



耆趣藝遊——賽馬會健腦行計劃

JOURNEY FOR ACTIVE MINDS
JOCKEY CLUB MUSEUM PROGRAMME FOR THE ELDERLY

博物館參觀與活動為腦退化症患者與其家人
改善生活質素的效能研究

*Effectiveness of museum visit and activities on enhancing the quality of life
of people with dementia and their caregivers*

期末報告

FINAL REPORT

July 2015

香港中文大學

The Chinese University of Hong Kong

耆趣藝遊——賽馬會健腦行計劃

JOURNEY FOR ACTIVE MINDS

JOCKEY CLUB MUSEUM PROGRAMME FOR THE ELDERLY

博物館參觀與活動為腦退化症患者與其家人

改善生活質素的效能研究

*Effectiveness of museum visit and activities on enhancing the quality of life
of people with dementia and their caregivers*

目錄

CONTENTS

引言	03	Introduction	18
方法	04	Method	20
參加者	04	Participants	20
樣本數	04	Sample size	20
研究設計	04	Design	20
評估工具	04	Assessment tools	20
資料收集與分析	05	Data Collection and Analysis	21
程序	05	Procedures	22
分析	05	Analysis	22
結果	06	Results	22
參與者個人資料	06	Demographic information of participants	23
長者的情緒健康	07	Emotional wellbeing of elder participants	24
生活質素	07	Quality of life	25
導賞活動與藝術工作坊進行期間的 溝通和參與	08	Communication and engagement during tour visit and art workshop	26
對參觀博物館的整體觀感	09	Perception towards the museum visit	27
定性研究	12	Qualitative Research	30
討論	15	Discussion	34
限制	15	Limitation	35
結論及建議	16	Conclusion and recommendation	35
		參考資料 / 附錄 – 問卷 References / Appendix – Questionnaires	36

引言

腦退化症是影響認知及執行能力的腦部退化障礙，對日常生活帶來負擔 (APA, 2013)。腦退化症分為不同類型，最普遍的阿爾茨海默症總共影響六至九成腦退化症患者。其他較為普遍的腦退化症類型包括影響二至三成患者、由慢性腦血管栓塞引起的腦退化症，並影響一成至一成五患者的利維體腦退化症。腦退化症的類型根據引發原因及症狀分類，例如阿爾茨海默症的特點是患者腦部出現原因不明的澱粉蛋白質斑與纏結，而慢性腦血管栓塞相關的腦退化症則因為流經腦部的血液減少而引致。患者有可能同時受多於一種腦退化症影響 (ALZ, 2015)。

身理機能及精神衰退往往成為關係的障礙。有研究指出腦退化症患者 (PWD) 的家人因著患者未能維持發病前的溝通能力，而感受到關係變質 (DeVugt et al., 2003)。而日常功能上的退化，亦另不少人逼於無奈地退出既有的社交和家庭活動，過去的研究亦有指出腦退化症患者的孤單及忽略感 (Phinney et al., 2007)。

一個人縱使在記憶及技能上出現退化，但仍有潛能參與各種有意義的活動，而博物館或許能夠為這些活動提供一個理想平台 (Parsa et al., 2010)。有指博物館的展品能夠連結個人經歷並觸動情感流露，因此可以刺激有意義的回應。亦有人指出導賞活動能夠提供即時而且富有彈性的回應，並且營造一個溫馨的參與氣氛。至於博物館則能夠為參觀者提供一個不受殘障所影響的社會身份：不論是照顧者還是被照顧的人，所有人的參與同等重要 (Silverman, 2002)。

紐約市的現代藝術博物館 (MoMA) 既是一個藝術機構，亦為腦退化症患者提供衛生服務。MoMA 是首間為輕度至中度腦退化症患者開設特別工作坊及藝術探索導賞服務的博物館，為患者及他們的家人提供「抒發渠道以及對話平台」(p.94) (Rosenberg, 2009)。

2013年，香港賽馬會慈善信託基金 (HKJCCT) 與康樂及文化事務署 (LCSD) 均認為 MoMA 的工作能為

腦退化症患者提供有效益的服務，並可考慮將類似計劃引進本港博物館。

香港的博物館能為長者及腦退化症患者提供懷舊回憶和分享藝術探索經驗的理想環境。懷舊回憶是透過懷緬舊事、舊物及過去的日子，促進患者的記憶。參觀體驗涵蓋觀賞、分享及討論有藝術及歷史特色的展品，如：生活舊相片、服裝飾物、傢具、圖案、圖畫及日常用具等，有助參觀者表達意見和對話 (Beshwate & Kasin, 2010)。另一方面，參與特別設計的工作坊，其中的藝術及文化探索讓腦退化症患者和他們的家屬照顧者在刺激記憶，分享經驗及互動交流中有所得益，建立患者的力量及平和感、信心及身份認同 (Rhoads, 2009)。

由康樂及文化事務署主辦、香港歷史博物館籌劃、藝術在醫院協辦，香港賽馬會慈善信託基金獨家贊助的「耆趣藝遊 —— 賽馬會健腦行」先導計劃，於二零一四年開始舉辦，是香港首個以長者及腦退化症患者為主要服務對象的博物館活動。透過特別導賞團、工作坊及外展活動，鼓勵參加者及其家屬一同分享回憶及互動交流，藉以刺激思維；並培養長者及腦退化症患者對香港歷史、藝術及文化遺產的興趣，拉近與社區的距離。

本研究由康文署委託進行，香港中文大學 (中文大學) 負責收集部分參與者的數據，並輸入資料、進行分析，以及撰寫報告，而「藝術在醫院」(AIH) 及香港歷史博物館 (HKMH) 則分別負責招募參觀者，與收集部分參與者的數據。本研究的目標為評估和探討本項目的影響及成效，以及香港歷史博物館安排的教育活動如何提升腦退化症患者、他們的家人，以及沒有患腦退化症的人士 (PWOD) 的生活質素。

