

University of Groningen

Measurement Properties of the Groningen Frailty Indicator in Home-Dwelling and Institutionalized Elderly People

Peters, Lilian L.; Boter, Han; Buskens, Erik; Slaets, Joris P. J.

Published in:
Journal of the American Medical Directors Association

DOI:
[10.1016/j.jamda.2012.04.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2012.04.007)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2012

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Peters, L. L., Boter, H., Buskens, E., & Slaets, J. P. J. (2012). Measurement Properties of the Groningen Frailty Indicator in Home-Dwelling and Institutionalized Elderly People. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*, 13(6), 546-551. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2012.04.007>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.



JAMDA

journal homepage: www.jamda.com

Original Study

Measurement Properties of the Groningen Frailty Indicator in Home-Dwelling and Institutionalized Elderly People

Lilian L. Peters MSc^{a,*}, Han Boter PhD^a, Erik Buskens MD, PhD^a, Joris P.J. Slaets MD, PhD^b

^a Department of Epidemiology, University of Groningen, University Medical Centre Groningen, The Netherlands

^b Department of Geriatrics, University of Groningen, University Medical Centre Groningen, The Netherlands

A B S T R A C T

Keywords:

Frailty
elderly people
measurement
clinimetric evaluation

Objectives: To enable prevention of poor outcome in elderly people, a valid instrument is required to detect individuals at high risk. The concept of frailty is a better predictor than age alone. The Groningen Frailty Indicator (GFI) has been developed to identify frailty. We assessed feasibility, reliability, and construct validity of the self-assessment version of the GFI.

Design: Cross-sectional.

Setting: Community-based.

Participants: Home-dwelling and institutionalized elderly persons were included in the study (n = 353) who met the following inclusion criteria: persons 65 years and older who were able to fill out questionnaires.

Measurements: The feasibility of the GFI was assessed by determining the proportion of missing values per item. The internal consistency reliability of the GFI was established by calculating the KR-20. Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis tests were applied to assess discrimination between specific subgroups (known group validity). Convergent and discriminant validity was assessed using Spearman Rank correlations between GFI and diseases and disorders, case complexity, and health care needs (INTERMED), life satisfaction (Cantril Ladder of Life), activities of daily living (Katz), quality of life (EQ-5D), and mental health (SF-36). Finally, we used multivariate regression analyses to evaluate the cutoff score of the GFI (<4 versus ≥4).

Results: A total of 296 (84%) of the participants completed all items of the GFI; the internal consistency was 0.68. The GFI yielded statistically significant GFI scores for subgroups (known group validity). The correlations for the convergent (range 0.45 to 0.61) and discriminant validity (range 0.08 to 0.50) were also as hypothesized. In contrast with nonfrail participants, frail older persons had higher levels of case complexity, disability, and lower quality of life and life satisfaction.

Conclusions: This study supports the feasibility, reliability, and validity of the self-assessment version of the GFI in home-dwelling and institutionalized elderly people.

Copyright © 2012 - American Medical Directors Association, Inc.

Since the introduction of the concept of frailty, several instruments have been developed to determine the level of frailty among elderly people.¹ Although researchers disagree on a precise definition, it is commonly accepted that frailty indicates a state of vulnerability regarding the future occurrence of poor health outcomes, such as

mortality, hospitalization, institutionalization, chronic conditions, and/or loss of function in one or more domains (ie, the physical, psychological, cognitive, and social domains).^{2–5} Frailty is not only associated with quality of life and life satisfaction of individuals, but also has an effect on health care demands, as the numbers of frail elderly people in our aging population will increase.^{6,7} A valid screening tool to identify frailty is essential from both a clinical and a social perspective. Without such an instrument, tailoring preventive interventions for elderly people who are at risk of adverse events will be difficult to attain. The current instruments differ in their perspective on frailty, and, as a consequence, different domains are included to measure the construct.^{1,4,5,8–15}

More recently, frailty has been considered as a multidimensional construct comprising several domains (eg, physical, psychological, social, and cognitive domains).^{1,8,16} Several multidimensional frailty

This study was supported by a grant from ZonMw—the Netherlands Organization for Health Research and Development (60-61900-98-218). ZonMw had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, writing of the manuscript, or the decision to submit the paper for publication. Finally, the authors have no financial or other relationships that might lead to a conflict of interest.

