

# BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email [info.bmjopen@bmj.com](mailto:info.bmjopen@bmj.com)

# BMJ Open

## Effects of individual, family and community factors on the willingness of institutional elder-care: a cross-sectional survey of the elderly in China.

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-032478
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Jun-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Wang, Zhaoqing Xing, Yanan Yan, Wenxin; Harbin Medical University School of Public Health, Department of Health Management Sun, Xinran; Harbin Medical University School of Public Health, Department of Health Management Zhang, Xueying; Harbin Medical University School of Public Health, Department of Health Management Huang, Shuang; Harbin Medical University School of Public Health, Department of Health Management Li, Li; Harbin Medical University, the college of public health
Keywords:	Chinese elder-care, institutional elder-care willingness, individual, family and community environment of the elderly, the effects of One-Child policy on the elderly

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

---

**Effects of individual , family and community factors on the willingness of institutional elder-care: a cross-sectional survey of the elderly in China.**

Zhaoqing Wang<sup>#</sup>, Yanan Xing<sup>#</sup>, Wenxin Yan, Xinran Sun, Xueying Zhang, Shuang Huang, Li Li\*

Zhaoqing Wang: Department of Health Management, School of Public Health, Harbin Medical University, Harbin, China 000 email:395602865@qq.com

Yanan Xing: Department of Health Management, School of Public Health, Harbin Medical University, Harbin, China email:1191255523@qq.com

Wenxin Yan: Department of Health Management, School of Public Health, Harbin Medical University, Harbin, China email:179188189@qq.com

Xinran Sun: Department of Health Management, School of Public Health, Harbin Medical University, Harbin, China email:309509842@qq.com

Xueying Zhang: Department of Health Management, School of Public Health, Harbin Medical University, Harbin, China email:2464987097@qq.com

Shuang Huang: Department of Health Management, School of Public Health, Harbin Medical University, Harbin, China email:804094493@qq.com

Correspondence:

Dr, LI LI, School of Public Health, Harbin Medical University, Baojian Road 157, Harbin, China, Tel: 86-0451-87502879 Fax: 86-0451-87502885 E-mail:healthlaw@126.com

<sup>#</sup>: These authors contributed equally to the work

**Abstract**

**Objective:** The current situation of elder care has become much more problematical in

China, where the One-Child policy was enforced for over 30 years. However, the Chinese economy, social welfare and social security systems are unable to cope with the pressure of the aging population. It is critical to conduct research on problems with elder care. This study analyzed the effects of the willingness to live in elder-care institutions associated with individual factors, family environment and the community environment.

**Design:** Cross-sectional survey

**Setting:** Heilongjiang Province, China

**Participants:** A total of 1003 the elderly were selected through multistage sampling in Heilongjiang Province.

**Primary and secondary outcome measures:** A cross-sectional survey of 1003 elderly individuals, from nine communities and nine villages in Heilongjiang Province, was conducted from March 1st to August 31st 2016. A multistage, stratified sampling design was employed. Differences in health status, family environment and community environment of the respondents were compared with the t-test and chi-squared test. Logistic regression analysis was performed to assess key determinants of willingness to live in institutions.

**Results:** This study showed that 45.4% of respondents were willing to live in elder-care institutions in the future. Factors influencing willingness to live in elder-care institutions were age, house ownership, living arrangements, disease caregivers and availability of home health care services.

---

**Conclusions:** These results suggest that the willingness to enter elder-care institutions is affected by individual, family environmental and community environmental factors.

We should vigorously develop community-centered intensive home-based elder-care services by improving the quality and availability of home health services by expanding investment in the community.

**Keywords:** Chinese eldercare; institutional eldercare willingness; individual, family and community environment of the elderly; the effects of One-Child policy on the elderly

### **Strengths and limitations of this study**

Made a comprehensive study that selected factors from individual, family environment and community environment as the potential factors which may affect the willingness of institutional eldercare.

Analysed the different factors influenced in the willingness of institutional eldercare among the elderly in Heilongjiang province.

Used cross-sectional design, data were collected at only one point in time.

Our participants were from a single province, and therefore, we cannot generalize the results to assume that they apply to all of the elderly in China.

### **Introduction**

The aging population has become a worldwide phenomenon, and concerns with the issue of elder care have been expanding globally. The situation of elder care has been

1  
2  
3  
4 very problematical in China, where the One-Child policy was enforced for over 30  
5  
6 years. According to Chinese official data, by the end of 2017, 158,310,000 persons  
7  
8 were aged 65 or older, accounting for 11.4% of the total population [1]. Meanwhile,  
9  
10 40.63 million disabled elderly people lived in China, making up 18.3% of the aged  
11  
12 population [2].  
13  
14  
15  
16

17  
18 Chinese society's economy, social welfare and social security systems are unable  
19  
20 to cope with the pressure of the aging population. Introduced in the 1980s, the One-  
21  
22 Child policy, which meant that a couple can have only one child, was enforced for over  
23  
24 30 years. People who were born at the beginning of the One-Child policy are now the  
25  
26 main providers of elder care for their parents. In this so-called 4:2:1 phenomenon, each  
27  
28 young parent is usually responsible for two pairs of grandparents, besides having the  
29  
30 duty to raise their children [3,4]. Therefore, too much pressure has been put on Chinese  
31  
32 families. In addition, the number of elder-care institutions, the quality of elder-care  
33  
34 workers and the services provided for the elderly all lag behind the diversified needs of  
35  
36 the elderly population [5,6]. Obviously, it is necessary to conduct research on elder-  
37  
38 care problems.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47  
48 The Chinese government has introduced many policies and invested a large  
49  
50 amount of money to erase the pressure on elder care, and has proposed two slogans,  
51  
52 'Active aging' and 'Healthy aging' [7]. Topics related to elder care have been paid  
53  
54 much attention not only by the government, but also by researchers. The extensive  
55  
56 literature about elder care can be divided into four categories.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 First, some researchers have focused on the health and quality of life of the elderly  
5  
6 [8,9,10]. They have found that the quality of life in the elderly population is affected  
7  
8 by many factors, including individual, community and societal variables. Second, some  
9  
10 studies of long-term care, which can effectively solve the pressure of social old-age  
11  
12 care, found that most countries are ill-prepared in system or law to satisfy the demand  
13  
14 for long-term care (LTC) [11,12]. Third, research has shown that the living  
15  
16 arrangements of the elderly has an important influence on their mental health [13,14].  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 Finally, plenty of literature has focused on the factors influencing the willingness  
24  
25 to receive elder care. Some studies have assessed the relationship between social  
26  
27 support for the elderly and the willingness to receive elder care in China [15-16].  
28  
29 Another study analyzed the different factors influencing willingness to receive elder  
30  
31 care from the perspective of inter-generational relations and social economic status [17].  
32  
33 This indicated that the more harmonious the inter-generational relationship, the lower  
34  
35 the willingness of the elderly to enter an institution. Meanwhile, the higher the social  
36  
37 economic status, the more likely the elderly are to choose institutional elder care. Some  
38  
39 researchers have studied the influence of the community environment on the  
40  
41 willingness to receive elder care [18-19]. One study showed that the quality of the  
42  
43 community environment had a positive effect on the degree of satisfaction with  
44  
45 community elder care [20].  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55 We believe that not only the internal characteristics of a person, such as health  
56  
57 status, income and age, but also the external factors, such as family members and  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 community environment, affect the willingness of the elderly to receive elder care. It is  
5  
6 worth mentioning that China is currently implementing a policy called the ‘community  
7  
8 family physician model’, which can promote the accessibility of community health  
9  
10 management and care services for the elderly. The main duty of the family physician is  
11  
12 to carry out health management for community residents, especially chronic disease  
13  
14 management and health recovery for the elderly. In this way, the policy has improved  
15  
16 the availability of medical treatment for residents, especially for the elderly. Therefore,  
17  
18 the implementation of this policy should affect the willingness of elderly people to  
19  
20 receive elder care. Our study included the following aspects of the elderly: individual  
21  
22 characteristics, family environment and community environment.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

## 34 **Methods**

### 35 36 37 **Data and Sample**

38  
39  
40 A cross-sectional survey of elderly individuals was conducted from March 1st to  
41  
42 August 31st 2016 in Heilongjiang Province, China. A multistage, stratified sampling  
43  
44 design was employed. First, three cities were selected on the basis of their gross  
45  
46 domestic product. Second, three communities and three villages were selected in each  
47  
48 sampled city according to economic factors. In total, nine communities and nine  
49  
50 villages were selected. Those aged 60 years old and above and with the ability to answer  
51  
52 the questions were included as our sample.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58

### 59 **Data collection**

60



---

The data were collected through face-to-face interviews using a structured questionnaire conducted by trained undergraduate and graduate students from Harbin Medical University. A total of 1200 questionnaires were distributed; 1003 (83.6%) valid questionnaires were returned.

### **Assessment tools**

The study's instrument was a self-administered questionnaire composed of five sections. Section 1 consisted of the participants' demographic characteristics including residence, gender, age, income, house ownership and education.

Section 2 measured the health status of respondents. Physical health was assessed by self-rated physical health and self-rated capacity. Higher scores indicate better health. The scores for each question ranged from 1 to 5. Psychological health status was assessed by life satisfaction and feeling of isolation.

Section 3 assessed the family environment of the respondents. Family environment included whether he/she had living children, marital status, living arrangements, disease caregiver and parent-child relationships. Living arrangements were investigated using three questions: 'Are you living with your spouse?', 'Are you living with your children?', and 'Are you living with others?'. Based on the answers, we classified living arrangements into four groups: (1) living alone, (2) living with spouse (may have others), (3) living with children (may have others), and (4) living with children and spouse (may have others). Because no participants in our sample were living with others only (not spouse or children), we ruled out this situation. Disease

---

caregiver was divided into five groups: spouse, child, other relatives, nursing workers and themselves. The parent–child relationship was rated good, normal and bad.

Section 4 assessed the community environment of the respondents. This section included two questions: availability of community recreational facilities and availability of home health-care services. Each question's score ranged from 1 to 5, and high scores indicate high availability.

Section 5 assessed willingness to live in an institution. The variable 'Willingness to live in institution' was indicated by the question 'Which are you willing to accept out of home care and institutional care?'

### Data analysis

The data were analyzed using the Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 17.0. Descriptive analyses included frequencies and percentages for the categorical variables and means and standard deviations (SDs) for continuous variables. Differences in health status, family environment and community environment for respondents were compared with the t-test and chi-squared test. Logistic regression analysis was performed to assess key determinants of the willingness of elderly people to live in institutions. Statistical significance was set at the 5% level.

### Results

---

## Socioeconomic and demographic status of respondents

The socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of the respondents are shown in Table 1. More than half of the respondents were female (52.7%), urban (57.9%) and married (59.4%). A majority of the participants have children (95.0%) and own a house (61.3%). About half of them (52.0%) were educated to a lower level than that of junior high school. Only 31.2% of them had monthly incomes above 2000 CNY. Seventy-two percent of them were able to support themselves financially. In this survey, 51.0% of the respondents were aged between 60 and 69 years, and 27.9% were aged between 70 and 79 years. Table 1 shows that 48.5% of urban older adults and 41.0% of rural older adults preferred elder-care institutions. There were significant differences in the percentage willingness to live in elder-care institutions according to urban area ( $p<0.05$ ), age ( $p<0.01$ ), house ownership ( $p<0.01$ ) and financial independence ( $p<0.05$ ). Older adults who have their own house and have no financial independence had lower willingness to enter eldercare institutions than those who have no house ownership. The respondents aged 80 or above had the highest willingness to enter an elder-care institution, followed by those aged 70–79 and aged 60–69 years.

Table 1 Analysis of the willingness to live in elder-care institutions according to individual characteristics of the respondents

---

variables	Total	willingness to live in eldercare institutions
-----------	-------	---

---

		n	%	n	%
Residence	urban	581	57.9	282	48.5
	rural	422	42.1	173	41.0
	$\chi^2$			<b>5.61*</b>	
Sex	Male	474	47.3	216	45.6
	Female	529	52.7	239	45.2
	$\chi^2$			0.02	
Age in years	60-69	512	51.0	189	36.9
	70-79	280	27.9	122	43.6
	$\geq 80$	211	21.1	144	68.2
	$\chi^2$			<b>59.69**</b>	
Monthly income (RMB)	<500	314	31.3	124	39.5
	500-999	125	12.5	55	44.0
	1000-1999	251	25	125	49.8
	2000-3000	197	19.6	95	48.2

	>3000	116	11.6	56	48.3
	$\chi^2$				7.51
House property	yes	615	61.3	279	35.9
	no	388	38.7	176	60.3
	$\chi^2$				<b>57.00**</b>
Financial independence	yes	725	72.3	328	47.8
	no	278	27.7	108	38.8
	$\chi^2$				<b>6.48*</b>
Education	No education	195	19.4	85	43.6
	primary school	327	32.6	151	46.2
	junior high school	288	28.7	133	46.2
	senior high school	118	11.8	55	46.6
	college degree or above	75	7.5	31	34.0
	$\chi^2$				0.98

\*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01

## Willingness to live in elder-care institutions according to family environment

Table 2 shows that participants who have children ( $p<0.01$ ) and/or have a spouse ( $p<0.01$ ) have lower willingness to live in elder-care institutions. It is worth mentioning that our results showed that children were negatively correlated with the willingness to live in an elder-care institution ( $\chi^2=18.2$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) (odds ratio [OR]=7.52, 95% confidence interval [CI]=3.310–17.120,  $p<0.05$ ), which means that the elderly who have children were 7.52 times less willing to live in elder-care institutions than the elderly who have no child. Regarding living arrangements, older adults living alone have the strongest willingness to live in an elder-care institution, followed by those living with a spouse, living with children and living with spouse and children ( $p<0.01$ ). The willingness to enter elder-care institutions among the elderly who were nursed by nursing workers was higher than for those who were nursed by a spouse, children and/or other relatives ( $p<0.01$ ).

Table 2 Analysis of the willingness to live in elder-care institutions according to the family environment of the respondents

variables	Total		willingness to live in institutions	
	n	%	n	%
Children	yes	953	416	41.5
	no	50	39	78.0



		$\chi^2$				<b>68.8**</b>
parent-child relationship	Good	885	88.0	398	45.0	
	Normal	83	8.3	37	44.6	
	Bad	35	3.5	17	48.6	
		$\chi^2$				0.2

\*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01

### Willingness to live in elder-care institutions according to health status

We used self-rated physical health, life satisfaction, feeling of isolation and self-rated capacity for action to evaluate the health status of the respondents (Table 3). The mean scores for self-rated physical health and self-rated capacity for action were 3.30 and 3.54, respectively, which were slightly higher than the mid-point of 3. The life satisfaction was 5.08, which indicated high well-being among the elderly. The feeling of isolation was at a relatively low level (M=3.54, SD=0.96). Among these four variables, only self-rated capacity for action was significantly different between those preferring home care and those willing to receive institutional care: the participants preferring home care had higher self-rated capacity for action (M=3.61, SD=0.94, p=0.01).



Table 3 Analysis of the willingness to live in elder-care institutions according to the health status of the respondents

variables	Mean $\pm$ SD (n=1003)	Range of the score	Home care (n=548)	Institutional care (n=455)	t	P
self-rated physical health	3.30 $\pm$ 0.97	1-5	3.28 $\pm$ 1.00	3.33 $\pm$ 0.94	0.80	0.42
life satisfaction	5.08 $\pm$ 1.27	1-7	5.13 $\pm$ 1.25	5.03 $\pm$ 1.28	1.21	0.23
Feeling of isolation	1.91 $\pm$ 0.77	1-5	1.91 $\pm$ 0.76	1.91 $\pm$ 0.78	0.15	0.88
Self-rated capacity for acti on	3.54 $\pm$ 0.96	1-5	3.61 $\pm$ 0.94	3.45 $\pm$ 0.98	2.59	<b>0.01</b>

### Willingness to live in elder-care institutions according to community environment

The mean scores for self-assessed availability of community recreational facilities and availability of home health care services were 3.72 and 3.25, respectively (Table 4). Statistically significant differences were noted in the scores on both of these variables between those who preferred home care and those who favored institutional

care; those who preferred home care reported higher scores for the availability of community recreational facilities and the availability of home health care services ( $p<0.05$ ).

Table 4 Analysis of the willingness to live in elder-care institutions according to the community environment of the respondents

variables	Mean $\pm$ SD (n=1003)	Range of the score	Home care (n=548)	Institutional care (n=455)	t	P
Availability of community recreation facility	3.72 $\pm$ 0.74	1-5	3.76 $\pm$ 0.74	3.67 $\pm$ 0.74	2.00	<b>0.046</b>
Availability of home health care services	3.25 $\pm$ 0.69	1-5	3.29 $\pm$ 0.71	3.20 $\pm$ 0.66	2.15	<b>0.032</b>

### Factors influencing willingness to live in elder-care institutions

In this study, 45.4% of respondents said they were willing to live in elder-care

institutions at some point in the future. Based on the results of single factor analysis, logistic regression was conducted to analyze the factors influencing the willingness to live in elder-care institutions (Table 5). Regarding the individual factors, only age in years and house ownership were predictors of the willingness to enter institutions. The elders who had no property (OR=2.370,  $p<0.01$ ), and those aged 80 or above (OR=2.250,  $p<0.01$ ) were, respectively, 2.370 times and 2.250 times more receptive to living in elder-care institutions than their control groups. With regarding to living arrangements, those living with a spouse (OR=0.468,  $p<0.01$ ), living with children (OR=0.252,  $p<0.01$ ) or living with a spouse and children (OR=0.285,  $p<0.01$ ) were less willing to live in elder-care institutions than those who were living alone. These results meant that the elderly who live with a spouse were 0.468 times more willing to choose institutional elder care than those who were living alone. We also found that elders who were cared for by their children (OR=0.329,  $p<0.01$ ) or cared for by their spouse (OR=0.403,  $p<0.01$ ) when they were ill had much lower willingness to live in elder-care institutions than those who cared for themselves. The availability of home health care services (OR=0.780,  $p<0.05$ ) was negatively associated with the willingness to live in elder-care institutions.