方法

參加者

經確診患上腦退化症的六十歲或以上長者，通過香港的日間中心參與是此研究。除卻參與半日活動的行動能力以及基本溝通與回應訪問的能力以外，研究並沒有要求參加者符合其他任何參加條件。所有腦退化症患者的家屬都被邀請陪伴家人參與活動以及接受訪問，每名腦退化症患者與自己的一名家人組成一對「組合」，接受觀察研究。而沒有認知障礙、並年滿六十歲的長者，亦在活動之後就他們的導賞經歷接受訪問。

樣本數

研究目標為招募50對腦退化症患者及他們的家人，以及1000名沒有患上腦退化症的長者。在收集資料的過程中，共有46名腦退化症患者及653名沒有患上腦退化症的長者接受研究。

研究設計

AIH邀請日間中心使用者報名參加於歷史博物館對外關閉的日子(星期二)舉行的活動。每一次參觀由歷史博物館內的導賞團及相關主題的藝術工作坊組成。研究以心理健康評估工具調查參加者的情緒、生活質素及心理健康。資料以不同形式收集：由家屬自行填寫的問卷、由研究員詢問參加者所得的非開放式題目，以及由研究員完成的觀察研究調查表。研究通過比對參加者參與活動前後的評估分數，以及分析研究員的觀察，評估「耆趣藝遊——賽馬會健腦行計劃」的成效及可行性。同時，研究亦以微型小組討論與訪問的方式收集更深入的意見，而收集深入意見的形式則取決於參與者的配合能力。

評估工具

研究使用的評估工具與問卷臚列如下：

1. 阿氏癡呆症生活質素量表(QoL-AD)

生活質素由阿氏癡呆症生活質素量表(QoL-AD)量度。QoL-AD由13個條目組成，特別為評估患腦退化症的人士而設計。分數愈高，代表自我評估的心理健康更好。

2. 臉譜量表(SFAS)

情緒由臉譜量表(SFAS)量度。量表只有一個條目，受訪者被邀請從五個代表遞進心情的臉譜當中，選擇一個以表示自己當刻的心情(非常不開心、有點不開心、中立、幾開心、非常開心)。分數愈高，代表心情愈好。

3. 通用健康問卷(GHQ-30)

心理徵狀以通用健康問卷調查。問卷由30個有關徵狀頻率的條目組成，例如「因為擔心而睡不著」、「心情煩躁以致睡得不好」，和「覺得整天有精神壓力」。分數愈高，代表心理健康愈差。

4. 增潤問卷-A(問卷A)

問卷A調查參觀活動的一般觀感(11個條目)以及參與者的個人資料(3個條目)。增潤問卷由非開放式條目組成，並由沒有患上腦退化症的長者自行完成。

5. 增潤問卷-B(問卷B)

問卷B調查參觀活動的一般觀感(8個條目)以及參與者的個人資料(2個條目)。增潤問卷由非開放式條目組成，並由腦退化症患者的家屬自行完成。

6. 增潤問卷-C(問卷C)

問卷C調查參觀活動的一般觀感(11個條目)。

增潤問卷由非開放式條目組成，並由研究員協助腦退化症患者完成。

7. 增潤問卷-D(問卷D)

問卷D調查腦退化症患者的個人資料(5個條目)。增潤問卷由非開放式條目組成，並由中文大學研究員以訪問形式協助腦退化症患者的家屬完成。

8. 增潤問卷-E(問卷E)

問卷E調查參觀活動的一般觀感(19個條目)以及參與者的個人資料(6個條目)。增潤問卷由開放及非開放式條目組成，並由腦退化症患者的家屬自行完成。

9. 觀察調查

研究員於導賞活動及工作坊期間進行觀察，以調查腦退化症患者與導賞員、家屬並其他長者的互動。

資料收集與分析

問卷

1. 給予沒有患上腦退化症的參觀者的問卷(PWOD) 沒有患上腦退化症的參觀者各自於導賞活動開始前、並工作坊完成後，獲發自行填寫的SFAS，以及問卷A。整份問卷由沒有患上腦退化症的長者自行完成，而HKMH則負責送遞、收集，並檢查問卷。

2. 給予腦退化症患者的簡版問卷(PWD-SV)

不願意參與深入研究的腦退化症患者獲發一份簡版問卷。問卷由自行填寫的SFAS組成，並於導賞活動開始前、並工作坊完成後填寫。如果參加者有家屬陪同，家屬會獲發自行填寫的問卷B。HKMH負責送遞、收集並檢查問卷。

3. 給予腦退化症患者的完整版問卷(PWD-FV)

願意參與深入研究的腦退化症患者並他們的家人會獲發PWD-FV。

腦退化症患者一共接受四次訪問。QoL-AD和SFAS在第一次參觀博物館前進行；SFAS在完成第一次博物館參觀的工作坊活動後進行。如果腦退化症患者第二次參觀博物館，SFAS在第二次參觀博物館前進行。QoL-AD、SFAS和問卷C於第二次博物館參觀活動後，或完成第一次博物館參觀後的兩個月以內進行。所有訪問由中文大學研究員負責。

陪同腦退化症患者的家屬照顧者與第一次參觀以前獲發GHQ-30。於第二次參觀後，或完成第一次博物館參觀後的兩個月以內，家屬會獲發以自行填寫模式完成的問卷E，和經研究員訪問完成的問卷D。所有訪問由中文大學研究員負責。

