# RESEARCH ARTICLE

# The relationship between caregiver burden and self-care agency of pregnant women with 0-6-year-old children

# Sibel Ergün 💿

Department of Pediatric Nursing, Balıkesir University Faculty of Health Sciences, Balıkesir, Turkey

#### Correspondence

Sibel Ergün, Department of Pediatric Nursing, Balıkesir University Faculty of Health Sciences, Çağış campus, 10100 Balıkesir, Turkey. Email: sibel.ergun@balikesir.edu.tr

#### **Funding information**

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article

#### **Abstract**

Aim: This study aims to determine the relationship between the burden of care and self-care abilities of pregnant women with 0–6-year-old children and the factors affecting them.

Design: A cross-sectional questionnaire survey.

**Methods:** This study consisted of 348 pregnant women over the age of 18, with children between the ages of 0–6.

**Results:** The study determined that the self-care ability mean scores of mothers who have two or more children between the ages of 0-6 were low and the caregiver burden mean scores were high. The researcher found a negative correlation between the self-care ability scale scores and caregiver burden scale scores of pregnant women included in the study. These results are statistically significant and valuable in terms of revealing information about the caregiver burden and self-care ability of pregnant women with 0-6-year-old children.

# KEYWORDS

caregiver burden, child, mother, pregnant, self-care

# 1 | INTRODUCTION

Having a baby is one of the most important decisions in one's life. Pregnancy is the most important characteristic of a woman, and it has an important place in the life of the woman because it ensures the continuity of the generation (Güleşen & Yıldız, 2013). The global total fertility rate is 2.5 births per woman (United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, 2020). According to TSI (Turkish Statistical Institute) results, the total fertility rate is 1.88 births per woman in Turkey (TSI, 2019).

The gestation period affects the biological structure of women and changes in psychological, social and family life (Ayoubi et al., 2017). Having a healthy gestation period is important for both the woman and the baby to be born. The psychological state and lifestyle of the woman affects not only the pregnancy but also her

psychological and emotional state during pregnancy and the postpartum period. Risks during pregnancy may adversely affect her for the sake of both her own health and of her baby (Barua & Junaid, 2015). Pregnancy is a special period in which self-care agency is desired and emphasized in the literature. Pregnant women should have sufficient self-care agency to have a healthy pregnancy and to meet their antenatal care needs (Çelik Sis & Derya Aksoy, 2019). Although pregnancy is a natural process, it is a period in which the risk of disease and death is higher than other life processes in a woman's life (Taşkın, 2017). Also, pregnancy will cause difficulties for women to carry out their daily life activities and increase the caregiver burden and the responsibility of the pregnant woman in the family because of the increase in the number of children. Thus, pregnant women will spare less time for themselves, and their self-care agency will be adversely affected (Saydam Karaca et al., 2007).

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

© 2021 The Authors. *Nursing Open* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd.



# 1053

# 2 | BACKGROUND

Pregnancy affects the biophysical, psychological and socioeconomic processes in the life of the woman. Therefore, they face difficulties in daily life activities and responsibilities. In this context, it may cause a negative perception about their self-care agency. To maintain a healthy life, individuals need self-care.

According to Orem, self-care includes activities to maintain one's own health and well-being at every stage of life (Orem, 2012; Silva et al., 2017). Orem stated that many factors affect the level of self-care, and people may need partial or complete help to fulfil their self-care needs in various life periods and in some special cases (such as pregnancy). Pregnancy is one of the important periods that self-care is a need (Orem, 2012). Although pregnancy is a natural process, women's life is at a higher risk of disease and death than other life processes in this gestation period (Taşkın, 2017). Also, pregnancy will cause difficulties for women to carry out their daily life activities and increase the caregiver burden and the responsibility of the pregnant woman in the family because of the increase in the number of children (Saydam Karaca et al., 2007). Thus, pregnant women will spare less time for themselves, and this will affect their self-care negatively.

In this context, pregnant women who have children may experience changes in their caregiver role and inadequacy in self-care. The positive experiences with the mother who gives primary care to children support the child's brain development, especially in the 0-6 age period. The children, who are supported more in this period, become more successful in school and adulthood (Bayoğlu, 2015; Yavuzer, 2016). Thanks to their "mother" who gives them primary care, children discover their environment: they learn how to behave by observing their mother's movements and behaviours. In this context, they know and learn the world through the actions of their mother. Supporting women with children between the ages of 0-6 during pregnancy will improve the child's cognitive, motor, linguistic, social and emotional development areas (Yavuzer, 2016). Considering the effect of the mother who gives primary care on the child's development, the self-care agency and caregiver burdens of women have an important place in the development of the children. Self-care agency and caregiver burden, which are not studied much among pregnant women in Turkey, are important concepts to protect the individual from diseases, maintain and improve their health. Individuals need to strengthen their health consciousness and develop behaviours and skills that will enable them to use their health skills to the fullest, to lead a satisfying life both during the gestation period and after pregnancy. Although there are studies on self-care agency of pregnancy in the literature, there is no study investigating the relationship between self-care agency and caregiver burden of pregnant women with 0-6-year-old children. Therefore, the current study is of importance because it presents results obtained from a point of view that is new to the literature.

In this regard, this study aims to seek the answers to the following questions about pregnant women with at least one 0–6-year-old child:

- 1. Do sociodemographic characteristics affect self-care agency and caregiver burden?
- 2. What is the level of the caregiver burden?
- 3. What is the level of the self-care agency?
- 4. What is the relationship between caregiver burden and self-care agency?

# 3 | METHODS

# 3.1 | Study design and participants

This is a cross-sectional and descriptive study. The sample of the study consisted of pregnant women older than 18 years, with one or more children aged 0–6 years, who applied to the obstetric clinic of a public hospital between 02.01.2018–04.01.2019. The study included 348 pregnant women and used an effect size of 45%, a significance level of 0.05, and a power of 91%. The purpose of the study was explained to the pregnant women and they were asked to fill in the questionnaires. It took 15 min to fill out each questionnaire.

# 3.2 | Instruments

The personal information form, self-care agency scale and caregiver burden scale were used to collect data.