Table 5 Logistic regression analysis of the factors influencing willingness to live in elder-care institutions.

variables	Adjusted OR	95%CI
Residence (reference: urban)		

	Rural	0.960	0.700-1.320
	Age in years (reference:60-69)		
	70-79	1.020	0.730-1.430
	≥80	2.250**	1.490-3.400
	House property (reference: yes)		
	No	2.370**	1.750-3.200
	Financial independence (reference: yes)		
	No	0.850	0.590-1.210
	Children (reference: yes)		
	No	7.520**	3.310-17.120
	Marital status (reference: married)		
	Others	0.730	0.330-1.630
	Living arrangement(reference: living alone)		
	Living with spouse	0.468**	0.287-0.762
	Living with children	0.252**	0.158-0.402
	Living with spouse and children	0.285**	0.160-0.509

Disease caregiver (reference: By self)			
spouse	0.403**	0.180-0.903	
Son/daughter	0.329**	0.158-0.684	
Other relatives	0.481	0.131-1.760	
nursing workers	0.802	0.337-1.904	
Self-rated capacity for action	1.010	0.860-1.180	
Availability of community recreation facility	1.030	0.830-1.280	
Availability of home health care services	0.780*	0.626-0.972	

\*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01

## Discussion

This cross-sectional study was conducted to explore the key factors contributing to the willingness to enter elder-care institutions. This study was a pioneering one because we took the willingness to live in elder-care institutions as the dependent variable and chose independent variables from three dimensions: individual factors, family environment and community environment.

With regard to individual factors, both the single factor analysis (Table 1) and the

1  
2  
3  
4 logistic regression (Table 5) demonstrated that age and house ownership were  
5  
6 significantly associated with the willingness to live in an elder-care institution. People  
7  
8 in their 80s and above had 2.250 times more willingness to live in elder-care institutions  
9  
10 than the group aged 60–69 years. Another study pointed out that those in advanced old  
11  
12 age are much more likely to have elder-care needs, including physical and  
13  
14 psychological [21]. Given that most of these needs cannot be met by family, the  
15  
16 willingness to accept institutional eldercare rises with age. Second, when analyzing  
17  
18 house ownership and the willingness to enter institutional elder care, we found that  
19  
20 when the elderly have their own house, they have a significantly lower willingness to  
21  
22 accept institutional eldercare than those who have no property. The elderly in China  
23  
24 traditionally intend to live the rest of their life in their own house because they regard  
25  
26 their own houses as their roots of life. Having their own houses gives the Chinese  
27  
28 elderly a great sense of belonging, as a study found that the sense of comfort and  
29  
30 freedom when receiving elder care in their own houses is irreplaceable by other  
31  
32 methods [22]. A similar conclusion was reached by other studies, which demonstrated  
33  
34 that house ownership is highly correlated with current health status and is predictive of  
35  
36 future mortality risk in older populations [23-24]. However, statistical significance of  
37  
38 the impact of the independent variable residence on the dependent variable (the  
39  
40 willingness to live in eldercare institutions) was found only with chi-squared tests  
41  
42 (Table 1,  $\chi^2=5.61$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) and not in logistic regression, as shown in many studies  
43  
44 [25-26]. However, our result was similar to a previous study [27]. We assume that, as  
45  
46 the trend of urban–rural integration advances, the difference between urban and rural  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 areas is not strong enough to show statistically significant differences when compared  
5  
6 with other variables such as age and house ownership.  
7  
8  
9

10 Family environment also comprised some typical factors influencing willingness  
11 to live in elder-care institutions. This study showed that the elderly who have children  
12 were 7.52 times less willing to live in elder-care institutions than those who have no  
13 children. This meant that children were negatively correlated with the willingness to  
14 live in elder-care institution. In addition, we found that the elderly who lived alone and  
15 those who cared for themselves when they had diseases both had the highest willingness  
16 to live in elder-care institutions. Undeniably, Chinese grown children nowadays are  
17 facing great pressure because of the so-called '4-2-1' family structure and the  
18 interpersonal tensions and work–family conflict created by the advent of globalization  
19 and fierce market competition [28-29]. However, a published review indicated that  
20 adult children still endorse filial piety in contemporary Chinese society [30]. This result  
21 was consistent with many studies in which the elderly showed less willingness to live  
22 in elder-care institutions when they have children [31-32]. As the well-known proverb  
23 'raising children to ensure elder care' indicates, in Chinese traditional culture, filial  
24 piety demands that, apart from economic and living care, psychological care should  
25 also be provided for elderly parents [33]. Some studies have even pointed out that adult  
26 children who have placed their parents in elder-care homes may be negatively regarded  
27 by society [34-35]. This study showed that the elderly who lived alone had the highest  
28 willingness to live in elder-care institutions. We assume that the elderly living alone  
29 typically lack physical and psychological assistance and care from their family, and are  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 therefore more willing to live in elder-care institutions. Similar results were found in a  
5  
6 study that showed that elderly people who lived alone were more willing to live in  
7  
8 elder-care institutions, for both single males and females, when compared with those  
9  
10 who lived with children or others [36]. First, as another study concluded, older people  
11  
12 are more likely than any other section of the population to be living in single-person  
13  
14 households [37]. Second, the elderly who live alone have higher scores for loneliness  
15  
16 and worse mental health and functioning compared with those who do not live alone  
17  
18 [38-39]. Third, a Korean study found that physical health status, self-esteem, family  
19  
20 support and health-promoting behavior, specifically exercise and nutrition, of the  
21  
22 elderly living with family were higher than those of the elderly living alone [40].  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 With an increase in age, physical health tends to deteriorate, so we included  
32  
33 disease-caregiver in our research. Our analysis showed significant differences among  
34  
35 five disease caregivers: spouse, son or daughter, other relatives, nursing workers and  
36  
37 the elderly person themselves; 86.24% of respondents were provided with disease care  
38  
39 by their immediate family members or other relatives. This means that informal care is  
40  
41 the main form of care for the elderly in China. A study in Europe showed that informal  
42  
43 care is an effective substitute for long-term care as long as the needs of the elderly are  
44  
45 met [41]. In support, in our study the lowest willingness to accept elder-care institutions  
46  
47 was shown by the elderly cared for by their spouse. A study demonstrated that a spouse  
48  
49 can give the elder physical and, especially, mental care, thus their willingness to live in  
50  
51 elder-care institutions was lower than that of those that have no spouse [42]. In the  
52  
53 multiple logistic regression analysis, we found that when the elderly were provided with  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4 disease care by their spouse or children, their willingness to live in elder-care  
5  
6 institutions decreased. When the elderly have no children or live alone, they cannot  
7  
8 obtain informal or formal care from family as desired, so they have to seek care from  
9  
10 elder-care institutions. Therefore, the primary culture of filial piety, the conditions of  
11  
12 living and the presence of disease all affect the willingness of the elderly to live in elder-  
13  
14 care institutions.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 Last, but not least, we paid attention to the community environment. We found  
22  
23 that that availability of home health-care services negatively affected the willingness to  
24  
25 live in elder-care institutions, in agreement with previous studies [43-44]. In China,  
26  
27 home health-care services are mostly provided by institutions called elder-care  
28  
29 community centers, such as Community Health Service centers. One study showed that  
30  
31 these centers could increase willingness to accept home elder care [45]. The research  
32  
33 pointed out that high availability of home health services in the community provided  
34  
35 the elderly with basic nursing services to meet their fundamental needs for care, and  
36  
37 therefore lowered the willingness to accept institutional elder care [46]. In our study,  
38  
39 the mean availability of home health care services was 3.25, which is much higher than  
40  
41 the average level because of adoption of the model of community family physician.  
42  
43 This new Chinese policy, the ‘community family physician model’, has aroused heated  
44  
45 discussion among all types of people. Some researchers have found that this policy is  
46  
47 associated with problems such as unclear responsibilities, high medical risk and lack of  
48  
49 a security system [47-48]. However, some found that this policy did improve the  
50  
51 convenience and success rate of medical treatment, thus improving the level of health  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

---

of the signatories [49-50]. It is no doubt that home health-care services have become more conveniently available for elderly residents.

## **Conclusion**

At present, in China, the enormous pressure of elder care has shifted increasingly from family to society, and it is difficult for institutions to take on the heavy burden of care. However, the tradition of filial piety in Chinese culture is restricting the willingness of the elderly to receive institutional elder care. Therefore, we should vigorously develop community-centered intensive home-based elder-care services by improving the quality and availability of home health services by expanding investment in the community. Only in this way can we meet the need for both formal and informal elder care and the need to cater to the Chinese traditional morality.

## **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

Ethics approval for this study was granted by the Institutional Research Board of Harbin Medical University. The data were collected anonymously. Respondents were assured that participation in this survey was voluntary, with the return of completed questionnaires being taken as consent to participate.

## **Consent for publication**

All presentations of case reports have consent for publication.

## **Availability of data and materials**

Data will not be shared. Because we promise not disclose their information when we

1  
2  
3  
4 signed the informed consent with the respondents.  
5  
6

### 7 **Patient and public involvement**

8  
9  
10 This study did not involve patients and the public.  
11  
12

### 13 **Competing interests**

14  
15  
16 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.  
17  
18

### 19 **Funding**

20  
21  
22  
23 This study was funded by the National Science Foundation of China (NSFC) and China  
24  
25  
26 Postdoctoral Science Foundation, Contract No.71573066/G0308 and  
27  
28  
29 No.2018M631967.  
30

### 31 **Contributors**

32  
33  
34  
35 LL conceived and designed the experiments; ZW WY performed the experiments;XS  
36  
37  
38 XZ analyzed the data; SH YX LL contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools; ZW  
39  
40  
41 wrote the paper. ZW WY XS provided technical support. LL critically revised the paper.  
42  
43  
44 All authors checked and proof-read the final version of manuscript.  
45

### 46 **Acknowledgements**

47  
48  
49  
50 The authors would like to thank all participants in this study. We also thank Dr.Li Li  
51  
52  
53 for her guidance on the writing of the manuscript. We thank International Science  
54  
55  
56 Editing ( <http://www.internationalscienceediting.com> ) for editing this manuscript.  
57  
58  
59  
60

---

## References

---

- [1] CSY, 2018. China Statistical Yearbook. China Statistical Publishing House, Beijing
- [2] The three departments released the results of the fourth sampling survey on the living conditions of urban and rural elderly in China[EB/ OL].Ministry of Civil Affairs Portal
- [3] Hesketh T, Zhou X , Wang Y . The End of the One-Child Policy: Lasting Implications for China[J]. *Jama*, 2015, 314(24):1-2.
- [4] HD L,W R, and YJ R. Analysis of the number of only children and family structure since the family planning policy. *Statistics & Decision*. 13(2018).DOI:10.13546/j.cnki.tjyjc.2018.13.022
- [5] LB Q. The status quo and prospect of the development of China's old-age service industry[J]. *Journal of Fujian Party School*, 2016(3):75-83.Doi:10.15993/j.cnki.cn35-1198/c.2016.03.016
- [6] Nie J B . Erosion of Eldercare in China: a Socio-Ethical Inquiry in Aging, Elderly Suicide and the Government's Responsibilities in the Context of the One-Child Policy[J]. *Ageing International*, 2016, 41(4):1-16.
- [7] MY Y, AQ F.The Construction of New Community Nursing Home Model from the Perspective of Active Aging[J]. *Study and Practice*, 2018(2).DOI:10.19624/j.cnki.cn42-1005/c.2018.02.014
- [8] Mun S , Park K , Baek Y , et al. Interrelationships among common symptoms in the elderly and their effects on health-related quality of life: a cross-sectional study in rural Korea[J]. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, 2016, 14(1).
- [9] Sun W , Aodeng S , Tanimoto Y , et al. Quality of life (QOL) of the community-dwelling elderly and associated factors: A population-based study in urban areas of China[J]. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, 2015, 60(2):311-316.
- [10] Y C. Comparison of health status, social support and quality of life of elderly living alone and

---

non-inhabited in Shanghai[J].Chinese Journal of Gerontology, 2017,37(24).

DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1005-9202.2017.24.090

[11] Jean Yeung, Wei-Jun, and Leng Leng Thang. "Long-Term Care for Older Adults in ASEAN Plus Three: The Roles of Family, Community, and the State in Addressing Unmet Eldercare Needs." *Journal of Aging and Health*, vol. 30, no. 10, Dec. 2018, pp. 1499–1515, doi:10.1177/0898264318796345.

[12] Deusdad B A , Pace C , Anttonen A . Facing the Challenges in the Development of Long-Term Care for Older People in Europe in the Context of an Economic Crisis[J]. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 2016, 42(2):144-150.

[13] YA J, F ZHOU, ZE ZHAI. The Influence of Residential Patterns on the Elderly's Depression—The Moderating Role of Community[J]. *Population Journal*, 2017, 39(3):66-77.

DOI:10.16405/j.cnki.1004-129X.2017.03.006

[14] Kwak Y , Chung H , Kim Y . Differences in Health-related Quality of Life and Mental Health by Living Arrangement among Korean Elderly in the KNHANES 2010–2012[J]. *Iranian Journal of Public Health*, 2017, 46(11):1512-1520.

[15] XP SHI, HJ ZHANG, J SUI. The investigation of long-term care mode selection and its influencing factors among disabled elderl[J]. *Modern Preventive Medicine*, 2016, 43(24):4467-4470.

[16] XC LIU, LQ YANG, YY LUO. Demand Analysis for Integrated Medical and Nursing Care among Community-dwelling Elderly People Based on Andersen's Behavioral Model [J/OL]. *Chinese General Practice*:1-8[2018-11-30].

[17] EP LIU, QL ZHANG. Inter-generational Relations, Socioeconomic Status and Preferences for Institutional Care of the Eldly—An Empirical Analysis Based on China's Longitudinal Aging Social Survey (2012)[J]. *Population and Development*, 2018(3):55-64.

[18] FX HU, MN LI, D ZHANG. Empirical Study on Rural Elderly's Demand Will for Patterns of

- 
- Pension Service and Its Influencing Factors—A Case Study from ShanXi Province[J].Journal of Xi'an Jiaotong University(Social Sciences),2016,36(4):57-64.DOI10.15896/j.xjtuskxb.201604009
- [19] JJ SUN, D SHEN.The Intention for the Old-age Support of the Chinese Elderly and Its Differences between Urban and Rural Elderly:A Study Based on the China Longitudinal Aging Social Survey[J].Population & Economics, 2017(2).DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1000-4149.2017.02.002
- [20] L QIU. Study on the Influencing Factors of the Satisfaction of Community Old-age Services: A Case Study of Shanghai[J]. The World of Survey and Research, 2016(2):15-18.DOI : 10.13778/j.cnki.11-3705/c.2016.02.003
- [21] Connolly S, Rosato M. House value as an indicator of cumulative wealth is strongly related to morbidity and mortality risk in older people: a census-based cross-sectional and longitudinal study[J]. International Journal of Epidemiology, 2010, 39(2):383-391.
- [22] YH WANG, YN FENG, WW HOU. Analysis for Cause of the disability old people aid to Xinjiang Choose Long-term Home care[J].Population and Development, 2013, 19(2):72-78.
- [23] Q ZHANG, D ZHANG. Study on Select of Pension Methods of the Elderly and Its influencing Factors in Beijing [J].Research on Economics and Management, 2014(7):102-106. DOI:10.13502/j.cnki.issn1000-7636.2014.07.012
- [24] Butterfield M C, Williams A R, Beebe T, et al. A two-county comparison of the HOUSES index on predicting self-rated health[J]. Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health (1979-), 2011, 65(3):254-259.
- [25] B HU, B ZHU, Y LIU.Choices of old-age care and influence factors among empty nest elderly, Xuzhou[J].Modern Preventive Medicine, 2018,45(01):90-94.
- [26] Liu H , Gao S , Wang J . The Impact of Elder-Care Patterns on Chinese Elderly's Health and Well-Being. (In Chinese. With English summary.)[J]. Economic Research Journal, 2011.
- [27] D ZHANG. A Study on the Aging Willingness and Influencing Factors of the Aged in Beijing's Institutions[J].The World of Survey and Research, 2017(10):23-29.

---

DOI: 10.13778/j.cnki.11-3705/c.2017.10.004

[28] Bhat M A, Rather T A. Socio-Economic Factors and Mental Health of Young People in India and China: An Elusive Link with Globalization[J]. *Asian Social Work & Policy Review*, 2012, 6(1):1-22.

