

Using individual and neighbourhood profiles and trends to understand frailty with nationally representative population data

Part 5: Care receipt, unmet need for care and frailty: a longitudinal analysis with multistate models

David R Sinclair, Asri Maharani, Andrew Clegg, Barbara Hanratty, James Nazroo, Chris Todd, Raphael Wittenberg, Terence W O'Neill, Fiona Matthews

Using individual and neighbourhood profiles and trends to understand frailty with nationally representative population data

Part 5: Care receipt, unmet need for care and frailty: a longitudinal analysis with multistate models

Executive Summary

August 2023

David R Sinclair^{1*}, Asri Maharani^{2*}, Andrew Clegg², Barbara Hanratty¹, James Nazroo², Chris Todd², Raphael Wittenberg³, Terence W O'Neill²†, Fiona E Matthews¹†

*,†: these authors contributed equally to this work

NIHR Older People and Frailty Policy Research Unit

Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University
School of Health Sciences, University of Manchester
Care Policy and Evaluation Centre, London School of Economics & Political Science

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research Policy Research Unit in Older People and Frailty. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Policy Research Unit Programme Reference Number PR-PRU-1217-21502

The problem

Frailty is a well-established measure of health reserve among older people that is strongly linked with poor outcomes. We do not know enough about how a person's level of frailty changes over time, depending on the care they receive (enough/not enough care) and socio-economic disadvantage.

What did we do?

We used information from the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA), a nationally representative study that follows people aged 50 +, over time. We measured changes in the frailty state of ELSA participants over an 18 year period (2002-2019). We looked at how these changes vary with receipt of care, unmet needs for care and four socio-economic characteristics: wealth, deprivation of the area where the person lived, educational status, and marital status.

Key findings

Care receipt:

- Receiving care was associated with a greater risk of increasing frailty and a lower chance of decreasing frailty.
- Receiving care signfies increased susceptibility to frailty and is a marker of people who cannot recover from frailty to a less frail state.

Unmet needs for care:

- Unmet needs for care were rarely associated with a risk of changing frailty state,
- However, this may be due to the small number of people with unmet needs in the dataset.

Socio-economic factors:

- Wealth is as good at predicting changes in frailty status as receipt of care.
- Low wealth was associated with greater risk of increased frailty and lower risk of reducing frailty.
- Lower educational attainment, greater area deprivation and not being married are all associated with a greater risk of increasing frailty.

Conclusion

Receiving care indicates progression towards a frailer health state and identifies individuals who are less likely to experience a reduction in their level of frailty. Household wealth is an equally influential factor in predicting changes in frailty. Individuals with little wealth who do not receive care are at comparable risk of frailty as those with high wealth who do receive care. Interventions aimed at preventing frailty would have the greatest impact on individuals who start to receive care, regardless of whether it is paid or unpaid care, and for people with lower wealth.



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