# 3.2.1 | Individual information form

The individual information consisted of 12 variables. This includes questions related to mother-child and current pregnancy such as a gestational week, age, marital status, body mass index, educational status, profession, income status, the place where they lived for the longest period, the number of people in the family, the person to support during pregnancy, the presence of another \care-receiver at home, health problems in pregnancy, prenatal care, the number of 0-6-year-old children and whether other children have a disability.

# 3.2.2 | Self-care agency scale

Kearney and Fleischer developed the scale in 1979, which is used to determine people's abilities to look after themselves. Nahcivan made Turkish validity and reliability study in 1993 (Nahcivan, 2015). The scale, which focuses on the assessment of individuals' self-care actions on their own, is a 5-point Likert type. Each expression can score from 0–4 points. The highest score that can be obtained from the scale is 140, and it is considered that the self-care agency increases as the score increases. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of this study is 0.77. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient is 0.81.

# 3.2.3 | Caregiver burden scale

Zarit, Reever and Bach-Peterson developed the scale in 1980. İnci and Erdem carried out Turkish validity and reliability study in 2006 (İnci & Erdem, 2008). The scale consists of 22 statements that determine the effect of those who need care on the life of caregivers. The scale has a Likert type assessment ranging from 0–4 as "never," "rarely," "sometimes," "quite often" and "almost always." The minimum score that can be obtained from the scale is 0, and the maximum score is 88. The items in the scale are mostly focused on the social and emotional areas. A high scale score indicates that the problem experienced is high. The scores obtained were evaluated as (0–20) low/no load, (21–40) mild/moderate load, (41–60) medium/high load and (61–88) overload. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of the scale is 0.95. In this study, Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient is 0.91.

# 3.3 | Data analysis

The data were analyzed using the SPSS package program. Demographic and descriptive data were evaluated with number-percentage. A t-test was used to determine the difference between the two groups. A one-way analysis of variance test was used for intergroup comparisons of the parameters when there were more than two groups. Bonferroni Post Hoc test was used to determine the group that caused the difference. The degree of significance was taken as p < .05.

# 3.4 | Ethical considerations

Before the study, the Research Ethics Committee approval was obtained from Balıkesir University Clinical Research Ethics Board (Decision date and no.29.11.2019-2017/141) and the managers' approval of the health institution. Also, before the interviews, the purpose of the study was explained to the participants, and their consent to participate in the study was obtained. The anonymity of participants and the confidentiality of the information provided were maintained throughout the study and in subsequent public presentations of results. Participants had the right to withdraw at any stage of the study. Furthermore, all of the requirements established in the Helsinki Declaration were followed, thus guaranteeing against future ethical problems that could arise from the research.

# 4 | RESULTS

# 4.1 | Sample characteristics

In the study, 48.3% of the pregnant women (mean age  $28.41 \pm 4.13$ ) were between the ages of 25–29, 47.1% were primary school graduates, 71.3% were housewives, 44.8% were living in the city center and 71.3% had no chronic disease. The results revealed that 58.6%

of the pregnant women had three to four people in their families, 42.5% did not have another individual to share the responsibility at home and 86.2% had one child younger than 6 years. This study had found that 77.0% of the participants were in the third trimester of pregnancy, 55.2% of them did not attend a special education about pregnancy, 89.7% of the pregnancies were planned and 80.5% of them were followed up at the state hospital.

# 4.2 | Evaluation of scale scores with sociodemographic variables

Evaluation of scale scores with sociodemographic variables pointed out a statistically significant difference between the age group of the pregnant women and their average scores of self-care agency and caregiver burden scales. Further analysis showed that difference occurred due to the 20–24 age group and 30 and over age group. Pregnant women in the over 30 age group had a lower mean score on the self-care agency scale and a higher mean score on the caregiver burden scale (p < .001).

A statistically significant difference was found between the education level and the self-care agency and caregiver burden means (Table 1). Advanced analysis, which was conducted to find out which group causes the difference in education level, revealed that university graduates and elementary school graduates caused the difference. The self-care agency mean scores of the university graduate pregnant women were higher, and the caregiver burden mean scores were lower (p < .001).

A statistically significant difference was found between the profession of pregnant women and their self-care agency and caregiver burden means. Bonferroni test, which was conducted to find out which profession group the difference originated from, showed that the difference was caused by pregnant women and housewives. The study revealed that the self-care agency mean scores of the pregnant women who were civil servants were higher, and the caregiver burden mean scores were lower (p < .001) (Table 1).

As can be seen in Table 1, there was a statistically significant difference between the place where the pregnant women live and the caregiver burden scores. Further analysis showed that the difference was due to the pregnant women living in the city center and those living in the district. The mean scores of those living in the city center were statistically significantly higher (p < .05). This study had determined that the caregiver burden mean scores of those with chronic disease were higher, and the difference was statistically significant (p < .05).

Evaluation of the scale scores of the participants according to their family characteristics showed that the self-care agency mean scores of those with three to four people in their family were higher and the caregiver burden mean scores were lower (p < .001). A statistically significant difference was found between being supported by a family member and the caregiver burden average scores. Further analysis revealed that the difference was due to pregnant women who received support from their partners and pregnant