[29] Simon M A, Chen R, Chang E S, et al. The association between filial piety and suicidal ideation: findings from a community-dwelling Chinese aging population.[J]. *Journals of Gerontology*, 2014, 69 Suppl 2(Suppl 2):S90.

[30] Dong, Xinqi & Xu, Ying. (2016). Filial Piety among Global Chinese Adult Children: A Systematic Review. *Research & Reviews: Journal of Social Sciences*. 2.

[31] LW ZHANG, YB CENG, Y FANG. Study on Pension Methods and its Influential Factors among the Elderly by Using Andersen Behavior Model[J]. *Chinese Journal of Health Statistics*, 2017, 34 (05):721-725.

[32] Li W W . Housing, aged care and migration: the housing careers of older Chinese migrants and its implications[J]. *Oceania Regional Congress of Geriatrics & Gerontology*, 2011.

[33] HP LV, ZG LI. Confucius' View of Filial Piety and the Way of Family Pension[J]. *Population Research*, 2008, 32(2):81-86. Doi:10.3969/j.issn.1000-6087.2008.02.011

[34] Chen Z. Knowledge and Perceptions: Chinese Older Adults' Willingness to Use Institutional Elder Care[J]. 2011.

[35] Zhan H J, Feng Z, Chen Z, et al. The role of the family in institutional long-term care: cultural management of filial piety in China[J]. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 2011, 20(Supplement s1):0-0.

[36] Qian Y, Jie C, Ge D, et al. Gender difference in utilization willingness of institutional care among the single seniors: evidence from rural Shandong, China[J]. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 2017, 16(1):77.

[37] Rolls L, Seymour J E, Froggatt K A, et al. Older people living alone at the end of life in the

---

UK: Research and policy challenges[J]. *Palliative Medicine*, 2011, 25(6):650-7.

[38] Chen Y, Hicks A, While A E. Loneliness and social support of older people in China: a systematic literature review.[J]. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, 2014, 22(2):113.

[39] Lim L L, Kua E H. Living alone, loneliness, and psychological well-being of older persons in singapore[J]. *Current Gerontology & Geriatrics Research*, 2011, 2011(1):673181.

[40] Sok S R, Yun E K. A comparison of physical health status, self-esteem, family support and health-promoting behaviours between aged living alone and living with family in Korea[J]. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 2011, 20(11-12):1606–1612.

[41] Bonsang E . Does informal care from children to their elderly parents substitute for formal care in Europe?[J]. *Journal of Health Economics*, 2009, 28(1):0-154.

[42] BH TIAN, CY WANG. Structural Characteristics and Determinant Factors of the Demand of the elderly For Social care Services-based on the Analysis on the Replacement Mechanism of Family Supporting For the Elderly[J].*China Rural Survey*, 2.014(04):2-17+95.

[43] JD DING.The Home Care Service:Recognizing Mistakes, Rational Principles and Perfecting Measures[J].*Journal of Renmin University of China*, 2013, 27(2):20-26.

[44] Y JIE, Rosenberg M W , Y CHENG, et al. Aging at home and the intent to relocate in Beijing [J]. *Progress in Geography*, 2015, 34(12):1577-1585.

[45] JJ SUN, D SHEN.The Intention for the Old-age Support of the Chinese Elderly and Its Differences between Urban and Rural Elderly:A Study Based on the China Longitudinal Aging SocialSurvey[J].*Population&Economics*,2017(2):11-20.

DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1000-4149.2017.02.002

[46] WJ ZHANG, W MENG.A Study on the Factors Associated with Preferences for Institutional Care of the Elderly in Urban China: Evidences from Xicheng District of Beijing[J]*Population & Economics*, 2014(6):22-34.



---

[47] W MA, XG XU. Reflection on the Perfection of Signing Service of Family Physician From the Perspective of Contract Law[J]. Chinese General Practice, 2015(16):1980-1983.

[48] SJ WU, JR LIU, S QIU. Studying on the Present Situation of Family Doctor Door-to-Door Service Taking Guangzhou as an Example[J]. Chinese Primary Health Care, 2015, 29(8):1-3. DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1001-568X.2015.08.0001

[49] JY CHEN, MX JIANG, Y BAO. Effect of Family Doctor Contract Service on Health Management of Poor Elderlies in Urban Community[J]. Chinese General Practice, 2013, 16(34):3355-3357. DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1007-9572.2013.10.021

[50] W LU, YM ZHANG. The performance evaluation based on the demand side of the family doctor contract service: A focus on chronic diseases[J]. Chinese Journal of Health Policy, 2016, 9(8):23-30.

# BMJ Open

## Effects of individual, family and community factors on the willingness of institutional elder-care: a cross-sectional survey of the elderly in China.

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-032478.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	24-Sep-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Wang, Zhaoqing; Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management, School of Health Management Xing, Yanan; Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management, School of Health Management Yan, Wenxin; Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management, School of Health Management Sun, Xinran; Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management, School of Health Management Zhang, Xueying; Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management, School of Health Management Huang, Shuang; Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management, School of Health Management Li, Li; Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management, School of Health Management
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Health services research
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health services research
Keywords:	Chinese elder-care, institutional elder-care willingness, individual, family and community environment of the elderly, the effects of One-Child policy on the elderly

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 1 **Effects of individual, family and community factors on the willingness of institutional**  
4 2 **elder-care: a cross-sectional survey of the elderly in China.**

5  
6  
7 3 Zhaoqing Wang<sup>#</sup>, Yanan Xing<sup>#</sup>, Wenxin Yan, Xinran Sun, Xueying Zhang, Shuang Huang, Li Li\*

8  
9 4 Zhaoqing Wang: Department of Health Management, School of Health Management, Harbin Medical  
10 5 University, Harbin, China email:395602865@qq.com

11  
12 6 Yanan Xing: Department of Health Management, School of Health Management, Harbin Medical  
13 7 University, Harbin, China email:1191255523@qq.com

14  
15 8 Wenxin Yan: Department of Health Management, School of Health Management, Harbin Medical  
16 9 University, Harbin, China email:179188189@qq.com

17  
18 10 Xinran Sun: Department of Health Management, School of Health Management, Harbin Medical  
19 11 University, Harbin, China email:309509842@qq.com

20  
21 12 Xueying Zhang: Department of Health Management, School of Health Management, Harbin Medical  
22 13 University, Harbin, China email:2464987097@qq.com

23  
24 14 Shuang Huang: Department of Health Management, School of Health Management, Harbin Medical  
25 15 University, Harbin, China email:804094493@qq.com

26  
27 16 Correspondence:

28  
29 17 Dr, LI LI, Department of Health Management, School of Health Management, Harbin Medical University,

30  
31 18 Baojian Road 157, Harbin, China, Tel: 86-0451-87502879 Fax: 86-0451-87502885

32  
33 19 E-mail:healthlaw@126.com

34  
35 20 <sup>#</sup>: These authors contributed equally to the work

36  
37 21

38  
39 22 **Abstract**

40  
41 23 **Objective:** To investigate the effects of the willingness to live in elder-care institutions  
42 24 associated with individual factors, family environment and the community environment in  
43 25 the elderly in China.

44  
45 26 **Design:** Cross-sectional survey

46  
47 27 **Setting:** Heilongjiang Province, China

1  
2  
3 28 **Participants:** A total of 1003 the elderly were selected through multistage sampling in  
4  
5 29 Heilongjiang Province.

6  
7  
8 30 **Primary and secondary outcome measures:** A multistage, stratified sampling design was  
9  
10 31 employed. Differences in health status, family environment and community environment of  
11  
12 32 the respondents were compared with the t-test and chi-squared test. Logistic regression  
13  
14 33 analysis was performed to assess key determinants of willingness to live in institutions.

15  
16 34 **Results:** This study showed that 45.4% of respondents were willing to live in elder-care  
17  
18 35 institutions in the future. Factors influencing willingness to live in elder-care institutions  
19  
20 36 were age, house ownership, living with spouse and children, disease caregivers and  
21  
22 37 availability of home health care services. The elders who had no property (OR=2.370,  
23  
24 38  $p<0.01$ ), and those aged 80 or above (OR=2.250,  $p<0.01$ ) were, respectively, 2.370 times and  
25  
26 39 2.250 times more receptive to living in elder-care institutions than their control groups.  
27  
28 40 However, those living with a spouse (OR=0.468,  $p<0.01$ ), living with children (OR=0.252,  
29  
30 41  $p<0.01$ ) or living with a spouse and children (OR=0.285,  $p<0.01$ ) were less willing to live in  
31  
32 42 elder-care institutions.

33  
34 43 **Conclusions:** These results suggest that the willingness to enter elder-care institutions is  
35  
36 44 affected by individual, family environmental and community environmental factors. We  
37  
38 45 should vigorously develop community-centered intensive home-based elder-care services by  
39  
40 46 improving the quality and availability of home health services by expanding investment in  
41  
42 47 the community.

43  
44 48 **Keywords:** Chinese eldercare; institutional eldercare willingness; individual, family and  
45  
46 49 community environment of the elderly; the effects of One-Child policy on the elderly

47  
48 50 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

1  
2  
3 51 Made a comprehensive study that selected factors from individual, family environment and  
4  
5 52 community environment as the potential factors which may affect the willingness of  
6  
7  
8 53 institutional eldercare.

9  
10 54 Analyzed the different factors influenced in the willingness of institutional eldercare among  
11  
12  
13 55 the elderly in Heilongjiang province.

14  
15 56 Used cross-sectional design, data were collected at only one point in time.

16  
17  
18 57 Our participants were from a single province, and therefore, we cannot generalize the results  
19  
20  
21 58 to assume that they apply to all of the elderly in China.

## 22 23 59 **Introduction**

24  
25  
26 60 The aging population has become a worldwide phenomenon, and concerns with the issue  
27  
28  
29 61 of elder care have been expanding globally. The situation of elder care has been very  
30  
31 62 problematical in China, where the One-Child policy was enforced for over 30 years[1].  
32  
33  
34 63 According to Chinese official data, by the end of 2017, 158,310,000 persons were aged 65 or  
35  
36 64 older, accounting for 11.4% of the total population[2]. Meanwhile, 40.63 million disabled  
37  
38  
39 65 elderly people lived in China, making up 18.3% of the aged population[3].

40  
41  
42 66 Chinese society's economy, social welfare and social security systems are unable to  
43  
44 67 cope with the pressure of the aging population. Introduced in the 1980s, the One-Child  
45  
46  
47 68 policy, which meant that a couple can have only one child, was enforced for over 30 years.  
48  
49  
50 69 People who were born at the beginning of the One-Child policy are now the main providers  
51  
52 70 of elder care for their parents. In this so-called 4:2:1 phenomenon, each young parent is  
53  
54  
55 71 usually responsible for two pairs of grandparents, besides having the duty to raise their  
56  
57 72 children [4,5]. Therefore, too much pressure has been put on Chinese families. In addition,  
58  
59  
60 73 the number of elder-care institutions, the quality of elder-care workers and the services

1  
2  
3 74 provided for the elderly all lag behind the diversified needs of the elderly population[6,7].

4  
5 75 Obviously, it is necessary to conduct research on elder-care problems.

6  
7  
8 76 The Chinese government has introduced many policies and invested a large amount of  
9  
10 77 money to erase the pressure on elder care, and has proposed two slogans, ‘Active aging’ and  
11  
12  
13 78 ‘Healthy aging’[8]. Topics related to elder care have been paid much attention not only by  
14  
15  
16 79 the government, but also by researchers. The extensive literature about elder care can be  
17  
18 80 divided into four categories.

19  
20  
21 81 First, some researchers have focused on the health and quality of life of the  
22  
23 82 elderly[9,10,11]. They have found that the quality of life in the elderly population is affected  
24  
25  
26 83 by many factors, including individual, community and societal variables. Second, some  
27  
28  
29 84 studies of long-term care, which can effectively solve the pressure of social old-age care,  
30  
31 85 found that most countries are ill-prepared in system or law to satisfy the demand for  
32  
33  
34 86 long-term care (LTC)[12,13]. Third, research has shown that the living arrangements of the  
35  
36 87 elderly has an important influence on their mental health [14,15].

37  
38  
39 88 Finally, plenty of literature has focused on the factors influencing the willingness to  
40  
41 89 receive elder care. Some studies have assessed the relationship between social support for the  
42  
43  
44 90 elderly and the willingness to receive elder care in China[16,17]. Another study analyzed the  
45  
46  
47 91 different factors influencing willingness to receive elder care from the perspective of  
48  
49  
50 92 inter-generational relations and social economic status[18]. This indicated that the more  
51  
52 93 harmonious the inter-generational relationship, the lower the willingness of the elderly to  
53  
54  
55 94 enter an institution. Meanwhile, the higher the social economic status, the more likely the  
56  
57 95 elderly are to choose institutional elder care. Some researchers have studied the influence of  
58  
59  
60 96 the community environment on the willingness to receive elder care[19,20]. One study

1  
2  
3 97 showed that the quality of the community environment had a positive effect on the degree of  
4  
5 98 satisfaction with community elder care[21].  
6  
7

8 99 We believe that not only the internal characteristics of a person, such as health status,  
9  
10  
11 100 income and age, but also the external factors, such as family members and community  
12  
13 101 environment, affect the willingness of the elderly to receive elder care. It is worth  
14  
15  
16 102 mentioning that China is currently implementing a policy called the ‘community family  
17  
18 103 physician model’, which can promote the accessibility of community health management and  
19  
20  
21 104 care services for the elderly. The main duty of the family physician is to carry out health  
22  
23  
24 105 management for community residents, especially chronic disease management and health  
25  
26 106 recovery for the elderly. Whether to choose institutional eldercare indicates whether old  
27  
28  
29 107 people are willing to leave the familiar environment, which can give them various kinds of  
30  
31 108 support such as disease care, physical and mental accompany. Considering the influences of  
32  
33  
34 109 personal factors and external factors on the elderly's willingness of eldercare are not isolated.  
35  
36  
37 110 Our study included the following aspects of the elderly: individual characteristics, family  
38  
39 111 environment and community environment. In view of the newly launched policy ‘family  
40  
41  
42 112 physician model’, which have been studied rarely, we have taken the ‘Availability of home  
43  
44 113 health care’ as an aspect. Our research was a pioneer in the study of the willingness to care  
45  
46  
47 114 for the elderly in three aspects of the individual, family and community.  
48

49 115 The present study aimed (1) to describe the status quo of and compare the willingness to  
50  
51  
52 116 use institutional eldercare from individual characteristics, family environment and  
53  
54  
55 117 community environment. and (2) to analyze effects of individual, family and community  
56  
57 118 factors on the willingness of institutional elder-care.  
58

59  
60 119 **Methods**

## **Data and Sample**

A cross-sectional survey of elderly individuals was conducted from March 1st to August 31st 2016 in Heilongjiang Province, China. Firstly, those aged 60 years old and above, having the ability and willing to answer the questions were included as our sample. Secondly, to make our samples representative as much as possible, we have employed multistage stratified sampling design. Meanwhile, we chose urban and rural samples each accounting for about 50 percent. Thirdly, three cities, Harbin, Qiqihar, and Jiamusi, were selected on the basis of their Gross Domestic Product. And three communities and three villages were selected in each sampled city according to economic factors. In total, nine communities and nine villages were selected. Besides, in order to ensure that the elderly understand the questionnaire correctly, we used the face-to-face interview form during investigation.

## **Data collection**

The data were collected through face-to-face interviews using a structured questionnaire conducted by trained undergraduate and graduate students from Harbin Medical University. A total of 1200 questionnaires were distributed; 1003 (83.6%) valid questionnaires were returned.

## **Assessment tools**

The study's instrument was a self-administered questionnaire composed of five sections. Section 1 consisted of the participants' demographic characteristics including residence, gender, age, income, house ownership and culture. Among these variables, residence was composed of *rural* and *urban*, *income* was represented by five levels: <500, 500-999, 1000-1999, 2000-3000 and >3000 monthly and culture has divided into 5 dimensions by *no education*, *primary school*, *junior high school*, *senior high school* and *college degree or*



1  
2  
3 144 *above.*

4  
5 145 Section 2 measured the health status of respondents. Physical health was assessed by  
6  
7  
8 146 self-rated physical health and self-rated capacity. Higher scores indicate better health. The  
9  
10  
11 147 scores for each question ranged from 1 to 5. Psychological health status was assessed by life  
12  
13 148 satisfaction and feeling of isolation.

14  
15 149 Section 3 assessed the family environment of the respondents. Family environment  
16  
17  
18 150 included whether he/she had living children, marital status, living arrangements, disease  
19  
20  
21 151 caregiver and parent–child relationships. Living arrangements were investigated using three  
22  
23  
24 152 questions: ‘Are you living with your spouse?’, ‘Are you living with your children?’, and  
25  
26 153 ‘Are you living with others?’. Based on the answers, we classified living arrangements into  
27  
28  
29 154 four groups: (1) living alone, (2) living with spouse (may have others), (3) living with  
30  
31 155 children (may have others), and (4) living with children and spouse (may have others).  
32  
33  
34 156 Because no participants in our sample were living with others only (not spouse or children),  
35  
36  
37 157 we ruled out this situation. Disease caregiver was divided into five groups: spouse, child,  
38  
39 158 other relatives, nursing workers and themselves. The parent–child relationship was rated  
40  
41  
42 159 good, normal and bad.