* Address correspondence to Lilian L. Peters, MSc, Department of Epidemiology (room F4.09), University Medical Centre Groningen, University of Groningen, PO Box 30001, 9700 RB Groningen, The Netherlands.

E-mail address: L.L.Peters@umcg.nl (L.L. Peters).

instruments have been developed, including the Tilburg Frailty Indicator (TFI)¹⁷; however, major drawbacks of most of these instruments are that they (1) aim to assess frailty in specific elderly populations only (eg, home-dwelling), (2) do not comprise both a professional and a self-assessed version, (3) do not comprise items that assess disability that could predict poor outcome, and (4) do not allow for grades of frailty to be identified. The Groningen Frailty Indicator (GFI) is an instrument that includes all these domains and meets the drawbacks of other instruments.¹⁸ The GFI is widely used in clinical practice (ie, geriatric centers, nursing homes, emergency departments, traumatology, pulmonology, rheumatology, and surgical medicine), in outpatient settings, and in clinical studies.^{4,18–21}

Some of these studies assessed the psychometric properties of the professional or self-report version of the GFI. The internal consistency of the professional version of the GFI was considered to be good and the calculated KR-20/Chronbach's alpha ranged from 0.71 to 0.77.^{18,19} Positive indications were also found for its validity because, in contrast to nonfrail elderly people, frail older participants showed lower scores on quality of life and higher scores on psychological distress.¹⁸ Another study found that higher scores on the GFI were associated with less self-management ability.¹⁹ Only one study, in community-dwelling older persons only, assessed the psychometric properties of the self-report version of the GFI.²² In this study, the internal consistency was 0.73 (Chronbach's alpha) and the construct validity of the GFI was also supported, as it had substantial to high correlations with 2 other frailty instruments: the Sherbrooke Postal Questionnaire and the TFI (convergent validity).²² Second, as with the TFI, the GFI scores were significantly higher for females, older persons with higher age, persons with lower education, and people with lower incomes (known group validity).²²

We conclude that a comprehensive psychometric evaluation of the self-report version of the GFI is still lacking in home-dwelling elderly and elderly living in assisted-living residences, homes for the elderly, and nursing homes. Accordingly, the aim of the present study was to assess feasibility, reliability, and validity of the self-report version of the GFI in a heterogeneous population of elderly people.

Methods

From June 2008 until February 2010, a cross-sectional study was conducted among individuals residing in the northern provinces of the Netherlands. We recruited 359 elderly people who met the following inclusion criteria: persons 65 years and older who were able to fill out questionnaires. We excluded elderly people who had severe cognitive dysfunction or were very ill. The exclusion of severe cognitive dysfunction during the home interview was based on the professional judgment of comprehensively trained research nurses. This type of nonintrusive observational study does not require ethical committee approval under Dutch legislation. For a later study involving the same instruments and, moreover, including follow-up measurements, the ethics review board of our institution provided a waiver that it was not an experimental study with test subjects as meant in the Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act (WMO). Trained research nurses identified eligible elderly people who lived independently, in assisted-living residences, or were institutionalized (in nursing homes or homes for the elderly). Respondents were identified with help from a geriatric department of a general hospital, home care organizations, and associations for the elderly. Before participation, all elderly people gave their consent to participate in the study. Subsequently, all participants received a postal questionnaire comprising items about demographics, diseases, and disorders and in addition instruments to assess frailty (GFI) and life satisfaction (Cantril Ladder of Life).