Variables         N (348)         %         Self-care agency scale X ± 5D         Caregiver burden scale X ± 5D           Age, y(avg. age: 28.41 ± 4.13)         34.5         98.00 ± 12.98         27.46 ± 13.34           25-29         168         48.3         105.09 ± 14.57         27.69 ± 11.32           >30         120         34.5         44.20 ± 6.49         68.20 ± 8.85           F*         94.426         54.743           p         ,000         ,000           Elementary education level         164         47.1         77.12 ± 30.14         45.46 ± 22.36           High school         124         35.6         83.83 ± 30.25         42.54 ± 21.90           University         60         17,2         96.60 ± 28.83         29.20 ± 20           F*         9.381         12.794           p         ,000         ,000           Occupation          9.381         12.794           Housewife         248         71.3         79.19 ± 31.09         43.75 ± 22.59           Goverment employee         36         10.3         101.11 ± 25.28         25.22 ± 12.96           Self-employee         64         18.4         86.87 ± 27.89         42.46 ± 21.01           F*								
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Variables	N (348)	%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
25-29 $168$ $48.3$ $105.09 \pm 14.57$ $27.69 \pm 11.32$ >30 $120$ $34.5$ $44.20 \pm 6.49$ $68.20 \pm 8.85$ $F^*$ $94.426$ $54.743$ $p$ $,000$ $,000$ Education level       Elementary education $164$ $47.1$ $77.12 \pm 30.14$ $45.46 \pm 22.36$ High school $124$ $35.6$ $83.83 \pm 30.25$ $42.54 \pm 21.90$ University $60$ $17.2$ $96.60 \pm 28.83$ $29.20 \pm 20$ $F^*$ $9.381$ $12.794$ $p$ $,000$ $,000$ Occupation $,000$ $,000$ Housewife $248$ $,000$ $,000$ Goverment employee $,000$ $,000$ $,000$ Self-employee $,000$ $,000$ $,000$ $,000$ $,000$ $,000$ Place of Longest Residence $,000$ $,000$ Village $,000$ $,000$ Province $,000$ $,000$ $,000$ $,000$ $,000$ $,000$	Age, y(avg. age: 28.41 ± 4.13)							
>30       120       34.5 $44.20 \pm 6.49$ $68.20 \pm 8.85$ $F^*$ 94.426 $54.743$ p       ,000       ,000         Education level       Elementary education       164 $47.1$ $77.12 \pm 30.14$ $45.46 \pm 22.36$ High school       124       35,6 $83.83 \pm 30.25$ $42.54 \pm 21.90$ University       60 $17.2$ $96.60 \pm 28.83$ $29.20 \pm 20$ $F^*$ 9.381 $12.794$ p       ,000       ,000         Occupation       ,000       ,000         Housewife       248       71.3 $79.19 \pm 31.09$ $43.75 \pm 22.59$ Governent employee       36       10.3 $101.11 \pm 25.28$ $25.22 \pm 12.96$ Self-employee       64       18.4 $86.87 \pm 27.89$ $42.46 \pm 21.01$ $F^*$ 9.095       11.734 $9.000$ $9.000$ Place of Longest Residence       Village       84       24.1 $77.95 \pm 31.23$ $41.38 \pm 24.13$ $9.000$ Province       156       44.8 $82.33 \pm 31.01$ $45.10 \pm 22.55$ $7.000$ $7.000$ Province	20-24y	60	17.2	$98.00 \pm 12.98$	$27.46 \pm 13.34$			
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	25-29	168	48.3	$105.09 \pm 14.57$	$27.69 \pm 11.32$			
p       ,000       ,000         Education level       Elementary education       164       47,1       77.12 ± 30.14       45.46 ± 22.36         High school       124       35,6       83.83 ± 30.25       42.54 ± 21.90         University       60       17,2       96.60 ± 28.83       29.20 ± 20         F*       9.381       12.794         p       ,000       ,000         Occupation       Housewife       248       71.3       79.19 ± 31.09       43.75 ± 22.59         Goverment employee       36       10.3       101.11 ± 25.28       25.22 ± 12.96         Self-employee       64       18.4       86.87 ± 27.89       42.46 ± 21.01         F*       9.095       11.734       <	>30	120	34.5	$44.20 \pm 6.49$	$68.20 \pm 8.85$			
Education level   Elementary education   164	F*			94.426	54.743			
Elementary education 164 47,1 77.12 $\pm$ 30.14 45.46 $\pm$ 22.36 High school 124 35,6 83.83 $\pm$ 30.25 42.54 $\pm$ 21.90 University 60 17,2 96.60 $\pm$ 28.83 29.20 $\pm$ 20 $F^*$ 9.381 12.794 p 9.381 12.794 p 9.000 9.000 Occupation Housewife 248 71.3 79.19 $\pm$ 31.09 43.75 $\pm$ 22.59 Goverment employee 36 10.3 101.11 $\pm$ 25.28 25.22 $\pm$ 12.96 Self-employee 64 18.4 86.87 $\pm$ 27.89 42.46 $\pm$ 21.01 $F^*$ 9.095 11.734 p 9.095 11.734 p 9.095 11.734 p 9.095 11.734 p 9.090 9.000 Place of Longest Residence Village 84 24.1 77.95 $\pm$ 31.23 41.38 $\pm$ 24.13 District 108 31.0 87.48 $\pm$ 29.35 36.77 $\pm$ 19.10 Province 156 44.8 82.33 $\pm$ 31.01 45.10 $\pm$ 22.55 $F^*$ 2,341 4.596 p 9.098 9.011 Chronic Disease Status Yes 100 28.7 86.22 $\pm$ 30.05 40.51 $\pm$ 12.42 No 248 71.3 74.56 $\pm$ 30.77 44.36 $\pm$ 17.06 $\pm$ 1.411 6.271	р			,000	,000			