43  
44 160 Section 4 assessed the community environment of the respondents. This section  
45  
46  
47 161 included two questions: availability of community recreational facilities and availability of  
48  
49  
50 162 home health-care services. Each question’s score ranged from 1 to 5, and high scores  
51  
52 163 indicate high availability.

53  
54 164 Section 5 assessed willingness to live in an institution. The variable ‘Willingness to live  
55  
56  
57 165 in institution’ was indicated by the question ‘Which are you willing to accept out of home  
58  
59  
60 166 care and institutional care?’. Let the respondents consider whether they want to go to an

1  
2  
3 167 institution or stay home for the eldercare when they need.  
4

## 5 168 **Data analysis**

6  
7  
8 169 The data were analyzed using the Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (SPSS)  
9  
10  
11 170 version 17.0. Descriptive analyses included frequencies and percentages for the categorical  
12  
13 171 variables and means and standard deviations (SDs) for continuous variables. Differences in  
14  
15  
16 172 health status, family environment and community environment for respondents were  
17  
18 173 compared with the t-test and chi-squared test. Logistic regression analysis was performed to  
19  
20  
21 174 assess key determinants of the willingness of elderly people to live in institutions. Statistical  
22  
23  
24 175 significance was set at the 5% level.  
25

## 26 176 **Patient and public involvement**

27  
28  
29 177 This study did not involve patients and the public in the design or planning of the study.  
30

## 31 178 **Results**

### 34 179 **Socioeconomic and demographic status of respondents**

35  
36 180 The socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of the respondents are shown in  
37  
38  
39 181 Table 1. More than half of the respondents were female (52.7%), urban (57.9%) and married  
40  
41  
42 182 (59.4%). A majority of the participants have children (95.0%) and own a house (61.3%).  
43  
44 183 About half of them (52.0%) were educated to a lower level than that of junior high school.  
45  
46  
47 184 Only 31.2% of them had monthly incomes above 2000 CNY. Seventy-two percent of them  
48  
49  
50 185 were able to support themselves financially. In this survey, 51.0% of the respondents were  
51  
52 186 aged between 60 and 69 years, and 27.9% were aged between 70 and 79 years. Table 1  
53  
54  
55 187 shows that 48.5% of urban older adults and 41.0% of rural older adults preferred elder-care  
56  
57 188 institutions. There were significant differences in the percentage willingness to live in  
58  
59  
60 189 elder-care institutions according to urban area ( $p < 0.05$ ), age ( $p < 0.01$ ), house ownership

1  
2  
3 190 (p<0.01) and financial independence (p<0.05). Older adults who have their own house and  
4  
5 191 have no financial independence had lower willingness to enter eldercare institutions than  
6  
7  
8 192 those who have no house ownership. The respondents aged 80 or above had the highest  
9  
10 193 willingness to enter an elder-care institution, followed by those aged 70–79 and aged 60–69  
11  
12  
13 194 years.

14  
15  
16 195  
17  
18 196 Table 1 Analysis of the willingness to live in elder-care institutions according to individual  
19  
20  
21 197 characteristics of the respondents

variables		Total		willingness to live in eldercare institutions	
		n	%	n	%
Residence	urban	581	57.9	281	48.4
	rural	422	42.1	173	41.0
	$\chi^2$			<b>5.36</b>	
	P			<b>0.02</b>	
Sex	Male	474	47.3	215	45.4
	Female	529	52.7	239	45.2
	$\chi^2$			0.00	
	P			1.00	
Age in years	60-69	508	51.0	188	37.0
	70-79	280	27.9	122	43.6
	≥80	215	21.1	144	67.0

						<b>55.21</b>
						<b>0.00</b>
Monthly income						
(RMB)	<500	314	31.3	124	39.5	
	500-999	125	12.5	55	44.0	
	1000-1999	251	25.0	124	49.4	
	2000-3000	197	19.6	95	48.2	
	>3000	116	11.6	56	48.3	
						7.16
						0.12
House property	yes	615	61.3	221	35.9	
	no	388	38.7	233	60.1	
						<b>55.85</b>
						<b>0.00</b>
Financial independence	yes	725	72.3	346	47.7	
	no	278	27.7	108	38.8	
						<b>6.39</b>
						<b>0.01</b>
Education	No education	195	19.4	85	43.6	
	Primary school	327	32.6	151	46.2	
	Junior high school	288	28.7	132	45.8	

	Senior high school	118	11.8	55	46.6
	College degree or above	75	7.5	31	41.3
	$\chi^2$				0.92
	P				0.92

16 198

### 17 18 19 199 **Willingness to live in elder-care institutions according to family environment**

20  
21 200 Table 2 shows that participants who have children ( $p<0.01$ ) and/or have a spouse ( $p<0.01$ )  
22  
23  
24 201 have lower willingness to live in elder-care institutions. It is worth mentioning that our  
25  
26 202 results showed that children were negatively correlated with the willingness to live in an  
27  
28  
29 203 elder-care institution ( $\chi^2=18.2$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) (odds ratio [OR]=7.52, 95% confidence interval  
30  
31  
32 204 [CI]=3.310–17.120,  $p<0.05$ ), which means that the elderly who have children were 7.52  
33  
34 205 times less willing to live in elder-care institutions than the elderly who have no child.  
35  
36  
37 206 Regarding living arrangements, older adults living alone have the strongest willingness to  
38  
39  
40 207 live in an elder-care institution, followed by those living with a spouse, living with children  
41  
42 208 and living with spouse and children ( $p<0.01$ ). The willingness to enter elder-care institutions  
43  
44  
45 209 among the elderly who were nursed by nursing workers was higher than for those who were  
46  
47 210 nursed by a spouse, children and/or other relatives ( $p<0.01$ ).  
48  
49

50 211

51  
52 212 Table 2 Analysis of the willingness to live in elder-care institutions according to the family  
53  
54  
55 213 environment of the respondents

57 58 59 60	variables	Total	willingness to live in institutions
----------------------	-----------	-------	--

		n	%	n	%
Children	yes	950	94.7	415	43.7
	no	53	5.3	39	73.6
	$\chi^2$			<b>18.1</b>	
	P			<b>0.00</b>	
Marital status	Married	593	59.4	213	35.9
	Others	410	40.6	241	58.8
	$\chi^2$			<b>51.1</b>	
	P			<b>0.00</b>	
Living arrangement	Living alone	282	28.1	193	68.4
	Living with spouse	428	42.7	165	38.6
	Living with children	147	14.7	56	38.1
	Living with spouse and children	146	14.6	40	28.1
		$\chi^2$			<b>90.7</b>
	P			<b>0.00</b>	
Disease caregiver	spouse	494	49.3	177	35.8
	Son/daughter	356	35.5	166	46.6
	Other relatives	15	1.5	7	46.7
	nursing workers	90	9.0	69	76.7
	By self	48	4.8	35	72.9

1						
2						
3	$\chi^2$					<b>68.7</b>
4						
5	P					<b>0.00</b>
6						
7						
8	parent-child					
9		Good	883	87.9	399	45.2
10	relationship					
11		Normal	84	8.4	37	44.0
12						
13		Bad	36	3.6	18	50.0
14						
15						
16						
17						
18	$\chi^2$					0.38
19						
20						
21	p					0.83
22						

214

### 215 Willingness to live in elder-care institutions according to health status

216 We used self-rated physical health, life satisfaction, feeling of isolation and self-rated  
 217 capacity for action to evaluate the health status of the respondents (Table 3). The mean  
 218 scores for self-rated physical health and self-rated capacity for action were 3.30 and 3.54,  
 219 respectively, which were slightly higher than the mid-point of 3. The life satisfaction was  
 220 5.08, which indicated high well-being among the elderly. The feeling of isolation was at a  
 221 relatively low level (M=3.54, SD=0.96). Among these four variables, only self-rated  
 222 capacity for action was significantly different between those preferring home care and those  
 223 willing to receive institutional care: the participants preferring home care had higher  
 224 self-rated capacity for action (M=3.61, SD=0.94, p=0.01).

225 Table 3 Analysis of the willingness to live in elder-care institutions according to the health  
 226 status of the respondents

227	228	229	230	231	232	233
234	235	236	237	238	239	240
241	242	243	244	245	246	247
248	249	250	251	252	253	254
255	256	257	258	259	260	261
262	263	264	265	266	267	268
269	270	271	272	273	274	275
276	277	278	279	280	281	282
283	284	285	286	287	288	289
290	291	292	293	294	295	296
297	298	299	300	301	302	303
304	305	306	307	308	309	310
311	312	313	314	315	316	317
318	319	320	321	322	323	324
325	326	327	328	329	330	331
332	333	334	335	336	337	338
339	340	341	342	343	344	345
346	347	348	349	350	351	352
353	354	355	356	357	358	359
360	361	362	363	364	365	366

(n=455)						
self-rated						
physical health	3.30±0.97	1-5	3.28±1.00	3.33±0.94	0.80	0.42
life satisfaction	5.08±1.27	1-7	5.13±1.25	5.03±1.28	1.21	0.23
Feeling of						
isolation	1.91 ± 0.77	1-5	1.91±0.76	1.91±0.78	0.15	0.88
Self-rated						
capacity for	3.54±0.96	1-5	3.61±0.94	3.45±0.98	2.59	<b>0.01</b>
action						

### Willingness to live in elder-care institutions according to community environment

The mean scores for self-assessed availability of community recreational facilities and availability of home health care services were 3.72 and 3.25, respectively (Table 4). Statistically significant differences were noted in the scores on both of these variables between those who preferred home care and those who favored institutional care; those who preferred home care reported higher scores for the availability of community recreational facilities and the availability of home health care services ( $p < 0.05$ ).

Table 4 Analysis of the willingness to live in elder-care institutions according to the community environment of the respondents

variables	Mean ± SD (n=1003)	Range of the score	Home care (n=548)	Institutional care (n=455)	t	P
Availability	3.72±0.74	1-5	3.76±0.74	3.67±0.74	2.00	<b>0.046</b>



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

of community

recreation

facility

Availability

of home

3.25±0.69 1-5 3.29 ± 0.71 3.20±0.66 2.15 **0.032**

health care

services

**Factors influencing willingness to live in elder-care institutions**

In this study, 45.4% of respondents said they were willing to live in elder-care institutions at some point in the future. Based on the results of single factor analysis, logistic regression was conducted to analyze the factors influencing the willingness to live in elder-care institutions (Table 5). Regarding the individual factors, only age in years and house ownership were predictors of the willingness to enter institutions. The elders who had no property (OR=2.370,  $p<0.01$ ), and those aged 80 or above (OR=2.250,  $p<0.01$ ) were, respectively, 2.370 times and 2.250 times more receptive to living in elder-care institutions than their control groups. With regarding to living arrangements, those living with a spouse (OR=0.468,  $p<0.01$ ), living with children (OR=0.252,  $p<0.01$ ) or living with a spouse and children (OR=0.285,  $p<0.01$ ) were less willing to live in elder-care institutions than those who were living alone. These results meant that the elderly who live with a spouse were 0.468 times more willing to choose institutional elder care than those who were living alone. We also found that elders who were cared for by their children (OR=0.329,  $p<0.01$ ) or cared for by their spouse (OR=0.403,  $p<0.01$ ) when they were ill had much lower willingness to live in elder-care institutions than those who cared for themselves. The availability of home

253 health care services (OR=0.780, p<0.05) was negatively associated with the willingness to  
 254 live in elder-care institutions.

255 Table 5 Logistic regression analysis of the factors influencing willingness to live in  
 256 elder-care institutions

variables	Adjusted OR	95%CI
Residence (reference: urban)		
Rural	0.960	0.700-1.320
Age in years (reference:60-69)		
70-79	1.020	0.730-1.430
≥80	2.250**	1.490-3.400
House property (reference: yes)		
No	2.370**	1.750-3.200
Financial independence (reference: yes)		
No	0.850	0.590-1.210
Children (reference: yes)		
No	7.520**	3.310-17.120
Marital status (reference: married)		
Others	0.730	0.330-1.630
Living arrangement(reference: living alone)		
Living with spouse	0.468**	0.287-0.762
Living with children	0.252**	0.158-0.402
Living with spouse and children	0.285**	0.160-0.509
Disease caregiver (reference: By self)		

1				
2				
3	257	spouse	0.403**	0.180-0.903 *p
4				
5	258	Son/daughter	0.329**	<0.
6				
7				
8	259	Other relatives	0.481	0.131-1.760 05;
9				
10	260	nursing workers	0.802	0.337-1.904 **p
11				
12				
13	261	Self-rated capacity for action	1.010	0.860-1.180 <0.
14				
15				
16	262	Availability of community recreation		01
17			1.030	0.830-1.280
18	263	facility		
19				
20				
21	264	Availability of home health care services	0.780*	0.626-0.972 <b>Dis</b>
22				
23				
24	265			<b>cus</b>
25				
26	266	<b>sion</b>		
27				
28				
29	267	This cross-sectional study was conducted to explore the key factors contributing to the		
30		willingness to enter elder-care institutions. This study was a pioneering one because we took		
31	268	the willingness to live in elder-care institutions as the dependent variable and chose		
32		independent variables from three dimensions: individual factors, family environment and		
33		community environment.		
34	269			
35				
36	270			
37				
38				
39	271			
40				
41				
42	272	With regard to individual factors, both the single factor analysis(Table 1) and the		
43		logistic regression(Table 5) demonstrated that age and house ownership were significantly		
44	273	associated with the willingness to live in an elder-care institution. People in their 80s and		
45		above had 2.250 times more willingness to live in elder-care institutions than the group aged		
46	274	60–69years. We found the same conclusion from another study[22]. Another study pointed		
47		out that those in advanced old age are much more likely to have elder-care needs, including		
48	275	physical and psychological[23]. Given that most of these needs cannot be met by family, the		
49		willingness to accept institutional eldercare rises with age. Second, when analyzing house		
50	276			
51				
52	277			
53				
54	278			
55				
56	279			
57				
58				
59				
60				

1  
2  
3 280 ownership and the willingness to enter institutional elder care, we found that when the  
4  
5 281 elderly have their own house, they have a significantly lower willingness to accept  
6  
7  
8 282 institutional eldercare than those who have no property. The elderly in China traditionally  
9  
10  
11 283 intend to live the rest of their life in their own house because they regard their own houses as  
12  
13 284 their roots of life. Having their own houses gives the Chinese elderly a great sense of  
14  
15  
16 285 belonging, as a study found that the sense of comfort and freedom when receiving elder care  
17  
18 286 in their own houses is irreplaceable by other methods[24]. A similar conclusion was reached  
19  
20  
21 287 by other studies, which demonstrated that house ownership is highly correlated with current  
22  
23  
24 288 health status and is predictive of future mortality risk in older populations[25-26]. However,  
25  
26 289 statistical significance of the impact of the independent variable residence on the dependent  
27  
28  
29 290 variable (the willingness to live in eldercare institutions) was found only with chi-squared  
30  
31 291 tests(Table 1,  $\chi^2=5.61, P < 0.05$ ) and not in logistic regression, as shown in many  
32  
33  
34 292 studies[27-28]. However, our result was similar to a previous study[29]. We assume that, as  
35  
36 293 the trend of urban–rural integration advances, the difference between urban and rural areas is  
37  
38  
39 294 not strong enough to show statistically significant differences when compared with other  
40  
41  
42 295 variables such as age and house ownership.

43  
44 296 Family environment also comprised some typical factors influencing willingness to live  
45  
46  
47 297 in elder-care institutions. This study showed that the elderly who have children were 7.52  
48  
49  
50 298 times less willing to live in elder-care institutions than those who have no children. This  
51  
52 299 meant that children were negatively correlated with the willingness to live in elder-care  
53  
54  
55 300 institution. In addition, we found that the elderly who lived alone and those who cared for  
56  
57 301 themselves when they had diseases both had the highest willingness to live in elder-care  
58  
59  
60 302 institutions. Undeniably, Chinese grown children nowadays are facing great pressure because

1  
2  
3 303 of the so-called '4-2-1' family structure and the interpersonal tensions and work-family  
4  
5 304 conflict created by the advent of globalization and fierce market competition[30-31].  
6  
7  
8 305 However, a published review indicated that adult children still endorse filial piety in  
9  
10 306 contemporary Chinese society[32]. This result was consistent with many studies in which the  
11  
12  
13 307 elderly showed less willingness to live in elder-care institutions when they have  
14  
15  
16 308 children[33-34].As the well-known proverb 'raising children to ensure elder care' indicates,  
17  
18 309 in Chinese traditional culture, filial piety demands that, apart from economic and living care,  
19  
20  
21 310 psychological care should also be provided for elderly parents[35]. Some studies have  
22  
23  
24 311 already pointed out that adult children who have placed their parents in elder-care homes  
25  
26 312 may be negatively regarded by society[36-37]. This study showed that the elderly who lived  
27  
28  
29 313 alone had the highest willingness to live in elder-care institutions. We assume that the elderly  
30  
31 314 living alone typically lack physical and psychological assistance and care from their family,  
32  
33  
34 315 and are therefore more willing to live in elder-care institutions. Similar results were found in  
35  
36  
37 316 a study that showed that elderly people who lived alone were more willing to live in  
38  
39 317 elder-care institutions, for both single males and females, when compared with those who  
40  
41  
42 318 lived with children or others[38]. First, as another study concluded, older people are more  
43  
44  
45 319 likely than any other section of the population to be living in single-person households[39].  
46  
47 320 Second, the elderly who live alone have higher scores for loneliness and worse mental health  
48  
49  
50 321 and functioning compared with those who do not live alone[40-41]. Third, a Korean study  
51  
52 322 found that physical health status, self-esteem, family support and health-promoting behavior,  
53  
54  
55 323 specifically exercise and nutrition, of the elderly living with family were higher than those of  
56  
57 324 the elderly living alone[42].