程序

資料收集由2014年11月至2015年5月。AIH通過香港的日間中心招募參加者。研究對象的同意書由AIH於參觀之前，或訪問開始之前收集。腦退化症患者於每次參觀前後都會由一名研究員訪問以收集資料。在每一次參觀中，一名研究員會負責觀察患者與家人的溝通模式，並完成觀察問卷。PWD-SV和PWOD兩份問卷由HKMH負責送遞，並由參加者在HKMH職員協助下自行完成。

分析

數據分析以統計軟件SPSS(第22版)進行。數據經整理後，以頻率、平均值及標準差(SD)形式報告。顯著性差異分析以t檢驗方式進行。

結果

參與者個人資料

各項問卷的完成人數臚列如下：

- PWD-FV:** 33名腦退化症患者完成PWD-FV的前後測，25名家屬完成PWD-FV的前後測；
- PWD-2V:** 13名腦退化症患者完成PWD-FV的前後測，12名家屬完成PWD-SV的前後測；

- PWOD:** 653名沒有患上腦退化症的長者完成問卷。

於本報告中，由於資料缺失(i.e.有參與者未有完成部分條目)，研究人數與獨立條目的報告人數可能有出入。

表格1 顯示參與研究的參加者的背景資料。

表格1 參加者的背景資料

	PWOD (N=653) N (%)	PWD-SV (N=13) N (%)	PWD-FV (N=33) N (%)	CG (N=25) N (%)
性別				
男	167 (25.8%)	5 (38.5%)	13 (39.4%)	6 (24%)
女	481 (74.2%)	8 (61.5%)	20 (60.6%)	19 (76%)
年紀				
49歲以下	-	-	-	3 (15.8%)
49-59	-	-	-	7 (36.8%)
60-69	189 (29.6%)	0	3 (9.4%)	4 (21.1%)
70-79	256 (40.1%)	3 (23.1%)	5 (15.6%)	0
80歲或以上	194 (30.4%)	10 (76.9%)	24 (75.0%)	5 (26.3%)
教育程度				
從未接受教育	147 (22.6%)	-	4 (12.1%)	
非正規教育	31 (4.8%)	-	4 (12.1%)	
小學	285 (43.8%)	-	16 (48.5%)	
中學	156 (24.0%)	-	7 (21.2%)	
大專/大學或以上	31 (4.8%)	-	2 (6.1%)	
婚姻狀況				
未婚	-	-	-	6 (24%)
已婚	-	-	14 (42.4%)	18 (72%)
鰥/寡	-	-	19 (57.6%)	1 (4%)
腦退化症程度 (由照顧者評定)				
初期	-	-	15 (46.9%)	-
中期	-	-	17 (53.1%)	-
與腦退化症長者的關係				
夫婦	-	-	-	8 (32%)
子女/媳婦/女婿	-	-	-	16 (64%)
其他	-	-	-	1 (4%)
過往的博物館活動經驗				
有參加過展覽和活動	489 (75.3%)	-	17 (53.1%)	20 (80%)
沒有參加過展覽和活動	160 (24.7%)	-	15 (46.9%)	5 (20%)

注: PWOD=沒有患上腦退化症的長者; PWD-SV=腦退化症患者(簡版); PWD-FV=腦退化症患者(完整版); CG=腦退化症患者的家屬照顧者; 百分比與數目的差異由資料缺失導致。

長者的情緒健康

表格2及3顯示參加者的評估分數。

4. 沒有患上腦退化症的長者 (N=639)

沒有患上腦退化症的長者自行匯報的SFAS分數有顯著的提升。參加者在參觀博物館之前的情緒分數在5分中平均為4.44±.026分，分數在參觀後有上升，平均分為4.72±.021。情緒的改善達到數據學上顯著的差異(p=.000)。

5. 腦退化症患者 (N=46)

填寫簡版問卷的腦退化症患者(n=13)和填寫完整版問卷的腦退化症患者(n=33)都有匯報SFAS分數，而他們的數據經合併分析。參加者

在參觀博物館之前的情緒分數在5分中平均為4.00±.730分，分數在參觀後有上升，平均分為4.33±.732。情緒的改善達到數據學上顯著的差異(p<.05)。

6. 腦退化症患者 (N=13)

十三名腦退化症患者參觀了兩次博物館。參加者在第二次的活動中有情緒改善的趨勢。參加者在參觀博物館之前的情緒分數在5分中平均為4.00±.913分，分數在參觀後有上升，平均分為4.15±.689。比對兩次參觀的情緒上升，顯示第二次參觀時情緒改善幅度較小，但跌幅並未達到數據學上顯著的差異。

表格2 自行匯報的情緒 (第一次參觀)

	PWOD (N=639) M(SD)	PWD (N=46) M(SD)	PWD-FV (N=33) M(SD)
參加前	4.44 (.03)	4.00 (.73)	3.85 (.76)
參加後	4.72 (.02)	4.33 (.73)	4.21 (.78)

注: PWOD=沒有患上腦退化症的長者; PWD-SV=腦退化症患者(簡版); PWD-FV=腦退化症患者(完整版)。

表格3 自行匯報的情緒 (第二次參觀)

	PWOD (N=639) M(SD)	PWD (N=46) M(SD)	PWD-FV (N=13) M(SD)
參加前	-	-	4.00 (.91)
參加後	-	-	4.15 (.69)

注: PWOD=沒有患上腦退化症的長者; PWD-SV=腦退化症患者(簡版); PWD-FV=腦退化症患者(完整版)。

生活質素

腦退化症患者在第一次匯報的生活質素(N=33)在52分中平均為32.06 ± 5.87。他們在

其後的匯報中平均分為35.15 ± 6.62。比對兩次結果，顯示參加者的生活質素有顯著上升，升幅達到數據學上的顯著差異。

表格4 腦退化症患者自行匯報的生活質素(N=33)

	M(SD)
參加前	32.06 (5.87)
參加後	35.15 (6.62)

3. Questionnaire for people with dementia – Full version (PWD-FV)

Dyads who agreed to participate in the in-depth research were given PWD-FV.