The GFI is a 15-item screening instrument to determine the level of frailty, which is available in a professional and self-report version.^{19,22} It measures the loss of functions and resources in 4 domains: physical (mobility functions, multiple health problems, physical fatigue, vision, hearing), cognitive (cognitive dysfunction), social (emotional isolation), and psychological (depressed mood and feelings of anxiety).¹⁸ All answer categories were dichotomized and a score of 1 indicates a problem or dependency. The range of the GFI score is 0 to 15. Geriatric experts agreed that a score of 4 or higher represents moderate to severe frailty.¹⁹ The professional version of the GFI was modified from a patient-orientated questionnaire (with items such as "Has the patient recently felt downhearted or sad?") to an individual-oriented questionnaire (with items such as "Have you recently felt downhearted or sad?") and, as a consequence, the formulations of all items were adapted.^{19,22} For the purpose of the future evaluation of the predictive validity of the GFI in the longitudinal cohort study Lifelines,²³ 4 psychosocial items were slightly rephrased. For example, the item "Do you sometimes miss people around yourself" was rephrased as "Do other people pay attention to you?" (See Appendix 1).

Life satisfaction of elderly people was assessed using the validated Cantril Ladder of Life Scale.^{24–27} It assesses the respondents' life satisfaction with 3 self-report items that indicate life satisfaction in the past, present, and future. The present study is limited to the analyses of present life satisfaction. Ratings are made on a 10-point scale that ranges from best possible life to worst possible life. A higher score indicates better life satisfaction.

After 2 weeks, the research nurses collected the questionnaire at the elderly homes. They asked the elderly people to indicate GFI items that were difficult to fill out and helped the participants to complete those questions that were skipped. During the interview, the following assessments were performed: case complexity and health care needs (INTERMED), activities of daily living (Katz extended activities of daily living [ADL]),²⁸ quality of life (EuroQol-5D),²⁹ and psychosocial functioning (SF-36 mental health subscale).³⁰

The INTERMED questionnaire is a valid and reliable assessment method of case complexity and health care needs. It provides a biopsychosocial description of the elderly person based on clinically relevant variables.^{31,32} It contains a biological, a psychological, a social, and a health care domain. All domains comprise 5 questions and each domain is assessed in a context of time (history, current state, and prognosis). In total, the instrument consists of 20 items and the scores are summed (range 0–60). A high score indicates high case complexity.^{33,34}

The Katz extended Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (Katz) measures the independency in personal and instrumental ADLs. This instrument is frequently used in elderly people. It includes 6 ADL items and 4 instrumental ADL items. Each item is scored with a 0 (dependent) or 1 (independent), range 0 to 10.³⁵

The EuroQol-5D (EQ-5D) is a reliable and valid tool for measuring health-related quality of life. The instrument comprises 5 domains: mobility, self-care, pain, usual activities, and psychological status (answers-categories: no/some/severe problems). An index score was calculated for each respondent's health status.²⁹

The SF-36 is a generic health questionnaire that measures several dimensions of the respondent's health status. For this study, we assessed the mental health subscale (containing 5 items). Scores on the scale ranged from 0 to 100 with a score of 100 indicating the highest rating of mental health.³⁰

Sample size

For the calculation of the number or required participants per subgroup, we estimated effect sizes based on the conventions of Cohen.³⁶ Medium effect sizes (0.5 SD difference between subgroups)

were considered to be clinically relevant. Because some of the subgroup characteristics comprised 3 categories (eg, living situation), we decided to recruit at least 52 older persons per subgroup (on the basis of a 2-tailed test with $\alpha = 5\%$ and $1 - \beta = 80\%$).³⁶

Statistical analyses

Baseline characteristics were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Differences between the study sample and excluded respondents were evaluated with independent *t* tests and Pearson chi-square tests, where appropriate. A total GFI score was calculated if at least 75% of the GFI items were completed.²² We applied 3 techniques to impute missing values. Missing values were imputed with 0, 1, or the mean score for completed items of the GFI. The different techniques showed similar results and therefore we arbitrarily decided to impute missing values by 0. Standard psychometric methods were used to estimate measurement properties (feasibility, reliability, and construct validity) of the GFI.