58  
59  
60 325 With an increase in age, physical health tends to deteriorate, so we included

1  
2  
3 326 disease-caregiver in our research. Our analysis showed significant differences among five  
4  
5 327 disease caregivers: spouse, son or daughter, other relatives, nursing workers and the elderly  
6  
7  
8 328 person themselves; 86.24% of respondents were provided with disease care by their  
9  
10  
11 329 immediate family members or other relatives. This means that informal care is the main form  
12  
13 330 of care for the elderly in China. A study in Europe showed that informal care is an effective  
14  
15  
16 331 substitute for long-term care as long as the needs of the elderly are met [43]. In support, in  
17  
18 332 our study the lowest willingness to accept elder-care institutions was shown by the elderly  
19  
20  
21 333 cared for by their spouse. A study demonstrated that a spouse can give the elder physical and,  
22  
23  
24 334 especially, mental care, thus their willingness to live in elder-care institutions was lower than  
25  
26 335 that of those that have no spouse[44]. In the multiple logistic regression analysis, we found  
27  
28  
29 336 that when the elderly were provided with disease care by their spouse or children, their  
30  
31 337 willingness to live in elder-care institutions decreased. When the elderly have no children or  
32  
33  
34 338 live alone, they cannot obtain informal or formal care from family as desired, so they have to  
35  
36 339 seek care from elder-care institutions. Therefore, the primary culture of filial piety, the  
37  
38  
39 340 conditions of living and the presence of disease all affect the willingness of the elderly to live  
40  
41  
42 341 in elder-care institutions.

43  
44 342 Last, but not least, we paid attention to the community environment. We found that that  
45  
46  
47 343 availability of home health-care services negatively affected the willingness to live in  
48  
49  
50 344 elder-care institutions, in agreement with previous studies [45-46]. In China, home  
51  
52 345 health-care services are mostly provided by institutions called elder-care community centers,  
53  
54  
55 346 such as Community Health Service centers. One study showed that these centers could  
56  
57 347 increase willingness to accept home elder care[47]. The research pointed out that high  
58  
59  
60 348 availability of home health services in the community provided the elderly with basic

1  
2  
3 349 nursing services to meet their fundamental needs for care, and therefore lowered the  
4  
5 350 willingness to accept institutional elder care[48]. In our study, the mean availability of home  
6  
7  
8 351 health care services was 3.25, which is much higher than the average level because of  
9  
10  
11 352 adoption of the model of community family physician. This new Chinese policy, the  
12  
13 353 ‘community family physician model’, has aroused heated discussion among all types of  
14  
15  
16 354 people. Some researchers have found that this policy is associated with problems such as  
17  
18 355 unclear responsibilities, high medical risk and lack of a security system[49-50]. However,  
19  
20  
21 356 some found that this policy did improve the convenience and success rate of medical  
22  
23  
24 357 treatment, thus improving the level of health of the signatories[51-52]. It is no doubt that  
25  
26 358 home health-care services have become more conveniently available for elderly residents.

27  
28  
29 359 However, several limitations in our study should be discussed. First of all, we have used  
30  
31 360 cross-sectional design, in which data were collected at only one point in time. It might cause  
32  
33  
34 361 information bias, mainly including recall bias and measurement bias. In order to reduce  
35  
36  
37 362 measurement bias, investigators have undergone rigorous training and increased investigator  
38  
39 363 survey skills and our respondents were given enough time to recall. Then, our participants  
40  
41  
42 364 were from a single province, and therefore, we cannot generalize the results to assume that  
43  
44 365 they apply to all of the elderly in China. In order to make our study much more convincing,  
45  
46  
47 366 we will introduce some more widely-used measuring tools like ADL into our research and  
48  
49  
50 367 conduct the same research nationwide later.

51  
52 368

## 53 54 55 369 **Conclusion**

56  
57 370 At present, in China, the enormous pressure of elder care has shifted increasingly from  
58  
59  
60 371 family to society, and it is difficult for institutions to take on the heavy burden of care.

1  
2  
3 372 However, the tradition of filial piety in Chinese culture is restricting the willingness of the  
4  
5 373 elderly to receive institutional elder care. Therefore, we should vigorously develop  
6  
7  
8 374 community-centered intensive home-based elder-care services by improving the quality and  
9  
10  
11 375 availability of home health services by expanding investment in the community. Only in this  
12  
13 376 way can we meet the need for both formal and informal elder care and the need to cater to  
14  
15  
16 377 the Chinese traditional morality.

### 18 378 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

20  
21 379 Ethics approval for this study was granted by the Institutional Research Board of Harbin  
22  
23 380 Medical University. The data were collected anonymously. Respondents were assured that  
24  
25  
26 381 participation in this survey was voluntary, with the return of completed questionnaires being  
27  
28  
29 382 taken as consent to participate.

### 31 383 **Availability of data and materials**

33  
34 384 Data will not be shared. Because we promise not disclose their information when we signed  
35  
36 385 the informed consent with the respondents.

### 39 386 **Competing interests**

41  
42 387 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

### 44 388 **Funding**

46  
47 389 This study was funded by the National Science Foundation of China (NSFC) and China  
48  
49 390 Postdoctoral Science Foundation, Contract No.71573066/G0308 and No.2018M631967.

### 52 391 **Contributors**

54  
55 392 LL conceived and designed the experiments; ZW WY performed the experiments; XS XZ  
56  
57 393 analyzed the data; SH YX LL contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools; ZW wrote the  
58  
59  
60 394 paper. ZW WY XS provided technical support. LL critically revised the paper. All authors



1  
2  
3 395 checked and proof-read the final version of manuscript.

4  
5 396 **Acknowledgement**

6  
7  
8 397 The authors would like to thank all participants in this study. We also thank Dr. Li Li for her  
9  
10 398 guidance on the writing of the manuscript. We thank International Science Editing  
11  
12  
13 399 ( <http://www.internationalscienceediting.com> ) for editing this manuscript.  
14

15  
16 400

17  
18 401 **References**

- 19  
20  
21  
22 [1] Chen, Lin , and W. J. Han . "Shanghai: Front-Runner of Community-Based Elder Care in China."  
23 Journal of Aging & Social Policy (2016):08959420.2016.1151310.  
24  
25 [2] CSY, 2018. China Statistical Yearbook. China Statistical Publishing House, Beijing  
26  
27 [3] The three departments released the results of the fourth sampling survey on the living conditions of  
28 urban and rural elderly in China[EB/ OL].Ministry of Civil Affairs Portal  
29  
30 [4] Hesketh T, Zhou X , Wang Y . The End of the One-Child Policy: Lasting Implications for China[J].  
31 Jama, 2015, 314(24):1-2.  
32  
33 [5] HD L,W R, and YJ R. Analysis of the number of only children and family structure since the family  
34 planning policy. Statistics & Decision. 13(2018).DOI:10.13546/j.cnki.tjyj.2018.13.022  
35  
36 [6] LB Q. The status quo and prospect of the development of China's old-age service industry[J]. Journal  
37 of Fujian Party School, 2016(3):75-83.DOI:10.15993/j.cnki.cn35-1198/c.2016.03.016  
38  
39 [7] Nie J B . Erosion of Eldercare in China: a Socio-Ethical Inquiry in Aging, Elderly Suicide and the  
40 Government's Responsibilities in the Context of the One-Child Policy[J]. Ageing International, 2016,  
41 41(4):1-16.  
42  
43 [8] MY Y, AQ F.The Construction of New Community Nursing Home Model from the Perspective of  
44 Active Aging[J]. Study and Practice, 2018(2).DOI:10.19624/j.cnki.cn42-1005/c.2018.02.014  
45  
46 [9] Mun S , Park K , Baek Y , et al. Interrelationships among common symptoms in the elderly and their  
47 effects on health-related quality of life: a cross-sectional study in rural Korea[J]. Health and Quality of  
48 Life Outcomes, 2016, 14(1).  
49  
50 [10] Sun W , Aodeng S , Tanimoto Y , et al. Quality of life (QOL) of the community-dwelling elderly and  
51 associated factors: A population-based study in urban areas of China[J]. Archives of Gerontology and  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 Geriatrics, 2015, 60(2):311-316.

5 [11] Y C. Comparison of health status, social support and quality of life of elderly living alone and  
6 non-inhabited in Shanghai[J].Chinese Journal of Gerontology, 2017,37(24).

7  
8  
9 DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1005-9202.2017.24.090

10  
11 [12]Jean Yeung, Wei-Jun, and Leng Leng Thang. “Long-Term Care for Older Adults in ASEAN Plus  
12 Three: The Roles of Family, Community, and the State in Addressing Unmet Eldercare Needs.” Journal of  
13 Aging and Health, vol. 30, no. 10, Dec. 2018, pp. 1499–1515, doi:10.1177/0898264318796345.

14  
15 [13] Deusdad B A , Pace C , Anttonen A . Facing the Challenges in the Development of Long-Term Care  
16 for Older People in Europe in the Context of an Economic Crisis[J]. Journal of Social Service Research,  
17 2016, 42(2):144-150.

18  
19 [14] YA J, F ZHOU, ZE ZHAI. The Influence of Residential Patterns on the Elderly's Depression—The  
20 Moderating Role of Community[J].Population Journal,2017,39(3):66-77.

21  
22  
23 DOI:10.16405/j.cnki.1004-129X.2017.03.006

24  
25 [15] Kwak Y , Chung H , Kim Y . Differences in Health-related Quality of Life and Mental Health by  
26 Living Arrangement among Korean Elderly in the KNHANES 2010–2012[J]. Iranian Journal of Public  
27 Health, 2017, 46(11):1512-1520.

28  
29 [16] XP SHI, HJ ZHANG, J SUI. The investigation of long-term care mode selection and its influencing  
30 factors among disabled elderly[J].Modern Preventive Medicine, 2016, 43(24):4467-4470.

31  
32 [17] XC LIU,LQ YANG,YY LUO.Demand Analysis for Integrated Medical and Nursing Care among  
33 Community-dwelling Elderly People Based on Andersen's Behavioral Model  
34 [J/OJ].Chinese General Practice:1-8[2018-11-30].

35  
36 [18] EP LIU, QL ZHANG. Inter-generational Relations, Socioeconomic Status and Preferences for  
37 Institutional Care of the Eldly—An Empirical Analysis Based on China's Longitudinal Aging Social  
38 Survey (2012)[J].Population and Development, 2018(3):55-64.

39  
40 [19] FX HU, MN LI, D ZHANG. Empirical Study on Rural Elderly's Demand Will for Patterns of  
41 Pension Service and Its Influencing Factors—A Case Study from ShanXi Province[J].Journal of Xi'an  
42 Jiaotong University(Social Sciences),2016,36(4):57-64.DOI10.15896/j.xjtuskxb.201604009

43  
44 [20] JJ SUN, D SHEN.The Intention for the Old-age Support of the Chinese Elderly and Its Differences  
45 between Urban and Rural Elderly:A Study Based on the China Longitudinal Aging Social  
46 Survey[J].Population & Economics, 2017(2).DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1000-4149.2017.02.002  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 [21] L QIU. Study on the Influencing Factors of the Satisfaction of Community Old-age Services: A Case  
5 Study of Shanghai[J]. The World of Survey and Research, 2016(2):15-18.DOI :  
6 10.13778/j.cnki.11-3705/c.2016.02.003  
7  
8 [22] Qian, Yangyang , et al. "Utilisation willingness for institutional care by the elderly: a comparative  
9 study of empty nesters and non-empty nesters in Shandong, China." BMJ Open 8.8(2018).  
10  
11 [23] Connolly S, Rosato M. House value as an indicator of cumulative wealth is strongly related to  
12 morbidity and mortality risk in older people: a census-based cross-sectional and longitudinal study[J].  
13 International Journal of Epidemiology, 2010, 39(2):383-391.  
14  
15 [24] YH WANG, YN FENG, WW HOU. Analysis for Cause of the disability old people aid to Xinjiang  
16 Choose Long-term Home care[J].Population and Development, 2013, 19(2):72-78.  
17  
18 [25] Q ZHANG, D ZHANG. Study on Select of Pension Methods of the Elderly and Its influencing  
19 Factors in Beijing [J].Research on Economics and Management, 2014(7):102-106.  
20  
21 DOI:10.13502/j.cnki.issn1000-7636.2014.07.012  
22  
23 [26] Butterfield M C, Williams A R, Beebe T, et al. A two-county comparison of the HOUSES index on  
24 predicting self-rated health[J]. Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health (1979-), 2011,  
25 65(3):254-259.  
26  
27 [27] B HU, B ZHU, Y LIU.Choices of old-age care and influence factors among empty nest elderly,  
28 Xuzhou[J].Modern Preventive Medicine, 2018,45(01):90-94.  
29  
30 [28] Liu H , Gao S , Wang J . The Impact of Elder-Care Patterns on Chinese Elderly's Health and  
31 Well-Being. (In Chinese. With English summary.)[J]. Economic Research Journal, 2011.  
32  
33 [29] D ZHANG. A Study on the Aging Willingness and Influencing Factors of the Aged in Beijing's  
34 Institutions[J].The World of Survey and Research, 2017(10):23-29.  
35  
36 DOI: 10.13778/j.cnki.11-3705/c.2017.10.004  
37  
38 [30] Bhat M A, Rather T A. Socio-Economic Factors and Mental Health of Young People in India and  
39 China: An Elusive Link with Globalization[J]. Asian Social Work & Policy Review, 2012, 6(1):1-22.  
40  
41 [31] Simon M A, Chen R, Chang E S, et al. The association between filial piety and suicidal ideation:  
42 findings from a community-dwelling Chinese aging population.[J]. Journals of Gerontology, 2014, 69  
43 Suppl 2(Suppl 2):S90.  
44  
45 [32] Dong, Xinqi & Xu, Ying. (2016). Filial Piety among Global Chinese Adult Children: A Systematic  
46 Review. Research & Reviews: Journal of Social Sciences. 2.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 [33] LW ZHANG,YB CENG,Y FANG.Study on Pension Methods and its Influential Factors among the  
5 Elderly by Using Andersen Behavior Model[J].Chinese Journal of Health Statistics, 2017, 34  
6 (05):721-725.  
7  
8  
9 [34] Li W W . Housing, aged care and migration: the housing careers of older Chinese migrants and its  
10 implications\ud[J]. Oceania Regional Congress of Geriatrics & Gerontology, 2011.  
11  
12 [35] HP LV, ZG LI.Confucius'View of Filial Piety and the Way of Family Pension[J].Population Research,  
13 2008, 32(2):81-86.Doi:10.3969/j.issn.1000-6087.2008.02.011  
14  
15 [36] Chen Z. Knowledge and Perceptions: Chinese Older Adults' Willingness to Use Institutional Elder  
16 Care[J]. 2011.  
17  
18 [37] Zhan H J , Feng Z , Chen Z , et al. The role of the family in institutional long-term care: cultural  
19 management of filial piety in China[J]. International Journal of Social Welfare, 2011, 20(Supplement  
20 s1):0-0.  
21  
22 [38] Qian Y, Jie C, Ge D, et al. Gender difference in utilization willingness of institutional care among the  
23 single seniors: evidence from rural Shandong, China[J]. International Journal for Equity in Health, 2017,  
24 16(1):77.  
25  
26 [39] Rolls L, Seymour J E, Froggatt K A, et al. Older people living alone at the end of life in the UK:  
27 Research and policy challenges[J]. Palliative Medicine, 2011, 25(6):650-7.  
28  
29 [40] Chen Y, Hicks A, While A E. Loneliness and social support of older people in China: a systematic  
30 literature review.[J]. Health & Social Care in the Community, 2014, 22(2):113.  
31  
32 [41] Lim L L, Kua E H. Living alone, loneliness, and psychological well-being of older persons in  
33 singapore[J]. Current Gerontology & Geriatrics Research, 2011, 2011(1):673181.  
34  
35 [42] Sok S R, Yun E K. A comparison of physical health status, self-esteem, family support and  
36 health-promoting behaviours between aged living alone and living with family in Korea[J]. Journal of  
37 Clinical Nursing, 2011, 20(11-12):1606–1612.  
38  
39 [43] Bonsang E . Does informal care from children to their elderly parents substitute for formal care in  
40 Europe?[J]. Journal of Health Economics, 2009, 28(1):0-154.  
41  
42 [44] BH TIAN, CY WANG. Structural Characteristics and Determinant Factors of the Demand of the  
43 elderly For Social care Services-based on the Analysis on the Replacement Mechanism of Family  
44 Supporting For the Elderly[J].China Rural Survey, 2.014(04):2-17+95.  
45  
46 [45] JD DING.The Home Care Service:Recognizing Mistakes, Rational Principles and Perfecting

1  
2  
3  
4 Measures[J].Journal of Renmin University of China, 2013, 27(2):20-26.

