NIHR | Policy Research Unit Older People and Frailty

Briefing Report

Preliminary analysis of older people who live in different types of supported housing in England

Asri Maharani, David Sinclair, Tarani Chandola, Peter Bower, Barbara Hanratty, James Nazroo, Neil Pendleton, Gindo Tampubolon, Chris Todd, Raphael Wittenberg, Terence O'Neill, Fiona Matthews

June 2021

Preliminary analysis of older people who live in different types of supported housing in England

Briefing Report

Asri Maharani[1], David Sinclair[2], Tarani Chandola[3], Peter Bower[1], Barbara Hanratty[2], James Nazroo[4], Neil Pendleton[1], Gindo Tampubolon[5], Chris Todd[1], Raphael Wittenberg[6], Terence O'Neill[1], Fiona Matthews[2]

National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Older People and Frailty Policy Research Unit, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, The University of Manchester, Manchester, M13 9PL, UK.

2 National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Older People and Frailty Policy Research Unit, Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, NE4 5PL, UK.

3 Faculty of Social Sciences, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong.

4 Cathie Marsh Institute for Social Research, School of Social Sciences, Faculty of Humanities, University of Manchester, UK.

5 Global Development Institute, School of Environment, Education and Development, School of Social Sciences, Faculty of Humanities, University of Manchester, UK.

6 National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Older People and Frailty Policy Research Unit, Care Policy and Evaluation Centre, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, WC2A 2AE, UK.

Preliminary analysis of older people who live in different types of supported housing in England

This short report presents the descriptive and bivariate analysis of older people living in different types of supported housing in England. The data was drawn from the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA). ELSA is a biennial household panel survey that collects information on the demographic characteristics, socioeconomic position, and comorbidities of individuals aged 50+ in England. Details of the study design are given elsewhere.[1] ELSA was started in 2002, and so far, there are nine waves of ELSA. This report used the most recent wave of ELSA (wave 9 in 2018-2019). Variables on housing and care receipt are not available in every wave of ELSA. Appendix 1 shows the availability of the housing and care receipt variables in each wave of ELSA.

Housing

We categorised supported housing into five types:

      (1) living in a nursing home or residential care home;
      (2) living in an ordinary or retirement house with meals and warden/porter services included in the with the accommodation or in the last rent payment;
      (3) living in an ordinary or retirement house with warden/porter services included in the with the accommodation or in the last rent payment;
      (4) living in a retirement house with no meals and warden/porter services included in the with the accommodation or in the last rent payment; and
      (5) living in an ordinary house with no meals and warden/porter services included in the with the accommodation or in the last rent payment.

Frailty

We assessed frailty using the frailty index, whereby we selected information on 60 functional, psychological, and social deficits within the range of data variables in ELSA.[2] All binary variables are recoded, using the convention that '0' indicates absence and '1' presence of a deficit. For ordinal and continuous variables, coding is based on the distribution of the data. Deficit points are summed for each individual, and divided by the total number of deficits, to produce a frailty index with a range from 0 to 1. Higher scores indicate greater frailty. Following Clegg et al.,[3] we categorised the frailty index into frailty (> 0.36), pre-frailty (>0.24-0.36) and non-frailty (≤0.24).

[1] Steptoe A, Breeze E, Banks J, et al. Cohort profile: the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing. Int J Epidemiol 2013; 42:1640–8.

[2] Wade KF, Marshall A, Vanhoutte B, et al. Does pain predict frailty in older men and women? Findings from the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA). J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2017;72(3):403-9. doi: 10.1093/gerona/glw226.

[3] Clegg A, Bates C, Young J, et al. Development and validation of an electronic frailty index using routine primary care electronic health record data. Age Ageing. 2016;45(3):353-60. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afw039.

Informal and formal care

We categorised the respondents as having informal care if they received help from: (1) husband/wife/partner; (2) son; (3) daughter; (4) grandchild; (5) sister; (6) brother; (7) other relative; (8) friend; or (9) neighbour (Appendix 2). We categorised the respondents as having formal care if they received help from: (1) home care worker/ home help/ personal assistant; (2) a member of the reablement / intermediate care staff team; (3) voluntary helper; (4) warden / sheltered housing manager; (5) cleaner; (6) council's handyman; (7) member of staff at the care/nursing home; or (95) other formal helpers.

Table 1 shows the frequency and proportions of adults aged 50-90 years old by supported housing types. Among 8,557 respondents, 0.67% (n=57) lived in a nursing home or residential care home; 0.02% (n=2) lived in an ordinary or retirement house with meals and warden/porter services included in the with the accommodation or in the last rent payment; 0.81% (n=69) lived in an ordinary or retirement house with warden/porter services included in the with the accommodation or in the last rent payment; and 2.96% (n=253) lived in a retirement house with no meals and warden/porter services included in the with the accommodation or in the last rent payment. The bivariate analyses show that older people living in supported housing differ from those not in supported housing in terms of age profiles, marital status, frailty status, and care receipt.