The feasibility was based on the proportion of participants who completed at least 75% of the GFI items. In addition, we calculated the nonresponse rate per item among those participants who completed at least 75% of the GFI items.²² The internal consistency reliability of the GFI was calculated with the Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 (KR-20), as the items were scored dichotomously.³⁷ The KR-20 and Chronbach's alpha produce the same results and an alpha above 0.70 indicates satisfactory internal consistency.³⁸ The construct validity of the GFI was assessed in terms of known or extreme groups' validity, convergent validity, and discriminant validity.³⁹ We hypothesized that the GFI total scores differ among elderly subgroups and that these would be associated with age, gender, being single, being institutionalized, and having more diseases and disorders.^{20,22} This was assessed with Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis tests (known group validity). To assess the construct validity of the GFI, we calculated Spearman Rank correlations between the GFI total score and concepts that measure similar concepts (convergent validity) and concepts that measure different concepts (discriminant validity).³⁹ Frailty means losses of direct resources in several domains of function and these losses are associated with the prevalence of diseases/disorders, case complexity, and dependency of carrying out daily tasks.^{11,15,19,22,40,41} Therefore, we assumed higher correlations between the GFI and similar constructs. We assumed lower correlations with total GFI scores versus different constructs, such as quality of life and life satisfaction. Finally, we evaluated the cutoff score of the GFI (<4 versus ≥ 4) using multivariable regression analyses (with adjustments for age, gender, and diseases/disorders) and the outcome measures: case complexity, ADLs, quality of life, and life satisfaction.

All GFI data were analyzed using previously mentioned nonparametric tests as the data were not normally distributed. All statistical analyses were performed by using SPSS/PASW 18 (SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL). The level of significance was set at $P = .05$.

Results

A total of 359 elderly persons consented to participate in the study and filled out a postal questionnaire. All included elderly persons participated in the home interviews for the assessment of case complexity (INTERMED) and life satisfaction (Cantril Ladder of Life). During the study period, the assessment of ADLs (Katz), quality of life (EQ-5D), and mental health (SF-36) were added to the interview. For most of the included elderly people ($n = 260$), all instruments mentioned previously were assessed. Based on the research nurses' professional experience in geriatric care, no participant had to be excluded because of severe cognitive impairment. The data of 353 individuals were analyzed, as they filled out at least 75% of the GFI

items (see the following paragraph on feasibility). The average age of the elderly was 81 years and 65% of the participants were female (see Table 1). The elderly people had a median GFI score of 4 (interquartile range 2–7). Sixty percent of the elderly ($n = 211$) had a total GFI score of 4 or higher and were considered to be frail. None of the elderly people scored the maximum total score of 15 and 7% ($n = 23$) scored the minimum GFI score.

Feasibility

During the home visit, the research nurses assisted 69 elderly persons with the completion of items in the postal questionnaire, comprising the GFI and other measures. Six (2%) of the 359 elderly people were excluded from the analyses because they completed 11 or fewer items of the GFI. Of those who were included in the analyses, 84% ($n = 296$) filled out all 15 items of the GFI. The 6 excluded older persons did not differ from those who were included, with regard to gender ($P = .92$), age ($P = .60$), marital status ($P = .06$), diseases and disorders ($P = .26$), or cognitive dysfunction ($P = .75$); however, more frequently elderly people who lived in assisted-living residences had missing values as compared with those who lived independently or in a home for the elderly or nursing home ($P = .001$). We also compared the demographic characteristics and cognitive functioning of the included elderly persons who completed all items ($n = 296$) versus those who omitted at least one item ($n = 57$). Participants who were older ($P = .05$), were single ($P = .05$), lived in a home for the elderly or nursing home ($P = .01$), or who had some cognitive dysfunction ($P = .03$) had more missing values. The average number of missing values per participant was 0.2. Of the 59 elderly persons who omitted at least one GFI item, 16 participants had 20 questions with regard to GFI items that they found difficult to fill out, especially the items of the psychosocial domains and the item "mark physical fitness." This corresponds with the higher proportions of missing values on the same items (see Table 2).

Reliability

The internal consistency of the GFI was 0.68.