5 [46] Y JIE, Rosenberg M W , Y CHENG, et al. Aging at home and the intent to relocate in Beijing [J].  
6 Progress in Geography, 2015, 34(12):1577-1585.  
7

8  
9 [47] JJ SUN, D SHEN.The Intention for the Old-age Support of the Chinese Elderly and Its Differences  
10 between Urban and Rural Elderly:A Study Based on the China Longitudinal Aging  
11 SocialSurvey[J].Population&Economics,2017(2):11-20.  
12  
13

14 DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1000-4149.2017.02.002  
15

16 [48] WJ ZHANG, W MENG.A Study on the Factors Associated with Preferences for Institutional Care of  
17 the Elderly in Urban China: Evidences from Xicheng District of Beijing[J]Population & Economics,  
18 2014(6):22-34.  
19  
20

21 [49] W MA, XG XU.Reflection on the Perfection of Signing Service of Family Physician From the  
22 Perspective of Contract Law[J].Chinese General Practice, 2015(16):1980-1983.  
23  
24

25 [50] SJ WU, JR LIU,S QIU.Studying on the Present Situation of Family Doctor Door-to-Door Service  
26 Taking Guangzhou as an Example[J].Chinese Primary Health Care, 2015,  
27 29(8):1-3.DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1001-568X.2015.08.0001  
28  
29

30 [51] JY CHEN, MX JIANG, Y BAO.Effect of Family Doctor Contract Service on Health Management of  
31 Poor Elderlies in Urban Community[J].Chinese General Practice, 2013,  
32 16(34):3355-3357.DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1007-9572.2013.10.021  
33  
34

35 [52] W LU , YM ZHANG.The performance evaluation based on the demand side of the family doctor  
36 contract service: A focus on chronic diseases[J].Chinese Journal of Health Policy, 2016, 9(8):23-30.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies***

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	Line1-2, P1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	Line21-57, P1-3
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	Line58-97, P3-5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	Line98-117, P5
<b>Methods</b>			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	Line119-129, P6
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	Line135-165, P6-7
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	Line130-134, P6
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	Line350-354, P21

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	Line167-173, P7-8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	Line121-128, P6
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	
<b>Results</b>			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	Line176-195, P8-9
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	Line178-192,P8-9
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	Line197-232, P11-15
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	

		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	
<b>Discussion</b>			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	Line235-252, P15-16
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	Line350-358, P21
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	Line257-349, P17-21
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	Line360-368, P21-22
<b>Other information</b>			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	Line379-381, P22

\*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at [www.strobe-statement.org](http://www.strobe-statement.org).



# BMJ Open

## Effects of individual, family and community factors on the willingness of institutional elder-care: a cross-sectional survey of the elderly in China.

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-032478.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	29-Nov-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Wang, Zhaoqing; Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management, School of Health Management Xing, Yanan; BOE Health Investment Management Co.,Ltd Yan, Wenxin; Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management, School of Health Management Sun, Xinran; Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management, School of Health Management Zhang, Xueying; Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management, School of Health Management Huang, Shuang; Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management, School of Health Management Li, Li; Harbin Medical University, Department of Health Management, School of Health Management
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Health services research
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health services research
Keywords:	Chinese elder-care, institutional elder-care willingness, individual, family and community environment of the elderly, the effects of One-Child policy on the elderly

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 1 **Effects of individual, family and community factors on the willingness of institutional**  
4 2 **elder-care: a cross-sectional survey of the elderly in China.**

5  
6  
7 3 Zhaoqing Wang<sup>#</sup>, Yanan Xing<sup>#</sup>, Wenxin Yan, Xinran Sun, Xueying Zhang, Shuang Huang, Li Li\*

8  
9 4 Zhaoqing Wang: Department of Health Management, School of Health Management, Harbin Medical  
10 5 University, Harbin, China email:395602865@qq.com

11  
12 6 Yanan Xing: BOE Health Investment Management Co.,Ltd. Beijing, China email:1191255523@qq.com

13  
14 7 Wenxin Yan: Department of Health Management, School of Health Management, Harbin Medical  
15 8 University, Harbin, China email:179188189@qq.com

16  
17 9 Xinran Sun: Department of Health Management, School of Health Management, Harbin Medical  
18 10 University, Harbin, China email:309509842@qq.com

19  
20 11 Xueying Zhang: Department of Health Management, School of Health Management, Harbin Medical  
21 12 University, Harbin, China email:2464987097@qq.com

22  
23 13 Shuang Huang: Department of Health Management, School of Health Management, Harbin Medical  
24 14 University, Harbin, China email:804094493@qq.com

25  
26 15 Correspondence:

27  
28 16 Dr, LI LI, Department of Health Management, School of Health Management, Harbin Medical University,

29  
30 17 Baojian Road 157, Harbin, China, Tel: 86-0451-87502879 Fax: 86-0451-87502885

31  
32 18 E-mail:healthlaw@126.com

33  
34 19 <sup>#</sup>: These authors contributed equally to the work

35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44 21 **Abstract**

45  
46  
47 22 **Objective:** To investigate the effects of the willingness to live in elder-care institutions  
48  
49 23 associated with individual factors, family environment and the community environment in  
50  
51  
52 24 the elderly in China.

53  
54 25 **Design:** Cross-sectional survey

55  
56  
57 26 **Setting:** Heilongjiang Province, China

1  
2  
3 27 **Participants:** A total of 1003 elderly people were selected through multistage sampling in  
4  
5 28 Heilongjiang Province.

6  
7  
8 29 **Primary and secondary outcome measures:** A multistage, stratified sampling design was  
9  
10 30 employed. Differences in health status, family environment and community environment of  
11  
12  
13 31 the respondents were compared with the t-test and chi-squared test. Logistic regression  
14  
15  
16 32 analysis was performed to assess key determinants of willingness to live in institutions.

17  
18 33 **Results:** This study showed that 45.4% of respondents were willing to live in elder-care  
19  
20  
21 34 institutions in the future. Factors influencing willingness to live in elder-care institutions  
22  
23  
24 35 were age, house ownership, living with spouse and children, disease caregivers and  
25  
26 36 availability of home health care services. The elders who had no property (OR=2.37, 95% CI  
27  
28  
29 37 = 1.750–3.200,  $p<0.01$ ), and those aged 80 or above (OR=2.25, 95% CI = 1.490–3.400,  
30  
31 38  $p<0.01$ ) were, respectively, 2.370 times and 2.250 times more receptive to living in  
32  
33  
34 39 elder-care institutions than their control groups. However, those living with a spouse  
35  
36 40 (OR=0.49, 95% CI = 0.287–0.762,  $p<0.01$ ), living with children (OR=0.25, 95% CI =  
37  
38  
39 41 0.158–0.402,  $p<0.01$ ) or living with a spouse and children (OR=0.29, 95% CI = 0.160–0.509,  
40  
41  
42 42  $p<0.01$ ) were less willing to live in elder-care institutions.

43  
44 43 **Conclusions:** These results suggest that the willingness to enter elder-care institutions is  
45  
46  
47 44 affected by individual, family environmental and community environmental factors. We  
48  
49  
50 45 should vigorously develop community-centered intensive home-based elder-care services by  
51  
52 46 improving the quality and availability of home health services by expanding investment in  
53  
54  
55 47 the community.

56  
57 48 **Keywords:** Chinese eldercare; institutional eldercare willingness; individual, family and  
58  
59  
60 49 community environment of the elderly; effects of the One-Child policy on the elderly

## 50 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

51 Strengths: We carried out a comprehensive study that selected factors related to  
52 individuals, family environment and community environment as potential factors which may  
53 affect the willingness to accept institutional eldercare.

54 The samples were selected through multistage sampling.

55 Limitations: We selected participants from a single province.

56 The small sample size in our study limits the generalizability of the findings.

57 We used a cross-sectional design; therefore, no causal relationships can be identified.

## 58 **Introduction**

59 The aging population has become a worldwide phenomenon, and concerns with the issue  
60 of elder care have been expanding globally. The situation of elder care has been very  
61 problematical in China, where the One-Child policy was enforced for over 30 years[1].  
62 According to Chinese official data, by the end of 2017,158,310,000 persons were aged 65 or  
63 older, accounting for 11.4% of the total population[2]. Meanwhile, 40.63 million disabled  
64 elderly people lived in China, making up 18.3% of the aged population[3].

65 Chinese society's economy, social welfare and social security systems are unable to  
66 cope with the pressure of the aging population. Introduced in the 1980s, the One-Child  
67 policy, which meant that a couple can have only one child, was enforced for over 30 years.  
68 People who were born at the beginning of the One-Child policy are now the main providers  
69 of elder care for their parents. In this so-called 4:2:1 phenomenon, each young parent is  
70 usually responsible for two pairs of grandparents, besides having the duty to raise their  
71 children [4,5]. Therefore, too much pressure has been put on Chinese families. In addition,  
72 the number of elder-care institutions, the quality of elder-care workers and the services  
73 provided for the elderly all lag behind the diversified needs of the elderly population[6,7].

1  
2  
3 74 Obviously, it is necessary to conduct research on elder-care problems.  
4

5 75 The Chinese government has introduced many policies and invested a large amount of  
6  
7  
8 76 money to erase the pressure on elder care, and has proposed two slogans, 'Active aging' and  
9  
10 77 'Healthy aging'[8]. Topics related to elder care have been paid much attention not only by  
11  
12  
13 78 the government, but also by researchers. The extensive literature about elder care can be  
14  
15  
16 79 divided into four categories.

17  
18 80 First, some researchers have focused on the health and quality of life of the  
19  
20  
21 81 elderly[9,10,11]. They have found that the quality of life in the elderly population is affected  
22  
23  
24 82 by many factors, including individual, community and societal variables. Second, some  
25  
26 83 studies of long-term care, which can effectively solve the pressure of social old-age care,  
27  
28  
29 84 found that most countries are ill-prepared in system or law to satisfy the demand for  
30  
31 85 long-term care (LTC)[12,13]. Third, research has shown that the living arrangements of the  
32  
33  
34 86 elderly has an important influence on their mental health[14,15].

35  
36 87 Finally, plenty of literature has focused on the factors influencing the willingness to  
37  
38  
39 88 receive elder care. Some studies have assessed the relationship between social support for the  
40  
41  
42 89 elderly and the willingness to receive elder care in China[16,17]. Another study analyzed the  
43  
44 90 different factors influencing willingness to receive elder care from the perspective of  
45  
46  
47 91 inter-generational relations and social economic status[18]. This indicated that the more  
48  
49  
50 92 harmonious the inter-generational relationship, the lower the willingness of the elderly to  
51  
52 93 enter an institution. Meanwhile, the higher the social economic status, the more likely the  
53  
54  
55 94 elderly are to choose institutional elder care. Some researchers have studied the influence of  
56  
57 95 the community environment on the willingness to receive elder care[19,20]. One study  
58  
59  
60 96 showed that the quality of the community environment had a positive effect on the degree of

1  
2  
3 97 satisfaction with community elder care[21].  
4

5 98 We believe that not only the internal characteristics of a person, such as health status,  
6  
7  
8 99 income and age, but also the external factors, such as family members and community  
9  
10  
11 100 environment, affect the willingness of the elderly to receive elder care. It is worth  
12  
13 101 mentioning that China is currently implementing a policy called the ‘community family  
14  
15 102 physician model’, which can promote the accessibility of community health management and  
16  
17  
18 103 care services for the elderly. The main duty of the family physician is to carry out health  
19  
20  
21 104 management for community residents, especially chronic disease management and health  
22  
23  
24 105 recovery for the elderly. Whether to choose institutional eldercare indicates whether old  
25  
26 106 people are willing to leave their familiar environment, which can give them various kinds of  
27  
28  
29 107 support such as disease care, and physical and mental company. The influences of personal  
30  
31  
32 108 factors and external factors on the willingness to accept eldercare are not isolated. Our study  
33  
34 109 included the following aspects of the elderly: individual characteristics, family environment  
35  
36 110 and community environment. In view of the newly launched policy ‘family physician model’,  
37  
38  
39 111 which has been studied only rarely, we have taken the ‘Availability of home health care’ as  
40  
41  
42 112 an aspect of the study. Our research is pioneering in the study of the willingness to accept  
43  
44 113 care for the elderly with regard to three aspects: the individual, family and community.  
45  
46

47 114 The present study aimed: (1) to describe the status quo and compare the willingness to  
48  
49 115 use institutional eldercare according to individual characteristics, family environment and  
50  
51  
52 116 community environment; (2) to analyze effects of individual, family and community factors  
53  
54  
55 117 on the willingness to accept institutional elder-care.  
56

## 57 118 **Methods**

## 58 59 119 **Data and Sample**

1  
2  
3 120 A cross-sectional survey of elderly individuals was conducted from March 1st to  
4  
5 121 August 31st 2016 in Heilongjiang Province, China. First, those aged 60 years and above  
6  
7  
8 122 having the ability and being willing to answer the questions were included as our sample.  
9  
10 123 Second, to make our sample as representative as possible, we employed a multistage  
11  
12  
13 124 stratified sampling design. We chose urban and rural samples, each accounting for about 50  
14  
15  
16 125 percent. Third, three cities, Harbin, Qiqihar, and Jiamusi, were selected on the basis of their  
17  
18 126 gross domestic product. Three communities and three villages were selected in each sampled  
19  
20  
21 127 city according to economic factors. In total, nine communities and nine villages were  
22  
23  
24 128 selected. In addition, in order to ensure that the elderly understood the questionnaire  
25  
26 129 correctly, we used the face-to-face interview format during the investigation.

### 28 130 **Data collection**

30 131 The data were collected through face-to-face interviews using a structured questionnaire  
31  
32  
33 132 conducted by trained undergraduate and graduate students from Harbin Medical University.  
34  
35  
36 133 A total of 1200 questionnaires were distributed; 1003 (83.6%) valid questionnaires were  
37  
38  
39 134 returned.

### 41 135 **Assessment tools**

43 136 The study's instrument was a self-administered questionnaire composed of five sections.  
44  
45  
46 137 Section 1 consisted of the participants' demographic characteristics including residence,  
47  
48  
49 138 gender, age, income, house ownership and culture. Among these variables, residence was  
50  
51  
52 139 composed of *rural* and *urban*, *income* was represented by five levels: <500, 500–999,  
53  
54 140 1000–1999, 2000–3000 and >3000 monthly, and culture was divided into five dimensions:  
55  
56  
57 141 *no education, primary school, junior high school, senior high school and college degree or*  
58  
59 142 *above.*  
60

1

2

3 143

4

5 144

6

7

8 145

9

10

11 146

12

13 147

14

15 148

16

17 149

18

19 150

20

21 151

22

23 152

24

25 153

26

27 154

28

29 155

30

31 156

32

33 157

34

35 158

36

37 159

38

39 160

40

41 161

42

43 162

44

45 163

46

47 164

48

49 165

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

Section 2 measured the health status of respondents. Physical health was assessed by self-rated physical health and self-rated capacity. Higher scores indicate better health. The scores for each question ranged from 1 to 5. Psychological health status was assessed by life satisfaction and feeling of isolation.

Section 3 assessed the family environment of the respondents. Family environment included whether he/she had living children, marital status, living arrangements, disease caregiver and parent–child relationships. Living arrangements were investigated using three questions: ‘Are you living with your spouse?’, ‘Are you living with your children?’, and ‘Are you living with others?’. Based on the answers, we classified living arrangements into four groups: (1) living alone, (2) living with spouse (may have others), (3) living with children (may have others), and (4) living with children and spouse (may have others). Because no participants in our sample were living with others only (not spouse or children), we ruled out this situation. Disease caregiver was divided into five groups: spouse, child, other relatives, nursing workers and themselves. The parent–child relationship was rated good, normal and bad.

Section 4 assessed the community environment of the respondents. This section included two questions: availability of community recreational facilities and availability of home health-care services. Each question’s score ranged from 1 to 5, and high scores indicate high availability.

Section 5 assessed willingness to live in an institution. The variable ‘Willingness to live in institution’ was indicated by the question ‘Which are you willing to accept out of home care and institutional care?’. The respondents were allowed to consider whether they wanted to go to an institution or stay at home for eldercare when needed.



## **Data analysis**

The data were analyzed using the Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 17.0. Descriptive analyses included frequencies and percentages for the categorical variables and means and standard deviations (SDs) for continuous variables. Differences in health status, family environment and community environment for respondents were compared with the t-test and chi-squared test. Logistic regression analysis was performed to assess key determinants of the willingness of elderly people to live in institutions. Statistical significance was set at the 5% level.

## **Patient and public involvement**

This study did not involve patients and the public in the design or planning of the study.