Table 1 Descriptive and bivariate analysis of the demographic, marital status, frailty and receipt of care, and types of supported housing. Presented are frequency (percentage). Bivariate analyses were performed using chi-square tests.

	All sample (n=8,557)	Ordinary housing with no services (n=8,176)	Retirement housing with no services (n=253)	Housing with warden/porter (n=69)	Housing with meals and warden/porter (n=2)	Living in a care home (n=57)	p-value
Age group							<0.001
50-59	1,888 (22.40)	1,872 (99.15)	13 (0.69)	3 (0.16)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	
60-69	2,777 (32.95)	2,700 (97.23)	54 (1.94)	15 (0.54)	0 (0.00)	8 (0.29)	
70-79	2,509 (29.77)	2,393 (95.38)	82 (3.27)	26 (1.04)	0 (0.00)	8 (0.32)	
80+	1,255 (14.89)	1,108 (88.29)	92 (7.33)	24 (1.91)	1 (0.08)	30 (2.39)	
Gender							
Male	3,810 (44.52)	3,660 (96.06)	97 (2.55)	28 (0.73)	1 (0.03)	24 (0.63)	0.319
Female	4,747 (55.48)	4,516 (95.13)	156 (3.29)	41 (0.86)	1 (0.02)	33 (0.70)	
Marital status							<0.001
Not-married	2,965 (34.65)	2,729 (92.04)	153 (5.16)	45 (1.52)	2 (0.07)	36 (1.21)	
Married	5,591 (65.35)	5,446 (97.41)	100 (1.79)	24 (0.43)	0 (0.00)	21 (0.38)	
Frailty status							<0.001
Robust	6,974 (81.53)	6,781 (97.23)	154 (2.21)	33 (0.47)	0 (0.00)	6 (0.09)	
Pre-frailty	901 (10.53)	810 (89.90)	57 (6.33)	17 (1.89)	0 (0.00)	17 (1.89)	
Frailty	679 (7.94)	583 (85.86)	41 (6.04)	19 (2.80)	2 (0.29)	34 (5.01)	
Receiving informal care							<0.001
No	7,245 (84.67)	7,002 (96.65)	188 (2.59)	38 (0.52)	0 (0.00)	17 (0.23)	
Yes	1,312 (15.33)	1,174 (89.48)	65 (4.95)	31 (2.36)	2 (0.15)	40 (3.05)	
Receiving formal care							<0.001
No	8,098 (94.64)	7,806 (96.39)	225 (2.78)	54 (0.67)	0 (0.00)	13 (0.16)	
Yes	459 (5.36)	370 (80.61)	28 (6.10)	15 (3.27)	2 (0.44)	44 (9.59)	

Appendix

Appendix 1 The availability of the housing and care receipt variables

	Wave								
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**
Whether staying in a retirement housing	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Whether staying in a nursing or residential care home since the last interview	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+
Receives informal and formal help	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Appendix 2 Different codes of 'receives help from' between waves

Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 3	Waves 4 and 5	Waves 6-9
01. Husband/wife/partner	01. Husband/wife/partner	01. Husband/wife/partner	01. Husband/wife/partner	**INFORMAL**
02. Mother/father	02. Mother/father	02. Mother/father	02. Son	01. Husband/wife/partner
03. Son	03. Son	03. Son	03. Daughter	02. Son
04. Son-in-law	04. Son-in-law	04. Son-in-law	04. Sister	03. Daughter
05. Daughter	05. Daughter	05. Daughter	05. Brother	04. Grandchild
06. Daughter-in-law	06. Daughter-in-law	06. Daughter-in-law	06. Other relative	05. Sister
07. Sister	07. Sister	07. Sister	07. Privately paid employee	06. Brother
08. Brother	08. Brother	08. Brother	08. Local authority/social services helper, e.g., home care worker	07. Other relative
09. Grandson	09. Grandson	09. Grandson	09. Nurse, e.g., health visitor or district nurse	08. Friend
10. Grand-daughter	10. Grand-daughter	10. Grand-daughter	10. Member of staff at the care/nursing home	09. Neighbour
11. Other relative	11. Other relative	11. Other relative	11. Friend or neighbour	
12. Unpaid volunteer	12. Unpaid volunteer	12. Home help or care arranged by social services	95. Other person	**FORMAL**
13. Privately paid employee	13. Privately paid employee	13. Home help or care arranged privately		01. Home care worker/ home help/ personal assistant
14. Social or health service worker	14. Social or health service worker	14. Nurse		02. A member of the reablement / intermediate care staff team
15. Friend or neighbour	15. Friend or neighbour	15. Someone else from the health or social services		03. Voluntary helper
16. Other person	95. Other person	16. Someone else from voluntary organisation		04. Warden / Sheltered housing manager
		17. Friend or neighbour		05. Cleaner
		95. Other person		06. Council's handyman
				07. Member of staff at the care/nursing home
				95. Other - please specify

This document is available in large print.

Please contact the NIHR Older People and Frailty PRU for assistance.

Email: pru-manager@manchester.ac.uk

Telephone: 0161 306 7797