High school       124       35,6 $83.83 \pm 30.25$ $42.54 \pm 21.90$ University       60 $17,2$ $96.60 \pm 28.83$ $29.20 \pm 20$ $F^*$ 9.381 $12.794$ p       ,000       ,000         Occupation       Housewife $248$ $71.3$ $79.19 \pm 31.09$ $43.75 \pm 22.59$ Goverment employee       36 $10.3$ $101.11 \pm 25.28$ $25.22 \pm 12.96$ Self-employee       64 $18.4$ $86.87 \pm 27.89$ $42.46 \pm 21.01$ $F^*$ 9.095 $11.734$ $9.995$ $11.734$ p       ,000       ,000 $9000$ Place of Longest Residence         Village       84 $24.1$ $77.95 \pm 31.23$ $41.38 \pm 24.13$ District $108$ $31.0$ $87.48 \pm 29.35$ $36.77 \pm 19.10$ Province $156$ $44.8$ $82.33 \pm 31.01$ $45.10 \pm 22.55$ $F^*$ $2,341$ $4.596$ $9.96$ $9.911$ Chronic Disease Status         Yes $100$ $28.7$ $86.22 \pm 30.05$ $40.51 \pm 12.42$	Education level							
University 60 17,2 96.60 $\pm$ 28.83 29.20 $\pm$ 20 $\pm$ 20 $\pm$ 7 $\pm$ 9.381 12.794 $\pm$ 9.000 ,000   Occupation   Housewife 248 71.3 79.19 $\pm$ 31.09 43.75 $\pm$ 22.59 Goverment employee 36 10.3 101.11 $\pm$ 25.28 25.22 $\pm$ 12.96 Self-employee 64 18.4 86.87 $\pm$ 27.89 42.46 $\pm$ 21.01 $\pm$ 9.095 11.734 $\pm$ 9.095 11.734 $\pm$ 9.090 ,000 Place of Longest Residence   Village 84 24.1 77.95 $\pm$ 31.23 41.38 $\pm$ 24.13 District 108 31.0 87.48 $\pm$ 29.35 36.77 $\pm$ 19.10 Province 156 44.8 82.33 $\pm$ 31.01 45.10 $\pm$ 22.55 $\pm$ 7 $\pm$ 2,341 4.596 $\pm$ 9.098 ,011 Chronic Disease Status Yes 100 28.7 86.22 $\pm$ 30.05 40.51 $\pm$ 12.42 No 248 71.3 74.56 $\pm$ 30.77 44.36 $\pm$ 17.06 $\pm$ 1.411 6.271	Elementary education	164	47,1	$77.12 \pm 30.14$	$45.46 \pm 22.36$			
$F^*$ 9,381       12.794         p       ,000       ,000         Occupation       Thousewife       248       71.3       79.19 ± 31.09       43.75 ± 22.59         Goverment employee       36       10.3       101.11 ± 25.28       25.22 ± 12.96         Self-employee       64       18.4       86.87 ± 27.89       42.46 ± 21.01 $F^*$ 9.095       11.734         p       000       ,000         Place of Longest Residence         Village       84       24.1       77.95 ± 31.23       41.38 ± 24.13         District       108       31.0       87.48 ± 29.35       36.77 ± 19.10         Province       156       44.8       82.33 ± 31.01       45.10 ± 22.55         F*       2,341       4.596         p       ,098       ,011         Chronic Disease Status         Yes<	High school	124	35,6	$83.83 \pm 30.25$	$42.54 \pm 21.90$			
p       ,000       ,000         Occupation         Housewife       248       71.3       79.19 ± 31.09       43.75 ± 22.59         Goverment employee       36       10.3 $101.11 \pm 25.28$ $25.22 \pm 12.96$ Self-employee       64       18.4 $86.87 \pm 27.89$ $42.46 \pm 21.01$ F*       9.095 $11.734$ p         Place of Longest Residence         Village       84       24.1 $77.95 \pm 31.23$ $41.38 \pm 24.13$ District       108       31.0 $87.48 \pm 29.35$ $36.77 \pm 19.10$ Province       156       44.8 $82.33 \pm 31.01$ $45.10 \pm 22.55$ F*       2,341       4.596         p       ,098       ,011         Chronic Disease Status         Yes       100       28.7 $86.22 \pm 30.05$ $40.51 \pm 12.42$ No       248       71.3 $74.56 \pm 30.77$ $44.36 \pm 17.06$ t**       1.411 $6.271$	University	60	17,2	$96.60 \pm 28.83$	29.20 ± 20			
Occupation         Housewife $248$ $71.3$ $79.19 \pm 31.09$ $43.75 \pm 22.59$ Goverment employee $36$ $10.3$ $101.11 \pm 25.28$ $25.22 \pm 12.96$ Self-employee $64$ $18.4$ $86.87 \pm 27.89$ $42.46 \pm 21.01$ $F^*$ $9.095$ $11.734$ $p$ $9.000$ $9.000$ Place of Longest Residence         Village $84$ $24.1$ $77.95 \pm 31.23$ $41.38 \pm 24.13$ District $108$ $31.0$ $87.48 \pm 29.35$ $36.77 \pm 19.10$ Province $156$ $44.8$ $82.33 \pm 31.01$ $45.10 \pm 22.55$ $F^*$ $2,341$ $4.596$ $p$ $9.098$ $9.011$ Chronic Disease Status         Yes $100$ $28.7$ $86.22 \pm 30.05$ $40.51 \pm 12.42$ No $248$ $71.3$ $74.56 \pm 30.77$ $44.36 \pm 17.06$ $t^**$ $1.411$ $6.271$	F*			9.381	12.794			
Housewife       248       71.3 $79.19 \pm 31.09$ $43.75 \pm 22.59$ Goverment employee       36 $10.3$ $101.11 \pm 25.28$ $25.22 \pm 12.96$ Self-employee       64 $18.4$ $86.87 \pm 27.89$ $42.46 \pm 21.01$ $F^*$ $9.095$ $11.734$ p $9.095$ $11.734$ p $9.000$ $9.000$ Place of Longest Residence         Village $84$ $24.1$ $77.95 \pm 31.23$ $41.38 \pm 24.13$ District $108$ $31.0$ $87.48 \pm 29.35$ $36.77 \pm 19.10$ Province $156$ $44.8$ $82.33 \pm 31.01$ $45.10 \pm 22.55$ $F^*$ $9.098$ $9.011$ Chronic Disease Status         Yes $100$ $28.7$ $86.22 \pm 30.05$ $40.51 \pm 12.42$ No $248$ $71.3$ $74.56 \pm 30.77$ $44.36 \pm 17.06$ $t^**$ $1.411$ $6.271$	р			,000	,000			