People with dementia were interviewed four times. Before the first museum visit, QoL-AD and SFAS were conducted; after the art workshop on the first museum visit, SFAS was conducted. If PWD paid a second visit to the museum, SFAS was conducted before the second museum visit. QoL-AD, SFAS, and Set C were conducted either after the second museum visit, or within two months after the first visit. CUHK researchers facilitated all interviews.

Caregivers who accompanied PWD were given GHQ-30 before the first museum visit. Set E, which was self-completed, and Set D, which was conducted by interview facilitated by a researcher. Set E and Set D were given to the caregivers either after the second museum visit, or within two months after the first visit. CUHK researchers were responsible for conducting interviews for PWD-FV dyads.

Procedures

Data collection was from November 2014 to May 2015. Subjects were recruited via day care centers in Hong Kong by AIH. Informed consent was obtained from eligible participants before the visits by AIH and/or before interview started. For PWD interview, before and after each visit, a researcher approached the research dyad and collect data. During each visit, the same researcher observed the communication pattern between the dyad and completed the observational questionnaire. Questionnaires for PWD-SV and PWOD were delivered by HKMH and self-administered by participants with help of HKMH staff.

Analysis

The SPSS (Version 22) statistical software was used for data analysis. Data were processed to obtain frequencies, group mean values, and standard deviations (SD) where appropriate. Student's t test was used as significance test.

RESULTS

Demographic information of participants

The valid samples for various questionnaires completed were listed below:-

- PWD-FV:** 33 PWD completed PWD-FV pretests and posttests, 25 PWD caregivers completed PWD-FV pretests and posttests;
- PWD-SV:** 13 PWD completed PWD-SV elderly part, 12 PWD caregivers completed PWD-SV caregiver part.

- PWOD:** 653 PWOD completed the questionnaires.

In this report, the sample size of individual item might not be the samples collected as stated above because of missing data (i.e. individual item was not filled in by participants).

Table 1 showed the demographic characteristics of the participants in this research.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of visit participants

	PWOD (N=653) N (%)	PWD-SV (N=13) N (%)	PWD-FV (N=33) N (%)	CG (N=25) N (%)
Gender				
Male	167 (25.8%)	5 (38.5%)	13 (39.4%)	6 (24%)
Female	481 (74.2%)	8 (61.5%)	20 (60.6%)	19 (76%)
Age				
Below 49	-	-	-	3 (15.8%)
49-59	-	-	-	7 (36.8%)
60-69	189 (29.6%)	0	3 (9.4%)	4 (21.1%)
70-79	256 (40.1%)	3 (23.1%)	5 (15.6%)	0
80 or over	194 (30.4%)	10 (76.9%)	24 (75.0%)	5 (26.3%)
Education				
Never received any	147 (22.6%)	-	4 (12.1%)	
Informal education	31 (4.8%)	-	4 (12.1%)	
Elementary education	285 (43.8%)	-	16 (48.5%)	
Secondary education	156 (24.0%)	-	7 (21.2%)	
Tertiary education or above	31 (4.8%)	-	2 (6.1%)	
Marriage				
Single	-	-	-	6 (24%)
Married	-	-	14 (42.4%)	18 (72%)
Widowed	-	-	19 (57.6%)	1 (4%)
Dementia stage (reported by CG)				
Early	-	-	15 (46.9%)	-
Intermediate	-	-	17 (53.1%)	-
Relationship to PWD				
Spouse	-	-	-	8 (32%)
Children/children-in-law	-	-	-	16 (64%)
Others	-	-	-	1 (4%)
Past experience in museum visit				
Yes	489 (75.3%)	-	17 (53.1%)	20 (80%)
No	160 (24.7%)	-	15 (46.9%)	5 (20%)

Remarks: PWOD=People without dementia; PWD-SV=People with dementia (Short version); PWD-FV=People with dementia (Full-version); CG=Caregivers of people with dementia; Discrepancies between percentage and count were because of missing data.

Emotional wellbeing of elder participants

Table 2 and 3 presented the assessment scores of participants.

1. PWOD (N=639)

A significant increase in self-reported SFAS score among PWOD was detected. Participants had a mean mood score of 4.44±.026 out of 5 points before the museum visit, and an elevated mood of 4.72±.021 after the day's program. The increase in mood score reached statistical significance (p=.000).

2. PWD (N=46)

PWD-SV (n=13) and PWD-FV (n=33) filled in SFAS scores and their results were combined for analysis. Participants had a mean mood

score of 4.00± .730 out of 5 points before the museum visit, and an elevated mood of 4.33± .732 after the program. The increase in mood score reached statistical significance (p<.05).

3. PWD (N=13)

Thirteen PWD paid a second visit to the museum. There was a trend of increase in interviewed SFAS score among PWD on their second visit. Participants had a mean mood score of 4.00± .913 out of 5 points before the museum visit, and an elevated mood of 4.15± .689 after the day's program. A comparison of the mood changes in two visits yielded an insignificant decrease in the scale of elevation in mood.

Table 2. Self reported mood (First visit)

	PWOD (N=639) M(SD)	PWD (N=46) M(SD)	PWD-FV (N=33) M(SD)
Before museum program	4.44 (.03)	4.00 (.73)	3.85 (.76)
After museum program	4.72 (.02)	4.33 (.73)	4.21 (.78)

Remarks: PWOD=People without dementia; PWD=People with dementia (Short and full versions combined); PWD-FV=People with dementia (Full version).

Table 3. Self reported mood (Second visit)

	PWOD (N=639) M(SD)	PWD (N=46) M(SD)	PWD-FV (N=13) M(SD)
Before museum program	-	-	4.00 (.91)
After museum program	-	-	4.15 (.69)

Remarks: PWOD=People without dementia; PWD=People with dementia (Short and full versions combined); PWD-FV=People with dementia (Full version).