Table 1
Baseline Characteristics of the Included Elderly Population ($n = 353$)

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Sex, n (%) | |
| Female | 228 (65) |
| Age, mean (SD) | 81 (8) |
| Marital status (partner/spouse), n (%) | 118 (33) |
| Living situation, n (%) | |
| Home-dwelling elderly | 168 (48) |
| Assisted-living residences | 61 (17) |
| Living in home for the elderly or nursing homes | 124 (35) |
| Diseases, n (%) [*] | |
| Degenerative joint disease | 190 (54) |
| Cardiovascular disease | 156 (44) |
| Diabetes mellitus | 71 (20) |
| Pulmonary disease | 65 (18) |
| Stroke | 54 (15) |
| Cognitive dysfunction, n (%) | |
| No cognitive dysfunction | 309 (88) |
| Some cognitive dysfunction | 44 (12) |
| Assessments, mean (SD) | |
| Frailty (GFI) | 4.5 (2.8) |
| Case complexity and healthcare needs (INTERMED) | 14.8 (6.3) |
| Life satisfaction current (Cantril Ladder of Life) | 7.0 (1.5) |
| Quality of life (EQ-5D) [†] | 0.7 (0.4) |
| Activities of daily living (Katz) [†] | 4.5 (2.8) |
| Mental Health (SF-36) [†] | 71.8 (19.6) |

GFI, Groningen Frailty Indicator; SF, short form.

^{*}The selected diseases showed the highest prevalence in the population.

[†] $n = 260$.

Table 2
Proportions of Missing Values on the Separate GFI Items

| GFI Item | Proportion of Missing Values n = 353 |
|--|---|
| Physical domain | |
| 1. Shopping | 10 (3) |
| 2. Walking around outside | 5 (1) |
| 3. Dressing and undressing | 1 (0) |
| 4. Going to the toilet | 2 (1) |
| 5. Mark physical fitness | 14 (4) |
| 6. Experience problems due to poor vision | 2 (1) |
| 7. Experience problems due to poor hearing | 1 (0) |
| 8. Lost weight | 3 (1) |
| 9. Prescription of 4 or more medicines | 2 (1) |
| Cognition domain | |
| 10. Complaints about memory | 0 (0) |
| Social domain | |
| 11. Part of social network | 13 (4) |
| 12. Attention other people | 3 (1) |
| 13. Help other people | 9 (3) |
| Psychological domain | |
| 14. Calm and relaxed | 9 (3) |
| 15. Nervous or downhearted | 4 (1) |

GFI, Groningen Frailty Indicator.
Values are n (%).

Construct validity

Table 3 shows the statistical differences on the median total GFI scores between elderly subgroups based on demographic and diseases/disorders characteristics (known group validity). The GFI total scores differed between subgroups as hypothesized: higher GFI scores were found in the oldest-old, elderly people who were single, those who were institutionalized, who had a higher number of diseases/disorders, and in women (although the last difference was not statistically significant).

The correlations between the GFI total score and its physical and psychological domains, versus comparable constructs were higher, as expected, and ranged from 0.45 to 0.61 (convergent validity; Table 4). With the exception of life satisfaction, lower correlations were found between the GFI and different concepts: 0.08 to 0.50 (discriminant validity). The current cutoff score of the GFI (<4 versus ≥4) in multivariate regression analyses with adjustments for age, gender,

Table 3
GFI Scores and Proportions of Frailty in Elderly Subgroups

| | GFI median (Interquartile Range) | Proportion Frailty GFI Total Score ≥ 4 (%) |
|---|--|--|
| Gender | | |
| Men (n = 125) | 4 (2–6) | 52 |
| Woman (n = 228) | 5 (3–7) | 64 |
| Age, y* | | |
| 65–82 (n = 178) | 4 (2–6) | 52 |
| ≥ 82 (n = 175) | 5 (3–7) | 68 |
| Marital status* | | |
| Partner/Spouse (n = 118) | 3 (2–6) | 47 |
| Single/Widow (n = 235) | 5 (3–7) | 66 |
| Living situation† | | |
| Home-dwelling elderly (n = 168) | 3 (1–5) | 46 |
| Assisted-living residences (n = 61) | 4 (3–6) | 62 |
| Living in home for the elderly or nursing homes (n = 124) | 6 (4–8) | 77 |
| Diseases and disorders‡ | | |
| 0–1 disease/disorder (n = 110) | 2 (1–4) | 29 |
| 2 diseases/disorders (n = 99) | 4 (3–6) | 61 |
| ≥ 3 diseases/disorders (n = 144) | 6 (4–8) | 83 |

GFI, Groningen Frailty Indicator.
*Mann-Whitney test $P \leq .001$.
†Kruskal-Wallis test $P \leq .001$.