Goverment employee 36 10.3 101.11 $\pm$ 25.28 25.22 $\pm$ 12.96 Self-employee 64 18.4 86.87 $\pm$ 27.89 42.46 $\pm$ 21.01 $F^*$ 9.095 11.734 p 9.090 ,000 Place of Longest Residence Village 84 24.1 77.95 $\pm$ 31.23 41.38 $\pm$ 24.13 District 108 31.0 87.48 $\pm$ 29.35 36.77 $\pm$ 19.10 Province 156 44.8 82.33 $\pm$ 31.01 45.10 $\pm$ 22.55 $F^*$ 2,341 4.596 p ,098 ,011 Chronic Disease Status Yes 100 28.7 86.22 $\pm$ 30.05 40.51 $\pm$ 12.42 No 248 71.3 74.56 $\pm$ 30.77 44.36 $\pm$ 17.06 $\pm$ 1.411 6.271	Occupation							
Self-employee       64       18.4 $86.87 \pm 27.89$ $42.46 \pm 21.01$ $F^*$ 9.095 $11.734$ p       ,000       ,000         Place of Longest Residence         Village       84       24.1 $77.95 \pm 31.23$ $41.38 \pm 24.13$ District       108       31.0 $87.48 \pm 29.35$ $36.77 \pm 19.10$ Province       156       44.8 $82.33 \pm 31.01$ $45.10 \pm 22.55$ $F^*$ 2,341       4.596         p       ,098       ,011         Chronic Disease Status         Yes       100       28.7 $86.22 \pm 30.05$ $40.51 \pm 12.42$ No       248 $71.3$ $74.56 \pm 30.77$ $44.36 \pm 17.06$ $t^{**}$ 1.411       6.271	Housewife	248	71.3	$79.19 \pm 31.09$	$43.75 \pm 22.59$			
$F^*$ 9.095       11.734         p       ,000       ,000         Place of Longest Residence         Village       84       24.1       77.95 ± 31.23       41.38 ± 24.13         District       108       31.0       87.48 ± 29.35       36.77 ± 19.10         Province       156       44.8       82.33 ± 31.01       45.10 ± 22.55 $F^*$ 2,341       4.596         p       ,098       ,011         Chronic Disease Status         Yes       100       28.7       86.22 ± 30.05       40.51 ± 12.42         No       248       71.3       74.56 ± 30.77       44.36 ± 17.06         t**       1.411       6.271	Goverment employee	36	10.3	$101.11 \pm 25.28$	$25.22 \pm 12.96$			
No 000       ,000       ,000         Place of Longest Residence         Village       84       24.1       77.95 $\pm$ 31.23       41.38 $\pm$ 24.13         District       108       31.0       87.48 $\pm$ 29.35       36.77 $\pm$ 19.10         Province       156       44.8       82.33 $\pm$ 31.01       45.10 $\pm$ 22.55         F*       2,341       4.596       9         Polymeration         Chronic Disease Status         Yes       100       28.7       86.22 $\pm$ 30.05       40.51 $\pm$ 12.42         No       248       71.3       74.56 $\pm$ 30.77       44.36 $\pm$ 17.06         t**       1.411       6.271	Self-employee	64	18.4	$86.87 \pm 27.89$	$42.46 \pm 21.01$			
Place of Longest Residence         Village       84       24.1 $77.95 \pm 31.23$ $41.38 \pm 24.13$ District       108       31.0 $87.48 \pm 29.35$ $36.77 \pm 19.10$ Province       156       44.8 $82.33 \pm 31.01$ $45.10 \pm 22.55$ $F^*$ 2,341 $4.596$ p       ,098       ,011         Chronic Disease Status         Yes       100       28.7 $86.22 \pm 30.05$ $40.51 \pm 12.42$ No       248 $71.3$ $74.56 \pm 30.77$ $44.36 \pm 17.06$ $t^{**}$ 1.411 $6.271$	F*			9.095	11.734			
Village       84       24.1 $77.95 \pm 31.23$ $41.38 \pm 24.13$ District       108 $31.0$ $87.48 \pm 29.35$ $36.77 \pm 19.10$ Province       156 $44.8$ $82.33 \pm 31.01$ $45.10 \pm 22.55$ $F^*$ 2,341 $4.596$ p       ,098       ,011         Chronic Disease Status       Yes       100 $28.7$ $86.22 \pm 30.05$ $40.51 \pm 12.42$ No       248 $71.3$ $74.56 \pm 30.77$ $44.36 \pm 17.06$ $t^{**}$ 1.411       6.271	p			,000	,000			
District 108 31.0 $87.48 \pm 29.35$ $36.77 \pm 19.10$ Province 156 44.8 $82.33 \pm 31.01$ $45.10 \pm 22.55$ $F^*$ 2,341 4.596 p ,098 ,011 Chronic Disease Status Yes 100 28.7 $86.22 \pm 30.05$ $40.51 \pm 12.42$ No 248 71.3 $74.56 \pm 30.77$ 44.36 $\pm 17.06$ $t^{**}$ 1.411 6.271	Place of Longest Residence							
Province 156 44.8 $82.33 \pm 31.01$ $45.10 \pm 22.55$ $F^*$ 2,341 4.596 p ,098 ,011 Chronic Disease Status Yes 100 28.7 $86.22 \pm 30.05$ 40.51 $\pm 12.42$ No 248 71.3 $74.56 \pm 30.77$ 44.36 $\pm 17.06$ $t^{**}$ 1.411 6.271	Village	84	24.1	$77.95 \pm 31.23$	$41.38 \pm 24.13$			
$F^*$ 2,341       4.596         p       ,098       ,011         Chronic Disease Status         Yes       100       28.7       86.22 ± 30.05       40.51 ± 12.42         No       248       71.3       74.56 ± 30.77       44.36 ± 17.06 $t^{**}$ 1.411       6.271	District	108	31.0	87.48 ± 29.35	$36.77 \pm 19.10$			
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Province	156	44.8	$82.33 \pm 31.01$	$45.10 \pm 22.55$			
Chronic Disease Status  Yes 100 28.7 $86.22 \pm 30.05$ $40.51 \pm 12.42$ No 248 71.3 $74.56 \pm 30.77$ $44.36 \pm 17.06$ $t^{**}$ 1.411 6.271	F*			2,341	4.596			
Yes 100 28.7 $86.22 \pm 30.05$ $40.51 \pm 12.42$ No 248 71.3 $74.56 \pm 30.77$ $44.36 \pm 17.06$ $t^{**}$ 1.411 6.271	p			,098	,011			
No 248 71.3 $74.56 \pm 30.77$ $44.36 \pm 17.06$ $t^{**}$ 1.411 6.271	Chronic Disease Status							
t** 1.411 6.271	Yes	100	28.7	$86.22 \pm 30.05$	$40.51 \pm 12.42$			
2002	No	248	71.3	$74.56 \pm 30.77$	$44.36 \pm 17.06$			
p ,001 ,157	t**			1.411	6.271			
	р			,001	,157			

