., Alpass, F. and Stephens, C., (2015). Effect of caregiving status on the sleep of older New Zealanders. *Australasian Journal on Ageing*, **34**, 155-9.

Happe, S., and Berger, K., FAQT Study Investigators. (2002). The association between caregiver burden and sleep disturbances in partners of patients with Parkinson's disease. *Age and Ageing* **31**, 349-54.

Hirst, M. (2005). Carer distress: A prospective, population-based study. *Social Science Medicine* **61**, 697-708.

Hosmer L., Lemeshow S. & Sturdivant R.X. (2013) *Applied Logistic Regression*. Wiley, Chichester.

Jackowska, M., Kumari, M., Steptoe, A. (2013). Sleep and biomarkers in the English longitudinal study of ageing: Associations with C-reactive protein, fibrinogen, dehydroepiandrosterone sulfate and hemoglobin. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* **38**, 1484-93.

Jackowska, M., and Poole, L. (2017). Sleep problems, short sleep and a combination of both increase the risk of depressive symptoms in older people: a 6-year follow-up investigation from the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing. *Sleep medicine* **37**, 60-5.

Kaschowitz, J. and Brandt, M. (2017). Health effects of informal caregiving across Europe: A longitudinal approach. *Social science & medicine*, **173**, 72-80.

Knies, G. (2017). *Understanding society: The UK household longitudinal study, waves 1-7, user manual*. Colchester: Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex. Report Version 1.1.

Kochar, J., Fredman, L., Stone, K.L., Cauley, J.A. (2007). Sleep problems in elderly women caregivers depend on the level of depressive symptoms: Results of the caregiver-study of osteoporotic fractures. *Journal of American Geriatrics Society* **55**, 2003-9.

Koyanagi A., DeVlyder J.E., Stubbs B., Carvalho A.F., Veronese N., Haro J.M. & Santini Z.I. (2018). Depression, sleep problems, and perceived stress among informal caregivers in 58 low-, middle-, and high-income countries: A cross-sectional analysis of community-based surveys. *Journal of psychiatric research* **96**, 115-23

Kumari, M., Green, R., Nazroo, J. (2010). Sleep disturbance and sleep duration. In: Banks, J., Lessof, C., Nazroo, J., Rogers, N., Stafford, M., and Steptoe, A. (eds), *Financial circumstances, health and well-being of the older population in England. The 2008 English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (wave 4)*. London: Institute for Fiscal Studies.

Lee, D.R., and Thomas, A.J. (2011). Sleep in dementia and caregiving - assessment and treatment implications: A review. *International Psychogeriatrics* **23**, 190-201.

Martin, W., and Bartlett, H. (2007). The social significance of sleep for older people with dementia in the context of care. *Sociological Research Online* **12**.

Meadows, R., and Arber, S. (2015). Marital status, relationship distress, and self-rated health: What role for "sleep problems"? *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour* **56**, 341-55.

Office for National Statistics. (2011). *Provision of unpaid care by age, LC3304EW*. London.

Parkinson, M., Carr, S.M., Rushmer, R., Abley, C. (2016). Investigating what works to support family carers of people with dementia: A rapid realist review. *Journal of Public Health*.

Pearlin, L.I. (2010). The life course and the stress process: Some conceptual comparisons. *Journals of Gerontology Series B-Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences* **65**, 207-15.

Pearlin, L.I., and Aneshensel, C.S. (1994). Caregiving: The unexpected career. *Social Justice Research* **7**, 373-90.

Pearlin, L.I., Mullan, J.T., Semple, S.J., Skaff, M.M. (1990). Caregiving and the stress process: An overview of concepts and their measures. *The Gerontologist* **30**, 583-94.

Peng, H. and Chang, Y. (2013). Sleep disturbance in family caregivers of individuals with dementia: A review of the literature. *Perspectives in psychiatric care* **49**, 135-46.

Pickard, L., King, D., Knapp, M. (2016). The ‘visibility’ of unpaid care in England. *Journal of Social Work* online, 1-20. ISSN 1468-0173, accessed in 2016 at <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/61243/>

Pollak, C.P., and Perlick, D. (1991). Sleep problems and institutionalisation of the elderly. *Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry and Neurology* **4**, 204-10.