Quality of life

Quality of life of PWD and PWOD reported before the first visit (N=33) had a mean score of 32.06 ± 5.87 out of 52 points. Quality of life reported after

the visit (N=33) had a mean score of 35.15 ± 6.62 out of 52 points. Comparison of means yielded a significant difference between the results.

Table 4. Self reported quality of life of people with dementia (N= 33)

	M(SD)
Before first visit	32.06 (5.87)
After second visit	35.15 (6.62)

Self reported psychological health before the first visit (N=25) had a mean score of 32.84 ± 8.34. Self reported psychological health after the visit (N=25) had a mean score of 35.36 ± 7.02. There was an insignificant trend of poorer psychological

health. The sub-domains showed that there were significant improvement in "anxiety" and "sleep disturbance" and significant decrease in "inadequate coping" and "social dysfunctioning".

Table 5. Self reported perceived health of caregivers of people with dementia (N=25)

	Before visit M(SD)	After visit M(SD)	Sig.
Total score	32.84 (8.35)	35.36 (7.02)	n.s.
Anxiety	6.28 (3.94)	5.92(3.59)	.000
Depression	2.40 (1.35)	3.16(1.95)	n.s.
Inadequate coping	11.56 (2.20)	14.40(2.08)	.012
Social dysfunctioning	9.48 (2.57)	10.80(1.32)	.014
Sleep disturbance	1.28 (1.37)	1.08(1.35)	.010

Communication and engagement during tour visit and art workshop

14 observations were done in the first visits and 7 were done in the second visits. Since only five dyads were observed twice, no within-subject comparison was performed.

Table 6 showed the communication pattern of PWD during the gallery tour in the two visits. Participants who were on their second visit

had less communication with the docent and other elderly, demonstrated less non-verbal communication with their family caregiver, and showed less positive affects. However, the number of times they initiated any verbal communication with their family caregivers increased. Improvement in communication between PWD and their family members were further explored in the qualitative research.

Table 6. Engagement pattern of PWD during gallery tour on the visits

	First visit (N=14) (M)	Second visit (N=7) (M)
Verbal communication with docent	41.21	19.29
Verbal communication with other elderly	4.50	1.57
Verbal communication with caregiver	41.36	58.71
Non-verbal communication with caregiver	14.07	11.86
Positive affects	23.93	11.43
Negative affects	0.93	0.57

Remarks: Engagement pattern was recorded by the number of times an observed participant initiated a verbal or non-verbal communicative action, or demonstrated a positive or negative affect.

Table 7 showed the communication pattern of PWD in the art workshop on both visits. On the second visit, participants were slightly less engaged in the conversation with the artist, but demonstrated slightly more willingness to communicate with other elder participants during the art workshop.

Similar to the communication pattern in the gallery tour, there was a trend of increase in verbal communication initiated by the PWD towards the family caregiver. The observed positive affects in the art workshop were also comparable between the two visits.

Table 7. Engagement pattern of PWD in the art workshop on the visits

	First visit (N=14) (M)	Second visit (N=7) (M)
Verbal communication with artist	10.93	9.43
Verbal communication with other elderly	1.00	2.29
Verbal communication with caregiver	28.93	35.86
Non-verbal communication with caregiver	9.79	4.14
Positive aspects	12.50	12.71
Negative aspects	0.57	0.29

Remarks: Engagement pattern was recorded by the number of times an observed participant initiated a verbal or non-verbal communicative action, or demonstrated a positive or negative aspect.

Perception towards the museum visit

1. PWOD (N=652)

Table 8 showed the evaluation of the PWOD. Respondents were overwhelmingly positive

towards the program. Most considered themselves likely to participate in future museum programs, but less were interested in handcraft-related activities.

Table 8. Program evaluation by PWOD (N=652)

	%
The content of exhibition was interesting.	99.4
The docent gave a clear presentation.	98.6
It was enjoyable to talk to the docent.	98.8
It was enjoyable to visit with other older people.	99.7
The environment was comfortable.	99.7
The art workshop was enjoyable.	98.5
I would share my experience with my friends and relatives.	98.5
I am interested in visiting the Museum of History again.	98.2
I am interested in doing handcrafts/ art works/ paintings in the future.	84.4
Overall, I was satisfied with the visit.	99.7

2. PWD (N=33)

Table 9 showed the program evaluation made by PWD. Participants with dementia generally found the experience satisfying, but motivation to future visits and workshops were slightly lower than elderly who did not have dementia. Further investigation was made during the qualitative

research. It was observed, however, that some participants were unable to make comments on specific elements of the program due to their forgetting about the details of visit (e.g. three respondents could not recall the docent, and thus could not comment on the clarity of his/her presentation).

Table 9. Program evaluation by PWD (N=33)

	%
The content of exhibition was interesting.	80.6
The docent gave a clear presentation.	96.7
It was enjoyable to talk to the docent.	96.3
It was enjoyable to visit with other older people.	96.8
The environment was comfortable.	93.3
The art workshop was enjoyable.	83.3
I would share my experience with my friends and relatives.	76.7
I am interested in visiting the Museum of History again.	78.8
I am interested in doing handcrafts/ art works/ paintings in the future.	75.8
Overall, I was satisfied with the visit.	96.7

3. PWD-SV- Caregivers (N=12)

Evaluations of the program made by the caregivers of PWD who contributed to the short version questionnaire were presented in Table 10. The overall satisfaction rate of the

program was overwhelmingly high. Room for improvements in the museum environment was noted by some. The specific reason for discomfort was further discussed in the qualitative session.