Note: \*F: one-way ANOVA test, \*\*t: Student t test.

Abbreviations: ANOVA, analysis of variance; SD, standard deviation; X, Mean.

p < .05., p < .01.

women without support. The caregiver burden mean scores of pregnant women who received support from their partner was lower (p < .05). The self-care agency mean scores of women with two or more children younger than 6 years were lower, and the caregiver burden mean scores were higher. The difference between them was statistically significant (p < .001) (Table 2).

Evaluation of the scale scores of the participants according to their pregnancy characteristics showed that the average self-care agency score of pregnant women who were in the 2nd trimester and of those who received education about pregnancy, and of those who had planned their pregnancy, was higher. The difference between them was statistically significant (p < .05) (Table 3).

# 4.3 | Relationship between the self-care agency scale scores and the caregiver burden scale scores

The self-care agency scale scores of the pregnant women ranged between 36-132, and the average was 82.87  $\pm$  30.67. The caregiver burden scale scores of the pregnant women ranged between 9-85, with an average of 41.62  $\pm$  22.17. A negative correlation was determined between the self-care agency scale scores and the caregiver burden scale scores of pregnant women (r = -0.860, p = .035) (Table 4).

# **DISCUSSION**

Pregnancy is a physiological process in which women experience significant biological changes and a complex sociological, psychological and developmental crisis. It is important that a woman embraces her pregnancy and future mother role during this period. This study, which investigated the relationship between self-care agency and caregiver burden of pregnant women with 0-6-year-old children, showed that the self-care agency mean scores of the pregnant women aged 30 and over were lower and the caregiver burden mean scores were higher. Recent studies showed that the self-care agency mean scores of pregnant women between the ages of 20-34 were

Self-care agency Caregiver burden Variables N (348) % scaleX ± SD scale X ± SD Number of people in the family 3-4 204 58.6  $89.13 \pm 28.57$  $35.64 \pm 19.80$ >5 144 41.4  $74.00 \pm 31.45$  $50.08 \pm 22.66$ t\* 15.468 19.391 .000 .000 Family support person Wife 120 34.5  $84.16 \pm 30.14$  $38.13 \pm 22.64$ Mother-father 80 23.0  $85.60 \pm 29.95$  $41.25 \pm 20.32$ None 148 42.5  $80.35 \pm 31.49$  $44.64 \pm 22.46$ F\* 0.922 2.906 .399 .050 р Having children younger than 6 years 1 child 300 86.2  $114.91 \pm 12.68$  $23.75 \pm 4.50$  $77.74 \pm 29.59$ >2 child 48 13.9  $44.48 \pm 22.54$ t\*\* 92.792 144.967 .000 .000 р

TABLE 2 Analysis of scores of self-care agency scale and caregiver burden scale in terms of family characteristics

Note: \*F: oneway ANOVA test, \*\*t: Student t test.

Abbreviations: ANOVA, analysis of variance; SD, standard deviation; X, Mean.

p < .05., p < .01.

Variables	N (348)	%	Self-care agency scale $X \pm SD$	Caregiver burden scale X ± SD						
Gestational trimester										
2. Trimester	80	23.0	$94.25 \pm 28.63$	$37.70 \pm 17.21$						
3. Trimester	268	77.0	$79.47 \pm 30.49$	$42.79 \pm 23.35$						
t**			13.170	39.892						
р			,000	,035						
Education during pregnancy										
Yes	156	44.8	87.46 ± 30.08	$35.48 \pm 20.21$						
No	192	55.2	$79.14 \pm 30.73$	$46.60 \pm 22.50$						
t**			4.208	8.719						
р			,012	,000						
Planned of pregnancy										
Yes	312	89.7	$84.20 \pm 30.30$	$40.07 \pm 21.58$						
No	36	10.3	$71.33 \pm 31.39$	$55.00 \pm 23.06$						
t**			0.069	0.764						
р			,017	,000						

TABLE 3 Analysis of scores of self-care agency scale and caregiver burden scale in terms of gestation period features

Note: \*\*t: Student t test.

Abbreviations: SD, standard deviation; X, Mean. p < .01.

higher (Can Öztürk et al., 2019; Çelik Sis & Derya Aksoy, 2019). In our study, the self-care agency mean scores were lower than other studies. The reason was believed to be linked with advanced maternal age. Older women feel biologically more tired when compared with younger pregnant women, their self-care agency decreases and their caregiver burden, pregnancy risks and complaints increase because of advanced maternal age.

The findings showed that the self-care agency mean scores of the university graduate pregnant women were higher, and the caregiver burden mean scores were lower. Recent studies also showed that the self-care agency mean scores of the university graduate pregnant women were higher (Altıparmak, 2006; Can Öztürk et al., 2019; Çelik Sis & Derya Aksoy, 2019). This may be associated with the fact that pregnant women with higher education can use their support

1057

**TABLE 4** The distribution of self-care agency score and caregiver burden score, and analysis of the correlation between pregnant women score of self-care agency and caregiver burden

Variables	Highest and Lowest Scores Min-max	Highest and Lowest Scores Min-max	X ± SD	r	р	N
Self-care agency scale	0-140	36-132	$82.87 \pm 30.67$			
Caregiver burden scale	0-88	9-85	41.62 ± 22.17	-0,860	,035*	348

Note: Abbreviations: Max, maximum; Min, minimum; SD, standard deviation; X, Mean.

systems more effectively while performing their responsibilities at home and cope with caregiver burden more easily.

Our research results showed that the self-care agency mean scores of pregnant women who were civil servants were higher, and the caregiver burden mean scores were lower. Also, in other studies, the self-care agency mean scores of pregnant women working in an income-generating job were higher (Altıparmak, 2006; Çelik Sis &Derya Aksoy, 2019). Self-care agency results showed similarity with the literature. Because working life contributes to the home financially, it increases women's self-confidence and positively affects self-care. At the same time, it is more likely for the working women to plan their dues, receive support in the household and take time for them while they fulfil their responsibilities at home (child care, cooking, etc.). These may reduce the caregiver burden.

The study showed that the caregiver burden mean scores of the pregnant women living in the city center were higher than those living in the village and the district. This situation may be due to reasons such as more active social life in the city, spending more time on transportation and effort to meet basic needs than in small places.

This study had identified that the caregiver burden mean scores of pregnant women with chronic disease were higher. Having a chronic disease in addition to pregnancy increases the burden of pregnant women. Mothers with chronic diseases should apply to the nearest health institutions where they can get support and education at the moment of planning a new pregnancy. Although this provides a healthy pregnancy for the mother, it gives an opportunity to take better care of other children in need of care. As a result, it is important to direct pregnant women with chronic diseases to appropriate health institutions.

