

## Supplementary Table

Logistic regression models were established for sensitivity test by recoding the knowledge, attitude and self-efficacy scores into dichotomous variables (using average values as a cut-off point: encoding 1 for those greater than the mean, otherwise 0). Table 1 showed factors associated with knowledge, attitude and self-efficacy are same as the results from multivariable linear regression analyses.

Table 1 Results from logistic regression models

Variables	FAQ 1 scores			KAOP scores			Self-efficacy scores		
	OR	95%CI	p	OR	95%CI	p	OR	95%CI	p
<b>Gender</b>									
Male	Ref.			Ref.			Ref.		
Female	0.489	(0.239, 1.004)	0.051	<b>0.839</b>	<b>(0.042, 0.938)</b>	<b>0.023</b>	1.191	(0.579, 2.447)	0.635
<b>Age(years)</b>									
30-39	Ref.			Ref.			Ref.		
40-49	1.626	(0.919, 2.877)	0.095	0.990	(0.559, 1.754)	0.973	1.260	(0.702, 2.262)	0.439
50≤	0.840	(0.547, 1.543)	0.573	1.221	(0.666, 2.241)	0.518	<b>1.810</b>	<b>(1.069, 3.378)</b>	<b>0.003</b>
<b>Education level</b>									
Junior high school or below	Ref.			Ref.			Ref.		
Secondary high school	0.917	(0.471, 1.784)	0.799	1.013	(0.589, 1.742)	0.963	0.894	(0.511, 1.562)	0.693
Bachelor degree or above	<b>1.751</b>	<b>(1.009, 3.038)</b>	<b>0.046</b>	0.889	(0.459, 1.723)	0.728	1.143	(0.585, 2.235)	0.696
<b>Working tenure(years)</b>									
1-3	Ref.			Ref.			Ref.		
4-6	0.841	(0.519, 1.363)	0.843	1.600	(0.876, 2.925)	0.126	0.719	(0.436, 1.184)	0.195
7≤	0.662	(0.339, 1.142)	0.125	<b>0.628</b>	<b>(0.006, 0.835)</b>	<b>0.047</b>	0.686	(0.369, 1.276)	0.234
<b>Ownership of NHs</b>									
Public	Ref.			Ref.			Ref.		
Private	0.899	(0.568, 1.423)	0.650	1.145	(0.725, 1.808)	0.561	1.246	(0.780, 1.989)	0.358
<b>Work place</b>									
Urban	Ref.			Ref.			Ref.		
Rural	1.130	(0.729, 1.751)	0.584	0.899	(0.582, 1.388)	0.630	0.891	(0.569, 1.395)	0.613
<b>Employment type</b>									
Informal employee	Ref.			Ref.			Ref.		
Formal employee	1.130	(0.729, 1.751)	0.869	<b>1.694</b>	<b>(1.352, 2.887)</b>	<b>0.011</b>	0.910	(0.468, 1.773)	0.783
<b>Monthly income (¥)</b>									
< 2000	Ref.			Ref.			Ref.		
2000-3000	1.100	(0.688, 1.758)	0.691	0.758	(0.477, 1.204)	0.241	1.052	(0.650, 1.702)	0.838
> 3000	1.133	(0.441, 1.986)	0.862	<b>3.021</b>	<b>(1.330, 6.862)</b>	<b>0.008</b>	1.163	(0.540, 2.503)	0.700

<b>Pre-job training</b>									
No	Ref.			Ref.			Ref.		
Yes	<b>1.421</b>	<b>(1.065, 2.336)</b>	<b>0.043</b>	1.022	(0.626, 1.669)	0.931	<b>2.616</b>	<b>(1.548, 4.421)</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
<b>The health status of the elderly</b>									
Complete disability	Ref.			Ref.			Ref.		
Partial disability	1.226	(0.337, 1.566)	0.415	1.440	(0.665, 3.118)	0.354	<b>1.225</b>	<b>(1.097, 2.700)</b>	<b>0.001</b>
No disability	1.151	(0.339, 1.665)	0.481	1.301	(0.586, 2.889)	0.581	<b>1.330</b>	<b>(1.139, 2.798)</b>	<b>0.012</b>
<b>Interest in working with the aged</b>									
No	Ref.			Ref.			Ref.		
Yes	1.307	(0.707, 2.418)	0.393	<b>2.069</b>	<b>(1.105, 3.873)</b>	<b>0.023</b>	<b>1.381</b>	<b>(1.021, 2.646)</b>	<b>0.030</b>
<b>Job Satisfaction</b>									
Not satisfied	Ref.			Ref.			Ref.		
Generally satisfied	<b>2.481</b>	<b>(1.053, 5.846)</b>	<b>0.038</b>	1.878	(0.804, 4.384)	0.145	1.439	(0.576, 3.592)	0.435
Very satisfied	<b>2.137</b>	<b>(1.915, 4.991)</b>	<b>0.035</b>	1.668	(0.719, 3.871)	0.234	<b>1.905</b>	<b>(1.072, 4.699)</b>	<b>0.041</b>
$\chi^2$	35.118		0.014	33.362		0.015	46.818		<0.001
$R^2$	0.111			0.106			0.147		

**Note: Figures in bold indicate coefficients with statistical significance**