Table 10. Program evaluation by caregivers of PWD (PWD-SV) (N=12)

	%
My family member enjoyed the museum visit.	100
My family member enjoyed the workshop.	100
The program facilitated the communication between my family member and I.	100
The program facilitated the communication between my family member and other people.	91.7
The environment was comfortable.	83.3
I am interested in participating in similar exhibitions with my family member.	100
Overall, I am satisfied with the visit.	100

4. PWD-FV- Caregivers (N=25)

Table 11 showed a detailed feedback made by caregivers of PWD who contributed to the full version questionnaire. Most of the caregivers of PWD participated in the program because they wanted the person under care could enjoy a day out (92%). Slightly above half were attracted to the program because they wanted to engage in activities together with their family member (56%). These echoed the findings in the qualitative research as caregivers expressed how they saw

the museum program as a positive stimulation for PWD, and how they valued the quality time they share with their family members. Respondents had a satisfaction rate ranging from five to ten points (out of ten points), with a mean satisfaction score of 8.4. Most caregivers reported to find the program enjoyable (95.8%), and believed that their family members enjoyed the program (95.8%). Reasons for appreciation and expectations to future visits were further discussed in the qualitative research.

Table 11. Program evaluation by caregivers of PWD (PWD-SV) (N=25)

	N (%)
Reasons for participation:	
<i>I wanted my family member to enjoy a day out.</i>	23(92%)
<i>I wanted to participate in an activity with my family member.</i>	14(56%)
<i>I liked museum exhibitions.</i>	6(24%)
The part I appreciated most:	
<i>Interactions between the docent and the older participants</i>	8(32%)
<i>The presentation of the docent</i>	7(28%)
<i>The workshop</i>	7(28%)
<i>Nothing to appreciate</i>	3(12%)
The part I disliked most:	
<i>The arrangements of the visit</i>	3(12%)
<i>The workshop arrangements</i>	1(4%)
<i>The presentation of the docent</i>	1(4%)
<i>Interactions between the docent and the older participants</i>	1(4%)
<i>Nothing to dislike</i>	19(76%)
I enjoyed the program.	23(95.8%)
I believe my family member enjoyed the program.	23(95.8%)
The exhibition content was interesting.	24(96%)
The docent gave a clear presentation.	25(100%)
I enjoyed visiting with older visitors.	24(96%)
I enjoyed visiting with other caregivers.	24(96%)
Benefits the program had to me:	
<i>It improved my own perception towards my family member.</i>	14(56%)
<i>It allowed me a better understanding of my family member.</i>	14(56%)
<i>I have a more positive evaluation to the capability of my family member.</i>	13(52%)
<i>It gave me an opportunity to communicate with other caregivers.</i>	12(48%)
Benefits the program had to my family member:	
<i>My family member was happier after the visit.</i>	22(88%)
<i>It gave my family member an opportunity to communicate with others.</i>	17(68%)
<i>It made my family member more confident.</i>	12(48%)
The environment was comfortable	25(100%)
The environment was suitable for a PWD.	24(100%)
My mood improved after the visit.	16(64%)
I will share my experience with my friends and relatives.	21(84%)
I am interested in revisiting the History Museum with my family member.	23(95.8%)
I am interested in participating in other visits with my family member.	24(95.8%)
I will consider participating with my family member in:	
<i>Art workshops</i>	20(80%)
<i>Exhibitions in other museums</i>	18(72%)
<i>Activities other than exhibitions organized by the History Museum</i>	17(68%)
<i>Interest in revisiting the galleries of the History Museum</i>	12(48%)

Remark: Discrepancies between percentage and count were because of missing data.

Qualitative Research

Fifteen caregivers and five PWD participated in the qualitative research. Two mini focus groups involving five PWD and their caregivers were conducted, and the remaining caregivers were individually interviewed. The respondents aged from 47 to 87, with six males and 14 females.

1. Experience

Caregivers and PWD were generally positive about their museum experience. Many reported feeling an emotional uplift after the program, which echoed the findings from the quantitative research.

a. Gallery tour

Most caregivers and participants with dementia enjoyed the tour, and were most impressed by displays that related to their past experience. The majority of the caregivers and the participants with dementia thought the docent had a lively and clear presentation, which echoes the questionnaire findings. The way the docents engaged the audience was much appreciated:

"The docents were professional in encouraging them. I found the interactions and the response from elderly participants impressive..... When he (the docent) talked about things in the past he would make an effort to attract them, such as mentioning the Jockey Club lottery tickets at the store (display), and because he was stimulating, the audience was quite willing to take the initiative to talk about 'I used to do such and such', and then the docent would say, 'wow, you were so cool.' I think the atmosphere was pretty good." (Daughter, 57)

Some caregivers noted that their family members could not focus on the docent's

presentation for long, likely because some care recipients had a short attention span because of dementia. Some caregivers suggested that the docents could be more aware of the needs of people with dementia, and make adaptations in slowing talking speed, intonations, and making more emphases. Few caregivers also thought that elements such as a short documentary shown on big screen could draw attention to those who were less interested in listening to speeches.

b. Workshop

Most caregivers appreciated the workshop. It was mentioned that the workshop was able to engage those who had a relatively passive participation in the tour session, because the workshop gave them a specific task. Caregivers appreciated the opportunity to work on the artwork together and to show their love through offering help. Some caregivers pointed out that their family member seldom worked on handcrafts at home, but once being accompanied, they were happy to join in the activity. A few caregivers pointed out that they had displayed the artworks at home. The sense of achievement observed could be illustrated by a spousal caregiver:

"We made a very beautiful object, a very pretty piece..... It's hanging in the living room now, and when people visited they said it was pretty. [My wife] told others that she made it..... Of course she was happy, she felt smart and proud." (Husband, 85)

Caregivers had different comments about the artworks. Paintings and simple handcrafts, such as a water bottle sculpture, were much welcomed, and caregivers found the step-by-step instructions clear and easy to follow.