## **Results**

### **Socioeconomic and demographic status of respondents**

The socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of the respondents are shown in Table 1. More than half of the respondents were female (52.7%), urban (57.9%) and married (59.4%). A majority of the participants have children (95.0%) and own a house (61.3%). About half of them (52.0%) were educated to a lower level than that of junior high school. Only 31.2% of them had monthly incomes above 2000 CNY. Seventy-two percent of them were able to support themselves financially. In this survey, 51.0% of the respondents were aged between 60 and 69 years, and 27.9% were aged between 70 and 79 years. Table 1 shows that 48.5% of urban older adults and 41.0% of rural older adults preferred elder-care institutions. There were significant differences in the percentage willingness to live in elder-care institutions according to urban area ( $p < 0.05$ ), age ( $p < 0.01$ ), house ownership ( $p < 0.01$ ) and financial independence ( $p < 0.05$ ). Older adults who have their own house and

1  
2  
3 189 have no financial independence had lower willingness to enter eldercare institutions than  
4  
5 190 those who have no house ownership. The respondents aged 80 or above had the highest  
6  
7  
8 191 willingness to enter an elder-care institution, followed by those aged 70–79 and aged 60–69  
9  
10 192 years.

13 193

15  
16 194 Table 1 Analysis of the willingness to live in elder-care institutions according to individual  
17  
18 195 characteristics of the respondents

variables	Total		willingness to live in eldercare institutions		
	n	%	n	%	
Residence	urban	581	57.9	281	48.4
	rural	422	42.1	173	41.0
$\chi^2$				<b>5.36</b>	
P				<b>0.02</b>	
Sex	Male	474	47.3	215	45.4
	Female	529	52.7	239	45.2
$\chi^2$				0.00	
P				1.00	
Age in years	60-69	508	51.0	188	37.0
	70-79	280	27.9	122	43.6
	$\geq 80$	215	21.1	144	67.0
$\chi^2$				<b>55.21</b>	

60

P					<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Monthly income					
(RMB)	<500	314	31.3	124	39.5
	500-999	125	12.5	55	44.0
	1000-1999	251	25.0	124	49.4
	2000-3000	197	19.6	95	48.2
	>3000	116	11.6	56	48.3
$\chi^2$					7.16
P					0.12
House property	yes	615	61.3	221	35.9
	no	388	38.7	233	60.1
$\chi^2$					<b>55.85</b>
P					<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Financial independence	yes	725	72.3	346	47.7
	no	278	27.7	108	38.8
$\chi^2$					<b>6.39</b>
P					<b>0.01</b>
Education	No education	195	19.4	85	43.6
	Primary school	327	32.6	151	46.2
	Junior high school	288	28.7	132	45.8
	Senior high school	118	11.8	55	46.6

1					
2					
3					
4		College degree or above	75	7.5	31
5					41.3
6					
7					
8		$\chi^2$			0.92
9					
10		P			0.92
11					
12					

13 196

### 16 197 **Willingness to live in elder-care institutions according to family environment**

18 Table 2 shows that participants who have children ( $p<0.01$ ) and/or have a spouse ( $p<0.01$ )  
 19 198 have lower willingness to live in elder-care institutions. It is worth mentioning that our  
 20 199 results showed that children were negatively correlated with the willingness to live in an  
 21 200 elder-care institution ( $\chi^2=18.2$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) (odds ratio [OR]=7.52, 95% confidence interval  
 22 201 [CI]=3.310–17.120,  $p<0.05$ ), which means that the elderly who have children were 7.52  
 23 202 times less willing to live in elder-care institutions than the elderly who have no child.  
 24 203 Regarding living arrangements, older adults living alone have the strongest willingness to  
 25 204 live in an elder-care institution, followed by those living with a spouse, living with children  
 26 205 and living with spouse and children ( $p<0.01$ ). The willingness to enter elder-care institutions  
 27 206 among the elderly who were nursed by nursing workers was higher than for those who were  
 28 207 nursed by a spouse, children and/or other relatives ( $p<0.01$ ).

29 209

30 210 Table 2 Analysis of the willingness to live in elder-care institutions according to the family  
 31 211 environment of the respondents

34 56 variables	35 57 Total		36 58 willingness to live in institutions	
	37 59 n	38 60 %	n	%

Children	yes	950	94.7	415	43.7
	no	53	5.3	39	73.6
	$\chi^2$				<b>18.1</b>
	P				<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Marital status	Married	593	59.4	213	35.9
	Others	410	40.6	241	58.8
	$\chi^2$				<b>51.1</b>
	P				<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Living arrangement	Living alone	282	28.1	193	68.4
	Living with spouse	428	42.7	165	38.6
	Living with children	147	14.7	56	38.1
	Living with spouse and children	146	14.6	40	28.1
	$\chi^2$				<b>90.7</b>
	P				<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Disease caregiver	spouse	494	49.3	177	35.8
	Son/daughter	356	35.5	166	46.6
	Other relatives	15	1.5	7	46.7
	nursing workers	90	9.0	69	76.7
	By self	48	4.8	35	72.9
	$\chi^2$				<b>68.7</b>

1						
2						
3	P					<0.001
4						
5	parent-child					
6		Good	883	87.9	399	45.2
7	relationship					
8		Normal	84	8.4	37	44.0
9						
10		Bad	36	3.6	18	50.0
11						
12						
13						
14						
15	$\chi^2$					0.38
16						
17						
18	p					0.83
19						
20						

21 212

22

23

24 213

25

26 214

27

28

29 215

30

31 216

32

33

34 217

35

36 218

37

38

39 219

40

41

42 220

43

44 221

45

46

47 222

48

49

50 223

51

52 224

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

### Willingness to live in elder-care institutions according to health status

We used self-rated physical health, life satisfaction, feeling of isolation and self-rated capacity for action to evaluate the health status of the respondents (Table 3). The mean scores for self-rated physical health and self-rated capacity for action were 3.30 and 3.54, respectively, which were slightly higher than the mid-point of 3. The life satisfaction was 5.08, which indicated high well-being among the elderly. The feeling of isolation was at a relatively low level (M=3.54, SD=0.96). Among these four variables, only self-rated capacity for action was significantly different between those preferring home care and those willing to receive institutional care: the participants preferring home care had higher self-rated capacity for action (M=3.61, SD=0.94, p=0.01).

Table 3 Analysis of the willingness to live in elder-care institutions according to the health status of the respondents

variables	Mean $\pm$ SD (n=1003)	Range of the score	Institutional		t	P
			Home care (n=548)	care (n=455)		

self-rated							
	3.30±0.97	1-5	3.28±1.00	3.33±0.94	0.80	0.42	
physical health							
life satisfaction	5.08±1.27	1-7	5.13±1.25	5.03±1.28	1.21	0.23	
Feeling of							
isolation	1.91 ± 0.77	1-5	1.91±0.76	1.91±0.78	0.15	0.88	
Self-rated							
capacity for	3.54±0.96	1-5	3.61±0.94	3.45±0.98	2.59	<b>0.01</b>	
action							

### Willingness to live in elder-care institutions according to community environment

The mean scores for self-assessed availability of community recreational facilities and availability of home health care services were 3.72 and 3.25, respectively (Table 4). Statistically significant differences were noted in the scores on both of these variables between those who preferred home care and those who favored institutional care; those who preferred home care reported higher scores for the availability of community recreational facilities and the availability of home health care services ( $p < 0.05$ ).

Table 4 Analysis of the willingness to live in elder-care institutions according to the community environment of the respondents

variables	Mean ± SD (n=1003)	Range of the score	Institutional		t	P
			Home care (n=548)	care (n=455)		
Availability of community	3.72±0.74	1-5	3.76±0.74	3.67±0.74	2.00	<b>0.046</b>

1							
2							
3	recreation						
4							
5	facility						
6							
7							
8	Availability						
9							
10	of home						
11							
12		3.25±0.69	1-5	3.29 ± 0.71	3.20±0.66	2.15	<b>0.032</b>
13	health care						
14							
15	services						
16							

### 235 **Factors influencing willingness to live in elder-care institutions**

236 In this study, 45.4% of respondents said they were willing to live in elder-care  
 237 institutions at some point in the future. Based on the results of single factor analysis, logistic  
 238 regression was conducted to analyze the factors influencing the willingness to live in  
 239 elder-care institutions (Table 5). Regarding the individual factors, only age in years and  
 240 house ownership were predictors of the willingness to enter institutions. The elders who had  
 241 no property (OR=2.37,  $p<0.01$ ), and those aged 80 or above (OR=2.25,  $p<0.01$ ) were,  
 242 respectively, 2.370 times and 2.250 times more receptive to living in elder-care institutions  
 243 than their control groups. With regarding to living arrangements, those living with a spouse  
 244 (OR=0.47,  $p<0.01$ ), living with children (OR=0.25,  $p<0.01$ ) or living with a spouse and  
 245 children (OR=0.29,  $p<0.01$ ) were less willing to live in elder-care institutions than those who  
 246 were living alone. These results meant that the elderly who live with a spouse were 0.468  
 247 times more willing to choose institutional elder care than those who were living alone. We  
 248 also found that elders who were cared for by their children (OR=0.33,  $p<0.01$ ) or cared for  
 249 by their spouse (OR=0.40,  $p<0.01$ ) when they were ill had much lower willingness to live in  
 250 elder-care institutions than those who cared for themselves. The availability of home health  
 251 care services (OR=0.78,  $p<0.05$ ) was negatively associated with the willingness to live in



1  
2  
3 252 elder-care institutions.

4  
5 253 Table 5 Logistic regression analysis of the factors influencing willingness to live in  
6  
7  
8 254 elder-care institutions

variables	Adjusted OR	95%CI
Residence (reference: urban)		
Rural	0.96	0.700-1.320
Age in years (reference:60-69)		
70-79	1.02	0.730-1.430
≥80	2.25**	1.490-3.400
House property (reference: yes)		
No	2.37**	1.750-3.200
Financial independence (reference: yes)		
No	0.85	0.590-1.210
Children (reference: yes)		
No	7.52**	3.310-17.120
Marital status (reference: married)		
Others	0.73	0.330-1.630
Living arrangement(reference: living alone)		
Living with spouse	0.47**	0.287-0.762
Living with children	0.25**	0.158-0.402
Living with spouse and children	0.29**	0.160-0.509
Disease caregiver (reference: By self)		
spouse	0.40**	0.180-0.903

1				
2				
3	255	Son/daughter	0.33**	0.158-0.684
4				*p
5	256	Other relatives	0.48	0.131-1.760
6				<0.
7				
8	257	nursing workers	0.80	0.337-1.904
9				05;
10	258	Self-rated capacity for action	1.01	0.860-1.180
11				**p
12				
13	259	Availability of community recreation		<0.
14			1.03	0.830-1.280
15		facility		01
16	260			
17				
18	261	Availability of home health care services	0.78*	0.626-0.972
19				

20  
21 262 **Dis**

22  
23 **Discussion**

24 263  
25  
26 264 This cross-sectional study was conducted to explore the key factors contributing to the  
27  
28  
29 265 willingness to enter elder-care institutions. This study was a pioneering one because we took  
30  
31 266 the willingness to live in elder-care institutions as the dependent variable and chose  
32  
33  
34 267 independent variables from three dimensions: individual factors, family environment and  
35  
36 268 community environment.

37  
38  
39 269 With regard to individual factors, both the single factor analysis (Table 1) and the  
40  
41  
42 270 logistic regression (Table 5) demonstrated that age and house ownership were significantly  
43  
44 271 associated with the willingness to live in an elder-care institution. People in their 80s and  
45  
46  
47 272 above had 2.250 times more willingness to live in elder-care institutions than the group aged  
48  
49  
50 273 60–69 years. The same conclusion was drawn from another study[22]. Another study pointed  
51  
52 274 out that those in advanced old age are much more likely to have elder-care needs, including  
53  
54  
55 275 physical and psychological[23]. Given that most of these needs cannot be met by family, the  
56  
57 276 willingness to accept institutional eldercare rises with age. Second, when analyzing house  
58  
59  
60 277 ownership and the willingness to enter institutional elder care, we found that when the

1  
2  
3 278 elderly have their own house, they have a significantly lower willingness to accept  
4  
5 279 institutional eldercare than those who have no property. The elderly in China traditionally  
6  
7  
8 280 intend to live the rest of their life in their own house because they regard their own houses as  
9  
10  
11 281 their roots of life. Having their own houses gives the Chinese elderly a great sense of  
12  
13 282 belonging, as a study found that the sense of comfort and freedom when receiving elder care  
14  
15  
16 283 in their own houses is irreplaceable by other methods[24]. A similar conclusion was reached  
17  
18 284 by other studies, which demonstrated that house ownership is highly correlated with current  
19  
20  
21 285 health status and is predictive of future mortality risk in older populations[25-26]. However,  
22  
23 286 statistical significance of the impact of the independent variable residence on the dependent  
24  
25  
26 287 variable (the willingness to live in eldercare institutions) was found only with chi-squared  
27  
28  
29 288 tests (Table 1,  $\chi^2=5.61, P < 0.05$ ) and not in logistic regression, as shown in many  
30  
31 289 studies[27-28]. However, our result was similar to a previous study [29]. We assume that, as  
32  
33  
34 290 the trend of urban–rural integration advances, the difference between urban and rural areas is  
35  
36 291 not strong enough to show statistically significant differences when compared with other  
37  
38  
39 292 variables such as age and house ownership.

40  
41  
42 293 Family environment also comprised some typical factors influencing willingness to live  
43  
44 294 in elder-care institutions. This study showed that the elderly who have children were 7.52  
45  
46  
47 295 times less willing to live in elder-care institutions than those who have no children. This  
48  
49  
50 296 meant that children were negatively correlated with the willingness to live in elder-care  
51  
52 297 institution. In addition, we found that the elderly who lived alone and those who cared for  
53  
54  
55 298 themselves when they had diseases both had the highest willingness to live in elder-care  
56  
57 299 institutions. Undeniably, Chinese grown children nowadays are facing great pressure because  
58  
59  
60 300 of the so-called ‘4-2-1’ family structure and the interpersonal tensions and work–family

1  
2  
3 301 conflict created by the advent of globalization and fierce market competition[30-31].  
4  
5 302 However, a published review indicated that adult children still endorse filial piety in  
6  
7  
8 303 contemporary Chinese society[32]. This result was consistent with many studies in which the  
9  
10  
11 304 elderly showed less willingness to live in elder-care institutions when they have  
12  
13 305 children[33-34].As the well-known proverb ‘raising children to ensure elder care’ indicates,  
14  
15  
16 306 in Chinese traditional culture, filial piety demands that, apart from economic and living care,  
17  
18 307 psychological care should also be provided for elderly parents[35]. Some previous studies  
19  
20  
21 308 have pointed out that adult children who have placed their parents in elder-care homes may  
22  
23  
24 309 be negatively regarded by society[36-37]. This study showed that the elderly who lived alone  
25  
26 310 had the highest willingness to live in elder-care institutions. We assume that the elderly  
27  
28  
29 311 living alone typically lack physical and psychological assistance and care from their family,  
30  
31  
32 312 and are therefore more willing to live in elder-care institutions. Similar results were found in  
33  
34 313 a study that showed that elderly people who lived alone were more willing to live in  
35  
36 314 elder-care institutions, for both single males and females, when compared with those who  
37  
38  
39 315 lived with children or others[38]. First, as another study concluded, older people are more  
40  
41  
42 316 likely than any other section of the population to be living in single-person households[39].  
43  
44 317 Second, the elderly who live alone have higher scores for loneliness and worse mental health  
45  
46  
47 318 and functioning compared with those who do not live alone[40-41]. Third, a Korean study  
48  
49  
50 319 found that physical health status, self-esteem, family support and health-promoting behavior,  
51  
52 320 specifically exercise and nutrition, of the elderly living with family were higher than those of  
53  
54  
55 321 the elderly living alone[42].

56  
57 322 With an increase in age, physical health tends to deteriorate, so we included  
58  
59  
60 323 disease-caregiver in our research. Our analysis showed significant differences among five

1  
2  
3 324 disease caregivers: spouse, son or daughter, other relatives, nursing workers and the elderly  
4  
5 325 person themselves; 86.24% of respondents were provided with disease care by their  
6  
7  
8 326 immediate family members or other relatives. This means that informal care is the main form  
9  
10  
11 327 of care for the elderly in China. A study in Europe showed that informal care is an effective  
12  
13 328 substitute for long-term care as long as the needs of the elderly are met [43]. In support, in  
14  
15  
16 329 our study the lowest willingness to accept elder-care institutions was shown by the elderly  
17  
18 330 cared for by their spouse. A study demonstrated that a spouse can give the elder physical and,  
19  
20  
21 331 especially, mental care, thus their willingness to live in elder-care institutions was lower than  
22  
23  
24 332 that of those that have no spouse[44]. In the multiple logistic regression analysis, we found  
25  
26 333 that when the elderly were provided with disease care by their spouse or children, their  
27  
28  
29 334 willingness to live in elder-care institutions decreased. When the elderly have no children or  
30  
31 335 live alone, they cannot obtain informal or formal care from family as desired, so they have to  
32  
33  
34 336 seek care from elder-care institutions. Therefore, the primary culture of filial piety, the  
35  
36 337 conditions of living and the presence of disease all affect the willingness of the elderly to live  
37  
38  
39 338 in elder-care institutions.