Our research results showed that the self-care agency mean scores of the pregnant women who live in three or four-people families, which is the nuclear family structure, were higher, and the caregiver burden mean scores were lower. A recent study also showed that the self-care agency mean scores of pregnant women with nuclear family were higher (Çelik Sis & Derya Aksoy, 2019). The low number of people in the family increases the self-care agency and decreases the caregiver burden because pregnant women may take more time for them.

The result revealed that the caregiver burden mean scores of pregnant women who were always supported by their partners were lower compared with others. Social support is the support provided by a partner, family members and friends (Golmakani et al., 2020). The social support system is important in the prevention, solution

and treatment of the individual's sociological and psychological problems, and in dealing with difficult and troublesome situations. Literature has shown that the participation of a father during pregnancy has important social, emotional and clinical effects. For example, in the study by Puspita et al. (2015), conducted with 263 pregnant women in Indonesia, factors such as knowledge of selfcare, perceived benefits of self-care and satisfaction with social support were determined to affect women's self-care behaviours during pregnancy. Similarly, another study showed that a father's participation in pregnancy increases the probability that the mother will receive prenatal care 1.5 times (Martin et al., 2007). Previous studies have found that the partner of the pregnant woman was the most supportive person during pregnancy (Metin & Pasinlioğlu, 2014; Vırıt et al., 2008). The researcher linked it with the fact that partners feel joyful and excited because of the introduction of a new individual to their family, and it is important to continue one's bloodline in Turkey, especially fathers-to-be try their best to support their partners in every aspect with the joy of being a father.

The study showed that the self-care agency mean scores of pregnant women with two or more children younger than 6 years were lower. There are studies indicating that the self-care agency mean scores decrease as the number of children increases (Aktaş & Karaçam, 2017; Çelik Sis & Derya Aksoy, 2019; Şanlı & Öncel, 2014). This study had shown that those who have two or more children younger than 6 years had a high caregiver burden mean score. As the ages of other children decrease, the energy and time spent by pregnant women for them will increase. Therefore, while the caregiver burden increases, the self-care agency will decrease.

Evaluation of the scale scores of the participants according to their pregnancy characteristics showed that the pregnant women who were in the 2nd trimester had a higher self-care agency mean score and a lower caregiver burden mean score than the pregnant women in the 3rd trimester. Recent studies showed that the self-care agency mean scores of pregnant women who were in the 2nd trimester were higher (Can Öztürk et al., 2019; Çelik Sis & Derya Aksoy, 2019). The reason for this is considered that the mother's ability to move is getting restricted because of the extensive growth of the uterus in the 3rd trimester, and they feel more tired because of the enlargement of the body.

The result revealed that the self-care agency mean scores and caregiver burden mean scores of the women who were trained during pregnancy and planned pregnancy were higher. The literature has shown that the care given in line with Orem's Self-Care Model increases the self-care agency of pregnant women at risk of preterm

<sup>\*</sup>Pearson correlation analysis, p < .01.

labor (Kılıç & Erci, 2017). Prenatal education increases compliance with motherhood and facilitates baby care. In this way, the self-care agency of pregnant women will increase, and the caregiver burden will decrease. Directing pregnant women to pregnant schools is of great importance for raising healthy generations.

The study showed that the self-care agency mean scale score of pregnant women was  $82.87 \pm 30.67$  (min = 36, max = 132). Researches on self-care agency in pregnant women showed the average self-care agency score (Aktaş & Karaçam, 2017; Can Öztürk et al., 2019; Çelik Sis & Derya Aksoy, 2019; Saydam Karaca et al., 2007). When the mean scores obtained from the self-care agency scales are interpreted according to the scores that can be obtained from the scales, the self-care agency levels of the women included in the studies were moderate.

This study had shown that the caregiver burden mean scale score was  $41.62 \pm 22.17$  (range: 9–85). This result showed that pregnant women have a moderate-high caregiver burden. Tanrıkulu and Özden Attepe (2019) found that the caregiver burden scale score was 47.94 in the study which examined the caregiver burden of women who take care of a family member in their home. Eğilli and Sunal (2017) found that the caregiver burden mean scores of the family members who provide care were 31.93.

A negative correlation was found between the self-care agency scale scores and caregiver burden scale scores of pregnant women included in the study. This result shows that as the self-care agency increases, general caregiver burden behaviour decreases in pregnant women. The literature has no studies investigating the relationship between self-care agency and caregiver burden during pregnancy. These results reveal the need for more studies on this subject.

# 6 | LIMITATIONS

The study reached pregnant women with fewer children because the data were collected only from the obstetrics clinic. The researcher asked for permission to conduct the study in both pediatric and obstetric polyclinic, but the health institution only approved it to be performed in the obstetric polyclinic. This situation prevented reaching more people for the research. The researcher recommends further studies in a larger population.

# 7 | CONCLUSION

This study conducted with pregnant women with children between the ages of 0–6 showed that the self-care agency and caregiver burden of the pregnant women were moderate. The study determined that sociodemographic characteristics affect self-care agency and caregiver burden. The researcher found that the self-care agency mean scores of pregnant women with two or more children aged between 0–6 were lower and the caregiver burden mean scores were higher. A negative correlation was found between the self-care agency and caregiver burden of pregnant women included in the study.

In line with the results of the study, the researcher recommends that midwives and nurses working in the mother-child health field such as obstetric polyclinics and family health centers should:

- Lay emphasis on self-care and the reduction of caregiver burden, which increases during pregnancy, to increase the self-care agency and to improve health practices during pregnancy,
- Identify the level of self-care agency and the amount of caregiver burden during pregnancy, determine the factors affecting them and introduce the support system to the family,
- Teach self-care practices to pregnant women who cannot meet their needs and who have low self-care agency and to provide consultancy and training for support systems during pregnancy,
- Encourage pregnant women to consult midwives and nurses on issues where there is a lack of information.
- Recommend to consult the pregnant women to make the support systems effective in the care of the child aged between 0-6.

# **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The author would like to express their thanks to the pregnant women who participated in the study.