Table 4
Convergent and Discriminant Validity of the GFI Total Score, GFI Physical Domain, and GFI Psychological Domain*

| | Total GFI Score | GFI Domain Physical | GFI Domain Psychological |
|--|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Convergent validity | | | |
| Diseases and disorders | 0.51 | 0.45 | — |
| Case complexity (INTERMED) | 0.56 | 0.49 | — |
| Activities of daily living (Katz) | 0.50 | 0.61 | — |
| Mental health (SF-36) | — | — | 0.57 |
| Discriminant validity | | | |
| Quality of life (EQ-5D)* | 0.26 | 0.28 | 0.13 |
| Life satisfaction (Cantril Ladder of Life) | 0.50 | 0.35 | 0.48 |
| Activities of daily living (Katz)* | — | — | 0.08 |
| Mental health (SF-36)* | — | 0.15 | — |

GFI, Groningen Frailty Indicator; —, no correlations calculated.

*Correlations are in absolute values (high scores on the instruments, ie, good quality of life, high life satisfaction, independent with activities of daily living, and good mental health, are associated with low scores on the GFI, ie, low frail).

and diseases/disorders showed that, as compared with nonfrail older adults, frail elderly persons scored higher on case complexity, had higher levels of dependency in carrying out ADLs, and had lower quality of life and lower life satisfaction rates (see Table 5).

Discussion

This study collaborates the feasibility, reliability, and validity of the self-report version of the GFI in home-dwelling and institutionalized elderly people.

The feasibility of the self-report version of the GFI in the present study was good, which supports the results of a previous study.²² Most of the elderly persons (84%, n = 296) had no difficulty completing the GFI, a minority (16%, n = 57) skipped at least one item on the GFI. Persons who had at least one missing value were older in age, single, lived institutionalized, or had mild to moderate cognitive dysfunction.

The internal consistency of the GFI in the present study (0.68) was slightly lower than the range of a satisfactory scale (>0.70) and also lower than the reliability found in a previous study (ie, 0.73)²²; however, it is not unusual to see a variation in internal consistency of a scale across data sets. Also, while developing the GFI, our aim was a feasible and short questionnaire as an indicator of frailty with items from different domains. Such an approach has clear advantages for the use of the instrument in clinical practice but may have compromised internal consistency.

With regard to construct validity, the results of the known group validity showed that, overall, the GFI discriminates between subgroups with different demographics and diseases/disorders characteristics. Our results were consistent with previous work showing that age has a statistically significant association with GFI scores^{20,22}; however, in contrast with one previous study, we did not

Table 5
Multivariate Regression Analyses to Assess the Associations between Dichotomized Total Scores on the GFI (<4 versus ≥4) and Case Complexity, Activities of Daily Living, Quality of Life and Life Satisfaction

| Dependent Variables | Multivariate GFI Model* B |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Case complexity (INTERMED) | 4.88 (3.66 to 6.11) [†] |
| Activities of daily living (Katz) | 2.54 (1.83 to 3.25) [†] |
| Quality of Life (EQ-5D) | -0.16 (-0.26 to -0.07) [†] |
| Life Satisfaction (Cantril Ladder of Life) | -1.01 (-1.33 to -0.69) [†] |

*Adjusted for age, gender, and diseases/disorders.
† $P < .05$.

find a significant association between gender and GFI scores.²⁰ The correlations of the GFI with diseases/disorders and other instruments showed evidence for both its convergent and its discriminant validity. As expected, we found higher correlations between the GFI and related concepts. Except for life satisfaction, lower correlations were found between the GFI and different concepts. The moderate correlations between case complexity (INTERMED) and the GFI were consistent with previous results, although in this study the professional version of the GFI was assessed.⁴ The substantial correlation between instrumental ADLs (Katz) and the GFI in the present study was comparable to the results in a previous study in which the Groningen Activity Restriction Scale was used.²²