40  
41  
42 339 Last, but not least, we paid attention to the community environment. We found that that  
43  
44 340 availability of home health-care services negatively affected the willingness to live in  
45  
46  
47 341 elder-care institutions, in agreement with previous studies [45-46]. In China, home  
48  
49  
50 342 health-care services are mostly provided by institutions called elder-care community centers,  
51  
52 343 such as Community Health Service centers. One study showed that these centers could  
53  
54  
55 344 increase willingness to accept home elder care[47]. The research pointed out that high  
56  
57 345 availability of home health services in the community provided the elderly with basic  
58  
59  
60 346 nursing services to meet their fundamental needs for care, and therefore lowered the

1  
2  
3 347 willingness to accept institutional elder care[48]. In our study, the mean availability of home  
4  
5 348 health care services was 3.25, which is much higher than the average level because of  
6  
7  
8 349 adoption of the model of community family physician. This new Chinese policy, the  
9  
10  
11 350 'community family physician model', has aroused heated discussion among all types of  
12  
13 351 people. Some researchers have found that this policy is associated with problems such as  
14  
15  
16 352 unclear responsibilities, high medical risk and lack of a security system[49-50]. However,  
17  
18 353 some found that this policy did improve the convenience and success rate of medical  
19  
20  
21 354 treatment, thus improving the level of health of the signatories[51-52]. It is no doubt that  
22  
23 355 home health-care services have become more conveniently available for elderly residents.

26 356 However, several limitations in our study should be discussed. First, we used a  
27  
28  
29 357 cross-sectional design, in which data were collected at only one point in time. This may have  
30  
31 358 caused information bias, including mainly recall bias and measurement bias. In order to  
32  
33  
34 359 reduce measurement bias, the investigators underwent rigorous training to improve their  
35  
36 360 survey skills and our respondents were given enough time to recall. Second, our participants  
37  
38  
39 361 were from a single province and, therefore, we cannot generalize the results to assume that  
40  
41  
42 362 they apply to all of the elderly in China. In order to make our study more convincing, we will  
43  
44 363 introduce more widely-used measuring tools including ADL into our research and conduct  
45  
46  
47 364 the same research nationwide in future.

48  
49 365

## 52 366 **Conclusion**

54  
55 367 At present, in China, the enormous pressure of elder care has shifted increasingly from  
56  
57 368 family to society, and it is difficult for institutions to take on the heavy burden of care.  
58  
59  
60 369 However, the tradition of filial piety in Chinese culture is restricting the willingness of the

1  
2  
3 370 elderly to receive institutional elder care. Therefore, we should vigorously develop  
4  
5 371 community-centered intensive home-based elder-care services by improving the quality and  
6  
7  
8 372 availability of home health services by expanding investment in the community. Only in this  
9  
10  
11 373 way can we meet the need for both formal and informal elder care and the need to cater to  
12  
13 374 the Chinese traditional morality.

### 15 375 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

17  
18 376 Ethics approval for this study was granted by the Institutional Research Board of Harbin  
19  
20  
21 377 Medical University. The data were collected anonymously. Respondents were assured that  
22  
23  
24 378 participation in this survey was voluntary, with the completion of the questionnaire being  
25  
26 379 taken as consent to participate.

### 28 380 **Availability of data and materials**

30  
31 381 Data will not be shared because we promised not to disclose their information when  
32  
33  
34 382 respondents signed the informed consent form.

### 36 383 **Competing interests**

38  
39 384 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

### 41 385 **Funding**

43  
44 386 This study was funded by the National Science Foundation of China (NSFC) and China  
45  
46  
47 387 Postdoctoral Science Foundation, Contract No.71573066/G0308 and No.2018M631967.

### 49 388 **Contributors**

51  
52 389 LL conceived and designed the experiments; ZW WY performed the experiments; XS, XZ  
53  
54  
55 390 analyzed the data; SH, YX, LL contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools; ZW wrote the  
56  
57 391 paper. ZW, WY, XS provided technical support. LL critically revised the paper. All authors  
58  
59  
60 392 checked and proof-read the final version of manuscript.

1  
2  
3 393 **Acknowledgement**

4  
5 394 The authors would like to thank all participants in this study. We also thank Dr. Li Li for her  
6  
7  
8 395 guidance on the writing of the manuscript. We thank International Science Editing  
9  
10 396 (<http://www.internationalscienceediting.com>) for editing this manuscript.  
11  
12

13 397  
14  
15 398 **References**

- 17  
18  
19 [1] Chen, Lin , and W. J. Han . "Shanghai: Front-Runner of Community-Based Elder Care in China."  
20 Journal of Aging & Social Policy (2016):08959420.2016.1151310.  
21  
22 [2] CSY, 2018. China Statistical Yearbook. China Statistical Publishing House, Beijing  
23  
24 [3] The three departments released the results of the fourth sampling survey on the living conditions of  
25 urban and rural elderly in China[EB/ OL].Ministry of Civil Affairs Portal  
26  
27 [4] Hesketh T, Zhou X , Wang Y . The End of the One-Child Policy: Lasting Implications for China[J].  
28 Jama, 2015, 314(24):1-2.  
29  
30 [5] HD L,W R, and YJ R. Analysis of the number of only children and family structure since the family  
31 planning policy. Statistics & Decision. 13(2018).DOI:10.13546/j.cnki.tjyj.2018.13.022  
32  
33 [6] LB Q. The status quo and prospect of the development of China's old-age service industry[J]. Journal  
34 of Fujian Party School, 2016(3):75-83.DOI:10.15993/j.cnki.cn35-1198/c.2016.03.016  
35  
36 [7] Nie J B . Erosion of Eldercare in China: a Socio-Ethical Inquiry in Aging, Elderly Suicide and the  
37 Government's Responsibilities in the Context of the One-Child Policy[J]. Ageing International, 2016,  
38 41(4):1-16.  
39  
40 [8] MY Y, AQ F.The Construction of New Community Nursing Home Model from the Perspective of  
41 Active Aging[J]. Study and Practice, 2018(2).DOI:10.19624/j.cnki.cn42-1005/c.2018.02.014  
42  
43 [9] Mun S , Park K , Baek Y , et al. Interrelationships among common symptoms in the elderly and their  
44 effects on health-related quality of life: a cross-sectional study in rural Korea[J]. Health and Quality of  
45 Life Outcomes, 2016, 14(1).  
46  
47 [10] Sun W , Aodeng S , Tanimoto Y , et al. Quality of life (QOL) of the community-dwelling elderly and  
48 associated factors: A population-based study in urban areas of China[J]. Archives of Gerontology and  
49 Geriatrics, 2015, 60(2):311-316.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



[11] Y C. Comparison of health status, social support and quality of life of elderly living alone and non-inhabited in Shanghai[J].Chinese Journal of Gerontology, 2017,37(24).

DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1005-9202.2017.24.090

[12]Jean Yeung, Wei-Jun, and Leng Leng Thang. “Long-Term Care for Older Adults in ASEAN Plus Three: The Roles of Family, Community, and the State in Addressing Unmet Eldercare Needs.” *Journal of Aging and Health*, vol. 30, no. 10, Dec. 2018, pp. 1499–1515, doi:10.1177/0898264318796345.

[13] Deusdad B A , Pace C , Anttonen A . Facing the Challenges in the Development of Long-Term Care for Older People in Europe in the Context of an Economic Crisis[J]. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 2016, 42(2):144-150.

[14] YA J, F ZHOU, ZE ZHAI. The Influence of Residential Patterns on the Elderly's Depression—The Moderating Role of Community[J].*Population Journal*,2017,39(3):66-77.

DOI:10.16405/j.cnki.1004-129X.2017.03.006

[15] Kwak Y , Chung H , Kim Y . Differences in Health-related Quality of Life and Mental Health by Living Arrangement among Korean Elderly in the KNHANES 2010–2012[J]. *Iranian Journal of Public Health*, 2017, 46(11):1512-1520.

[16] XP SHI, HJ ZHANG, J SUI. The investigation of long-term care mode selection and its influencing factors among disabled elderl[J].*Modern Preventive Medicine*, 2016, 43(24):4467-4470.

[17] XC LIU,LQ YANG,YY LUO.Demand Analysis for Integrated Medical and Nursing Care among Community-dwelling Elderly People Based on Andersen's Behavioral Model [J/OL].*Chinese General Practice*:1-8[2018-11-30].

[18] EP LIU, QL ZHANG. Inter-generational Relations, Socioeconomic Status and Preferences for Institutional Care of the Eldly—An Empirical Analysis Based on China's Longitudinal Aging Social Survey (2012)[J].*Population and Development*, 2018(3):55-64.

[19] FX HU, MN LI, D ZHANG. Empirical Study on Rural Elderly's Demand Will for Patterns of Pension Service and Its Influencing Factors—A Case Study from ShanXi Province[J].*Journal of Xi'an Jiaotong University(Social Sciences)*,2016,36(4):57-64.DOI10.15896/j.xjtuskxb.201604009

[20] JJ SUN, D SHEN.The Intention for the Old-age Support of the Chinese Elderly and Its Differences between Urban and Rural Elderly:A Study Based on the China Longitudinal Aging Social Survey[J].*Population & Economics*, 2017(2).DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1000-4149.2017.02.002

[21] L QIU. Study on the Influencing Factors of the Satisfaction of Community Old-age Services: A Case

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Study of Shanghai[J]. *The World of Survey and Research*, 2016(2):15-18.DOI :  
5 10.13778/j.cnki.11-3705/c.2016.02.003  
6  
7 [22] Qian, Yangyang , et al. "Utilisation willingness for institutional care by the elderly: a comparative  
8 study of empty nesters and non-empty nesters in Shandong, China." *BMJ Open* 8.8(2018).  
9  
10 [23] Connolly S, Rosato M. House value as an indicator of cumulative wealth is strongly related to  
11 morbidity and mortality risk in older people: a census-based cross-sectional and longitudinal study[J].  
12 *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 2010, 39(2):383-391.  
13  
14 [24] YH WANG, YN FENG, WW HOU. Analysis for Cause of the disability old people aid to Xinjiang  
15 Choose Long-term Home care[J].*Population and Development*, 2013, 19(2):72-78.  
16  
17 [25] Q ZHANG, D ZHANG. Study on Select of Pension Methods of the Elderly and Its influencing  
18 Factors in Beijing [J].*Research on Economics and Management*, 2014(7):102-106.  
19  
20 DOI:10.13502/j.cnki.issn1000-7636.2014.07.012  
21  
22 [26] Butterfield M C, Williams A R, Beebe T, et al. A two-county comparison of the HOUSES index on  
23 predicting self-rated health[J]. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* (1979-), 2011,  
24 65(3):254-259.  
25  
26 [27] B HU, B ZHU, Y LIU.Choices of old-age care and influence factors among empty nest elderly,  
27 Xuzhou[J].*Modern Preventive Medicine*, 2018,45(01):90-94.  
28  
29 [28] Liu H , Gao S , Wang J . The Impact of Elder-Care Patterns on Chinese Elderly's Health and  
30 Well-Being. (In Chinese. With English summary.)[J]. *Economic Research Journal*, 2011.  
31  
32 [29] D ZHANG. A Study on the Aging Willingness and Influencing Factors of the Aged in Beijing's  
33 Institutions[J].*The World of Survey and Research*, 2017(10):23-29.  
34  
35 DOI: 10.13778/j.cnki.11-3705/c.2017.10.004  
36  
37 [30] Bhat M A, Rather T A. Socio-Economic Factors and Mental Health of Young People in India and  
38 China: An Elusive Link with Globalization[J]. *Asian Social Work & Policy Review*, 2012, 6(1):1-22.  
39  
40 [31] Simon M A, Chen R, Chang E S, et al. The association between filial piety and suicidal ideation:  
41 findings from a community-dwelling Chinese aging population.[J]. *Journals of Gerontology*, 2014, 69  
42 Suppl 2(Suppl 2):S90.  
43  
44 [32] Dong, Xinqi & Xu, Ying. (2016). Filial Piety among Global Chinese Adult Children: A Systematic  
45 Review. *Research & Reviews: Journal of Social Sciences*. 2.  
46  
47 [33] LW ZHANG,YB CENG,Y FANG.Study on Pension Methods and its Influential Factors among the  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 Elderly by Using Andersen Behavior Model[J].Chinese Journal of Health Statistics, 2017, 34  
5 (05):721-725.

6  
7 [34] Li W W . Housing, aged care and migration: the housing careers of older Chinese migrants and its  
8 implications\ud[J]. Oceania Regional Congress of Geriatrics & Gerontology, 2011.

9  
10 [35] HP LV, ZG LI.Confucius'View of Filial Piety and the Way of Family Pension[J].Population Research,  
11 2008, 32(2):81-86.Doi:10.3969/j.issn.1000-6087.2008.02.011

12  
13 [36] Chen Z. Knowledge and Perceptions: Chinese Older Adults' Willingness to Use Institutional Elder  
14 Care[J]. 2011.

15  
16 [37] Zhan H J , Feng Z , Chen Z , et al. The role of the family in institutional long-term care: cultural  
17 management of filial piety in China[J]. International Journal of Social Welfare, 2011, 20(Supplement  
18 s1):0-0.

19  
20 [38] Qian Y, Jie C, Ge D, et al. Gender difference in utilization willingness of institutional care among the  
21 single seniors: evidence from rural Shandong, China[J]. International Journal for Equity in Health, 2017,  
22 16(1):77.

23  
24 [39] Rolls L, Seymour J E, Froggatt K A, et al. Older people living alone at the end of life in the UK:  
25 Research and policy challenges[J]. Palliative Medicine, 2011, 25(6):650-7.

26  
27 [40] Chen Y, Hicks A, While A E. Loneliness and social support of older people in China: a systematic  
28 literature review.[J]. Health & Social Care in the Community, 2014, 22(2):113.

29  
30 [41] Lim L L, Kua E H. Living alone, loneliness, and psychological well-being of older persons in  
31 singapore[J]. Current Gerontology & Geriatrics Research, 2011, 2011(1):673181.

32  
33 [42] Sok S R, Yun E K. A comparison of physical health status, self-esteem, family support and  
34 health-promoting behaviours between aged living alone and living with family in Korea[J]. Journal of  
35 Clinical Nursing, 2011, 20(11-12):1606–1612.

36  
37 [43] Bonsang E . Does informal care from children to their elderly parents substitute for formal care in  
38 Europe?[J]. Journal of Health Economics, 2009, 28(1):0-154.

39  
40 [44] BH TIAN, CY WANG. Structural Characteristics and Determinant Factors of the Demand of the  
41 elderly For Social care Services-based on the Analysis on the Replacement Mechanism of Family  
42 Supporting For the Elderly[J].China Rural Survey, 2.014(04):2-17+95.

43  
44 [45] JD DING.The Home Care Service:Recognizing Mistakes, Rational Principles and Perfecting  
45 Measures[J].Journal of Renmin University of China, 2013, 27(2):20-26.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 [46] Y JIE, Rosenberg M W , Y CHENG, et al. Aging at home and the intent to relocate in Beijing [J].  
5 Progress in Geography, 2015, 34(12):1577-1585.  
6  
7 [47] JJ SUN, D SHEN.The Intention for the Old-age Support of the Chinese Elderly and Its Differences  
8 between Urban and Rural Elderly:A Study Based on the China Longitudinal Aging  
9 SocialSurvey[J].Population&Economics,2017(2):11-20.  
10  
11  
12  
13 DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1000-4149.2017.02.002  
14  
15 [48] WJ ZHANG, W MENG.A Study on the Factors Associated with Preferences for Institutional Care of  
16 the Elderly in Urban China: Evidences from Xicheng District of Beijing[J]Population & Economics,  
17 2014(6):22-34.  
18  
19  
20  
21 [49] W MA, XG XU.Reflection on the Perfection of Signing Service of Family Physician From the  
22 Perspective of Contract Law[J].Chinese General Practice, 2015(16):1980-1983.  
23  
24  
25 [50] SJ WU, JR LIU,S QIU.Studying on the Present Situation of Family Doctor Door-to-Door Service  
26 Taking Guangzhou as an Example[J].Chinese Primary Health Care, 2015,  
27 29(8):1-3.DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1001-568X.2015.08.0001  
28  
29  
30  
31 [51] JY CHEN, MX JIANG, Y BAO.Effect of Family Doctor Contract Service on Health Management of  
32 Poor Elderlies in Urban Community[J].Chinese General Practice, 2013,  
33 16(34):3355-3357.DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1007-9572.2013.10.021  
34  
35  
36  
37 [52] W LU , YM ZHANG.The performance evaluation based on the demand side of the family doctor  
38 contract service: A focus on chronic diseases[J].Chinese Journal of Health Policy, 2016, 9(8):23-30.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies***

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	Line1-2, P1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	Line21-57, P1-3
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	Line58-97, P3-5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	Line98-117, P5
<b>Methods</b>			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	Line119-129,P6
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	Line135-165, P6-7
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	Line130-134, P6
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	Line350-354, P21

Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	Line167-173, P7-8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	Line121-128, P6
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	
<b>Results</b>			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	Line176-195, P8-9
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	Line178-192,P8-9
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	Line197-232, P11-15
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	

		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	
<b>Discussion</b>			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	Line235-252, P15-16
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	Line350-358, P21
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	Line257-349, P17-21
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	Line360-368, P21-22
<b>Other information</b>			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	Line379-381, P22

\*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at [www.strobe-statement.org](http://www.strobe-statement.org).