In contrast, a particular piece (paper mask), was commented to have involved abstract ideas and complicated techniques, therefore caregivers found it less suitable.

c. Schedule

The majority of the caregivers thought the duration of the tour and the workshop should not be extended, because their family members might feel tired and exhausted if the program lasted longer. Some caregivers who preferred a longer program remarked that a sufficient breaking interval would be needed to sustain the older people's energy.

Most caregivers expressed a wish to enrich the scheduled activities within the current time frame. They suggested that simple refreshment should stimulate positive mood from the people with dementia, and boost up their motivation to participate. Several caregivers also noted that the tour only covered one floor of the exhibition, and would like to see more in the tour. Intervals for the caregivers to communicate with each other, and simple exercise for the care recipients were also suggested as an add-on.

d. Special arrangements

The majority of the caregivers thought that visiting during the museum was closed to public could "make the environment quieter", "avoid visitors from getting lost", "create more space", and "facilitate management". It was mentioned that older visitors walked relatively slow, and it could be an issue to the tour if the galleries were too crowded. Several caregivers pointed out that the group was a "VIP" tour, and caregiver raised out that the arrangement could strengthen the idea of exclusion, but admitted that the family member did not seem to be

aware of it. In general, it was agreed that the arrangement facilitated better engagement:

"It helped Dad concentrate, so that he would not look around [at other visitors]. Older people have poorer hearing, if the environmental noise is loud, they won't be able to listen well." (Daughter, 53)

Most caregivers appreciated the shuttle service. It was pointed out that the shuttle bus saved the discomfort of transport transfer and outdoor heat, and therefore it could ensure the participants had a good mood from the start. For those who had difficulties in walking, the arrangement made the trip easier; for others, the point-to-point service allowed them to be more mentally relaxed:

"[Without a shuttle service] I won't visit the museum, I fear he (the husband) may get lost. I don't use complicated means to get around..... I seldom go to the Kowloon side, with the shuttle bus, it was convenient." (Wife, 52)

The arrival experience was confusing to some. One caregiver who drove to the museum said the signage was unclear, and since the family was unaware of the meeting spot, they walked to the main entrance to find it closed.

e. Environment

Aligning with the results in the questionnaire, caregivers generally found the museum comfortable. Caregivers thought the museum was spacious and well equipped with disable facilities. However, half of the caregivers also talked about their concerns in the lighting. It was remarked that in dim environment the participants tend to feel sleepy and had lower attention. Caregivers also pointed out that in carpeted area, more light is required to

eliminate the risk of fall:

"I think the biggest problem was his poor eyesight, he had a hard time looking at the display..... I think it's an issue of demented people, they don't like dark places, and [in such places] they begin to stumble."
(Daughter, 50)

f. Walking speed and walking load

Several caregivers thought the tour was slightly rush, and it was observed that the shape of the group was often long, making those who walked slow could not listen properly, and those in front had to spend much time waiting for others to keep up. It was commonly mentioned that the seating area was essential, and all people with dementia from the focus groups said they did not feel tired from the walking, which aligned with the observation of most caregivers.

2. Satisfaction

a. Social gathering and quality time

The majority of the participants felt positive about the program. Most considered it an opportunity to spend quality time with their family members, and to show their love. A wife was grateful because her spouse was allowed to the program:

"Bringing him along, so that I could see, and he could see too." (PWD, female, 87)

Some caregivers found little chance to talk with each other because they were occupied to providing assistance to their family member in the tour and in the workshop, but others managed to talk on the way. A spousal caregiver described the interactions in details:

"With other elderly, sometimes we could exchange our thoughts, and it felt good."

"You're bringing your family member, how does that feel?" "How is it with the daily caregiving?" [I could] feel it and listen to it, and talked to the others who provide care."
(Husband, 87)

b. Reminiscence boosts communication

Displays which were associated to personal experiences, such as the herbal tea store and the old style convenience store, yielded highest rate of recall. During both focus group sessions, participants talked about events and landscapes from the past, and the same dialogue was said to happen in the museum gallery. The majority of the caregivers liked the exhibition theme, it was described that the displays stimulated an emotional resonance, and many were impressed by their family members when they were able to associate gallery exhibits to themselves, and shared information that were previously not discussed, such as childhood experiences.

A wife specifically pointed out the transformation of her husband in the museum:

"He seldom speaks unless I speak to him, and in usual days I mostly ask him what the date and the month are..... [In the museum] he kept talking as he walked, and spoke to me about the trade fairs, haircutting as a kid, and old things about the herbal tea shops."
(Wife, 66)

c. Continuance

All caregivers agreed that the program was an enjoyable activity to their family members, and it was pointed out that "it was the process that mattered". Some caregivers reported that their family members had a brighter mood at home after the visit, and some even reported that the conversation about the visit lasted for several days:

"Without seeing anything special and without outside stimulations, we sometimes fall into silence at home, but then after the visit there were three to four days in which we had new topics, Dad would talk about the rice stores and the herbal tea shops from the past." (Daughter, 53)

3. Motivation

All but one caregiver said they were motivated to visiting other museums. One third of the caregivers mentioned that they would not revisit MH with their family caregivers because of the lack of novelty. One caregiver observed that her mother showed less interest to the exhibits on the second visit.

Some caregivers said the family members would be happy "as long as they have a day out", that "it was better to stay home", and

several saw the program as a stimulating activity such that the content did not matter.