# **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

# DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The author confirm that the data supporting the findings of this study are available within the article. The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

#### ORCID

Sibel Ergün https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1227-5856

# REFERENCES

Aktaş, N., & Karaçam, Z. (2017). Postpartum fatigue, self-care power of women and related factors. Tepecik Training and Research Hospital Journal, 27(3), 186–196. https://doi.org/10.5222/terh.2017.186

Altıparmak, S. (2006). The relationship between quality of life and self-care agency in pregnant. TAF Preventive Medicine Bulletin, 5, 416-423.

Ayoubi, S., Bostan, N., & Sharifipour, F. (2017). A study of the effects of physiological parturition training on pregnant women's stress and mental health. *Annals of Tropical Medicine and Public Health*, 10, 878–883. https://doi.org/10.4103/ATMPH.ATMPH\_237\_17

Barua, S., & Junaid, M. A. (2015). Lifestyle, pregnancy and epigenetic effects. *Epigenomics*, 7(1), 83–102. https://doi.org/10.2217/epi.14.71

Bayoğlu, B. (2015). Assessing and monitoring child development. In Y. Yalaz (Ed.). *Basic developmental child neurology* (pp. 45–50). Pelikan Bookstore.

Can, Ö. H., Baykal Meşe, Z., Koçak, Ç. Y., Ocalan, D., Dal Alp, N., & Sevil, Ü. (2019). Factors affecting perceived stress and self-care agency pregnant women. *Journal of Health, Medicine and Nursing*, *59*, 46–54. https://doi.org/10.7176/JHMN

- Çelik Sis, A., & Derya Aksoy, Y. (2019). Determining the self-care agency and the health practice levels of the pregnant women and the effective factors. Gümüşhane University Journal of Health Sciences, 8(1), 111–119.
- da Silva Neto, M. G., Freire, L. B. V., Costa, J. A. S., da Jesu, C. A. S., Pinhos, D. L. M., & Kamoda, I. (2017). Dependent care: posterior development of the theory of self-care deficit. *Journal of Nursing UFPE Online*, 11(2), 1086–1095. https://doi.org/10.5205/reuol.10263-91568-1-RV.1102sup201726
- Eğilli, C. S., & Sunal, N. (2017). Determination of care load of the caregivers of demented patient and relevant affecting factors. *JAREN*, 3(2), 83–91. https://doi.org/10.5222/jaren.2017.083
- Golmakani, N., Rahmati, R., Shaghaghi, F., Safinejad, H., Kamali, Z., & Mohebbi-Dehnavi, Z. (2020). Investigating the relationship between social support and self-compassion by improving the adequacy of prenatal care. *Journal of Education and Health Promotion*, 9, 340. https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp\_308\_20
- Güleşen, A., & Yıldız, D. (2013). Investigation of maternal-ınfant attach ment in the early postpartum period with evidence based practice. TAF Preventive Medicine Bulletin, 12(2), 177–182. https://doi.org/10.5455/pmb1-1336130426
- İnci, F. H., & Erdem, M. (2008). Validity and reliability of the burden interview and its adaptation to Turkish. *Journal of Atatürk University School of Nursing*, 11(4), 85–95.
- Kılıç, M., & Erci, B. (2017). The effect of the care provided based on self-care model of orem on self-care agency and frequency of nursing diagnoses in pregnant women with threat of preterm birth. *Turkiye Klinikleri Journal of Nursing*, 9(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.5336/nurses.2015-49259
- Martin, L. T., McNamara, M. J., Milot, A. S., Halle, T., & Hair, E. C. (2007). The effects of father involvement during pregnancy on receipt of prenatal care and maternal smoking. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, 11(6), 595–602. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10995-007-0209-0
- Metin, A., & Pasinlioğlu, T. (2014). Examination of the relationship between perceived social support and prenatal self-assessment in pregnant. Health Sciences Institute, Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Nursing Nursing. Erzurum, Turkey: Atatürk University. [thesis]; pp:25. https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezDetay.jsp?id=teogWinCLIEMBsiUyVjQ4w&no=MoWM2XXB-W1lNopgAiYx-g

- Nahcivan, N. (2015). Validity and reliability study: Adaptation of the self-care power scale to Turkish. *Florence Nightingale Journal of Nursing*, 7(33), 109–119. Retrieved from https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/fnjn/issue/9045/112795
- Orem, D. E. (2012). Nursing concepts of practice. 6th ed. Mosby; pp:63–70. Şanlı, Y., & Öncel, S. (2014). Evaluation of the functional status of woman after child birth and effective factors. Journal of Turkish Society of Obstetric and Gynecology, 2, 105–114. https://doi.org/10.4274/tjod.82574
- Saydam Karaca, B., Bozkurt Demirel, Ö., Hadımlı Pelik, A., Can Öztürk, H., & Soğukpınar, N. (2007). Evaluation of the effects of self-care capacity on healthy life style behaviors in risky pregnants. *Perinatal*, 15(3), 31–139.
- Tanrıkulu, S., Özden., & Attepe, S. (2019). Examination of caregiver burdens of women who care for a family member in home. Health Sciences Institute, Department of Social Work. Ankara, Turkey: Başkent University. [thesis]; pp. 44–52. http://acikerisim. baskent.edu.tr/bitstream/handle/11727/3007/TEZ%20SON %2029.01.2019.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- Taşkın, L. (2017). Maternity and women's health nursing. 13th ed. Akademisyen Bookstore; 53-65.
- Turkish Istatistical Institute. (2019). *Birth statistics* 2001-2019. http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreHaberBultenlerido?id=27589&utm\_source=feedburner&utm\_medium=feed&utm\_campaign=Feed%3A+tuikbulten+%28T%C3%9C%C4%B0K-Haber+B%C3%BCltenleri+%28Son+1+Ay%29%29
- Virit, O., Akbaş, E., Savaş, H. A., Sertbaş, G., & Kandemir, H. (2008). Association between the level of depression and anxiety with social support in pregnancy. *Neuropsychiatry Archive*, 45, 9–13.
- Yavuzer, H. (2016). Your child'sfirst 6 years, 34th ed. (pp:25-27). Remzi Bookstore.

How to cite this article: Ergün, S. (2022). The relationship between caregiver burden and self-care agency of pregnant women with 0–6-year-old children. *Nursing Open*, 9, 1052–1059. https://doi.org/10.1002/nop2.1142