Rafnsson, S.B., Shankar, A., Steptoe, A. (2017). Informal caregiving transitions, subjective well-being and depressed mood: Findings from the English longitudinal study of ageing. *Aging & Mental Health*, **21**, 104-15.

Roth, D.L., Fredman, L. and Haley, W.E. (2015). Informal caregiving and its impact on health: a reappraisal from population-based studies. *Gerontologist* **55**, 309-19.

Rowe, M.A., McCrae, C.S., Campbell, J.M., Benito, A.P., Cheng, J. (2008). Sleep pattern differences between older adult dementia caregivers and older adult noncaregivers using objective and subjective measures. *Journal of Clinical Sleep Medicine: Official Publication of the American Academy of Sleep Medicine* **4**, 362-9.

Sacco, L.B., Leineweber, C. and Platts, L.G., (2018). Informal Care and Sleep Disturbance Among Caregivers in Paid Work: Longitudinal Analyses From a Large Community-Based Swedish Cohort Study. *Sleep*, **41**, UNSP zsx198

Simpson, C., and Carter, P. (2013). Short-term changes in sleep, mastery & stress: Impacts on depression and health in dementia caregivers. *Geriatric Nursing* **34**, 509-16.

Song Y., Harrison S.L., Martin J.L., Alessi C.A., Ancoli-Israel S., Stone K.L. & Fredman L. (2017) Changes in Caregiving Status and Intensity and Sleep Characteristics Among High and Low Stressed Older Women. *Journal of Clinical Sleep Medicine* **13**, 1403-10.

Spira, A.P., Friedman, L., Beaudreau, S.A., Ancoli-Israel, S., Hernandez, B., Sheikh, J., Yesavage, J. (2010). Sleep and physical functioning in family caregivers of older adults with memory impairment. *International Psychogeriatrics* **22**, 306-11.

Tang N.K.Y., Fiecas M., Afolalu E.F. & Wolke D. (2017). Changes in Sleep Duration, Quality, and Medication Use Are Prospectively Associated With Health and Well-being: Analysis of the UK Household Longitudinal Study. *Sleep* **40**, zsw079.

Vitaliano, P., Zhang, J. and Scanlan, J. (2003). Is caregiving hazardous to one's physical health? A meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin* **129**, 946-72.

Vlachantoni, A. (2010). *The demographic characteristics and economic activity patterns of carers over 50: Evidence from the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing*. Population trends nr 141. London: Office for National Statistics (ONS).

Vlachantoni, A., Robards, J., Falkingham, J., Evandrou, M. (2016). Trajectories of informal care and health. *SSM - Population Health* **2**, 495-501.

Vlachantoni, A., Shaw, R., Willis, R., Evandrou, M., Falkingham, J., Luff, R. (2011). *Measuring unmet need for social care amongst older people*. Population trends no. 145. London: Office for National Statistics (ONS).

von Kaenel, R., Mausbach, B.T., Ancoli-Israel, S., Mills, P.J., Dimsdale, J.E., Patterson, T.L., Grant, I. (2014). Positive affect and sleep in spousal Alzheimer caregivers: A longitudinal study. *Behavioral Sleep Medicine* **12**, 358-72.

von Kaenel, R., Mausbach, B.T., Ancoli-Israel, S., Dimsdale, J.E., Mills, P.J., Patterson, T.L., Ziegler, M.G., Roepke, S.K., Chattillion, E.A., Allison, M., and Grant, I. (2012). Sleep in spousal Alzheimer caregivers: A longitudinal study with a focus on the effects of major patient transitions on sleep. *Sleep* **35**, 247-55.

Wilcox, S., and King, A. (1999). Sleep complaints in older women who are family caregivers. *Journals of Gerontology Series B-Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences* **54**, 189-98.

Washington, K. T., Oliver, D. P., Smith, J. B., McCrae, C. S., Balchandani, S. M., & Demiris, G. (2018). Sleep problems, anxiety, and global self-rated health among hospice family caregivers. *American Journal of Hospice & Palliative Medicine* **35**