One spousal caregiver said the following:

"I think doing reminiscence there is good, recalling the past. He talked about the temporal housing settlements, and how the water restriction was carried out once in four days..... I feel that there are things that still exist in his brain.....he doesn't really mind what he does; he behaved similar in the two visits." (Wife, 83)

One caregiver talked about the meaning she interpreted from the program:

"To me, seeing him (the father) interact with others let me know that he isn't that bad, and I value the chance to spend time together, that was a chance to see him."
(Daughter, 57)

DISCUSSION

Both elderly participants with normal cognitive functioning and with dementia resulted in a significant elevation of mood after the visit and workshop. Those visiting the program twice experienced an elevated mood from the museum program but also with an insignificant decrease in mood between the visits, the small sample size did not yield conclusive analysis on this change, but the result indicated that one visit might suffice for elevating participants' mood.

Self-perceived quality of life of PWD also increased significantly after the visit, which, with regard to the qualitative results, might be attributed to the chance of having outdoor activities, reminiscing past lives by the gallery items, as well as doing artworks.

Self-perceived psychological health of caregivers insignificantly worsened after the two visits, in which two sub-domains "inadequate coping" and "social dysfunctioning" got a significant decline. This program was not a coping training, so it might not help caregivers to adopt coping in their lives, and the decrease indicated that they might need other intervention on this theme.

In qualitative interviews, some caregivers said that they engaged a lot taking care of their family members during the visit and workshop, and did not have enough time to chat with other caregivers, their engagement with their family members but not others might explain the decline in social dysfunctioning. On the other hand, there was significant improvement in "anxiety" and "sleep disturbance", this indicated that the program served its purpose in improving the psychological wellbeing of the participants, and this might help

ease the anxiety, therefore promoting better sleep, among caregivers.

The program, both visit and workshop, was shown to help facilitate communication between people with dementia and their family caregivers, about past experience, about finishing the handcraft etc. The caregivers valued the quality of life of their beloved with dementia, and wanted them to enjoy happy time outside their homes. In addition, the handcrafting in workshop offered several elderly sense of achievement, which is often deprived of in life with dementia, and this also contributed to their better quality of life. This could be a powerful motivator for future programs to get caregivers involved, especially for the day care center users who are anticipated to have less leisure activities with their family caregivers.

The success of the program is also attributed to the theme, which allowed the elderly to reminisce and the caregivers to understand the past experience of the elderly. The lively presentation of the docents and artists, in particularly using examples of past time, also helped make the experience more positive. Slower talking speed and elevated intonation would further help keep the short attention of the elderly with dementia.

Sense of security was a major concern among caregivers, in this program, that the museum was opened to the program when it was closed to the public, as well as offering point-to-point transportation, served to give family caregivers this sense of security. On the other hand, the dim lighting in the museum lessened the sense of security, caregivers might worry about potential fall of the elderly.

LIMITATION

In spite of these encouraging findings, the small sample size prevented us from generalizing the findings to the entire population of people with

dementia. There was no control group in this study, so other variables that might affect the research results were not tested.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The high satisfaction rates proved the success of the program in improving the psychological wellbeing of people with dementia by offering a good experience for people with dementia to have an outdoor activity reminiscing past events and making handcrafts, as well by offering an opportunity for people with dementia and their family caregivers to communicate.

The findings supported that one visit would suffice improving the psychological wellbeing of the people with dementia. Two visits might help verbal communication between the people with dementia and their caregivers, while the research findings were inconclusive in drawing benefits of two visits in other areas. In reality, people in Hong Kong were busy, it would be difficult for caregivers to arrange two visits with their family members.

Another suggestion for arranging tours for people with dementia was to make it when the

museum / venue is closed to the public. Caregivers explicitly expressed that such environment would make them feel more secure in carrying their usually vulnerable family members along. Point-to-point transportation was also welcome, particularly when elderly with dementia might be more vulnerable in terms of mobility and taking transport. In addition, offering refreshment would further motivate the elderly to participate.

Completion of handcrafts gives participants sense of achievement, so workshop is suggested to be kept, while for people with dementia, handcrafting with step-by-step instructions and less abstract ideas are more welcome. Further studies with larger sample sizes and control group would be warranted to provide more convincing evidence and help design an optimal art appreciation program for people with dementia.

參考資料 (References)

- ALZ. (2015). *What Is Dementia*. Retrieved from <http://www.alz.org/what-is-dementia.asp>
- APA. (2013). *The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders: DSM 5*: bookpointUS.
- Beshwate, T. A., & Kasin, K. (2010). Art as Therapy: nurturing well-being and relationships for people with dementia. *Journal on Active Aging*, 9(5), 36-42.
- De Vugt, M. E., Stevens, F., Aalten, P., Lousberg, R., Jaspers, N., Winkens, I.,...Verhey, F. R. (2003). Behavioural disturbances in dementia patients and quality of the marital relationship. *International journal of geriatric psychiatry*, 18(2), 149-154.
- Parsa, A., Humble, L., & Gerber, C. (2010). Two art museum programs for people with dementia. *Museums & Social Issues*, 5(2), 217-234.
- Phinney, A., Chaudhury, H., & O'connor, D. L. (2007). Doing as much as I can do: The meaning of activity for people with dementia. *Aging and Mental Health*, 11(4), 384-393.
- Rhoads, L. (2009). Museums, meaning making, and memories: the need for Museum Programs for people with dementia and their caregivers. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 52(3), 229-240.
- Rosenberg, F. (2009). The MoMA Alzheimer's Project: Programming and resources for making art accessible to people with Alzheimer's disease and their caregivers. *Arts & Health*, 1(1), 93-97.
- Silverman, L. H. (2002). The therapeutic potential of museums as pathways to inclusion. *Museums, society, inequality*, 69-83.

完整報告可於香港歷史博物館網址下載：

The full version is available for download at the Museum's website:

<http://hk.history.museum/>

耆趣藝遊

賽馬會健腦行計劃

Journey For Active Minds

Jockey Club Museum Programme For The Elderly