The correlation between GFI and life satisfaction was moderate and therefore higher than expected. A previous study, which used a different life satisfaction instrument, also showed a moderate correlation between frailty and life satisfaction.²¹ Even though frail older persons experience substantial loss of function, they may maintain a certain level of satisfaction with their lives by adjusting their subjective criteria for success and failure in life.²¹

The strength of the present study was the recruitment of a heterogeneous elderly population, which supports the generalizability of the results of the GFI. Although some researchers and clinicians have the opinion that frailty is a predisability state, others like Fried et al.¹² disagree. We think that frailty is a distinct concept from, but overlapping with, disability. Therefore, the GFI comprises some disability items and we decided to recruit the previously mentioned heterogeneous elderly population, including some elderly persons with significant disabilities.

The limitations of the study were related to the data collection. First, we do not have demographic data from those who declined participation, which prohibited comparisons between nonparticipants and participants. Additionally, for practical reasons, the items of the sociopsychological domain were slightly rephrased. Second, not all elderly people filled out the Katz, SF-36, and EQ-5D, as the data collection of these instruments was not performed directly from the beginning of the study. Nevertheless, overall, the proportion of missing data appears limited, ie, does not compromise our findings. The final limitation is related to the GFI instrument itself: it does not (yet) differentiate between grades of fitness, mild, and prefrailty, as nonfrail older persons have GFI scores on a limited range of 0 to 3. Future research should explore the meaning of low scores (eg, 0–1 versus 2–3) and also higher scores on the GFI. For example, individuals with a score just above the cutoff are likely to differ from individuals with scores over 10.

We have the following recommendations for future studies. First, we recommend further psychometric evaluations on the GFI to assess the inter- and intrarater reliability. Second, the present study indicated that the current used cutoff score of the GFI is satisfactory to differentiate frail versus nonfrail older people; however, future longitudinal studies are recommended to assess the optimal cutoff point. This cutoff point may vary and depend on factors such as the setting (eg, independent versus institutionalized-living older persons) and the predicted poor outcome. Our third recommendation is to investigate the current weighing of the GFI, in fact a simple addition of factors present or not may be optimized. Still, a brief questionnaire like the GFI appears very useful because it explains a lot of variance within groups. Importantly, as a standalone instrument for prediction of individual risk in clinical practice, current instruments may lack the precision required. Finally, we recommend that other independent research groups also assess the psychometric properties of the GFI, preferably against a second frailty instrument.

In the current literature, there is some evidence of the predictive validity of the professional version of the GFI^{4,42–44}; however, there is scarce evidence of the predictive validity of the self-report version of

the GFI.^{45,46} Therefore, we will perform longitudinal studies in different populations and with different outcome variables to clarify the predictive performance of the self-report version of the GFI in both clinical practice and in home-dwelling elderly.

Conclusion

We conclude that the results of this cross-sectional study showed evidence that confirms the feasibility, reliability, and validity of the self-report version of the GFI in a heterogeneous elderly population.

Acknowledgments

We thank all elderly people who participated in the study and we show our gratitude to the research nurses, Marijke Kastermans and Karin Knuyvers, for collecting the study data.

References

- de Vries NM, Staal JB, van Ravensberg CD, et al. Outcome instruments to measure frailty: A systematic review. *Ageing Res Rev* 2011;10:104–114.
- Ferrucci L. An exciting thought. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2005;60:56.
- Rockwood K, Stadnyk K, MacKnight C, et al. A brief clinical instrument to classify frailty in elderly people. *Lancet* 1999;353:205–206.
- Slaets JP. Vulnerability in the elderly: Frailty. *Med Clin North Am* 2006;90:593–601.
- Fulop T, Larbi A, Witkowski JM, et al. Aging, frailty and age-related diseases. *Biogerontology* 2010;11:547–563.
- Bergman H, Ferrucci L, Guralnik J, et al. Frailty: An emerging research and clinical paradigm—Issues and controversies. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2007;62:731–737.
- Pel-Littel RE, Schuurmans MJ, Emmelot-Vonk MH, Verhaar HJJ. Frailty: Defining and measuring of a concept. *J Nutr Health Aging* 2009;13:390–394.
- Walston J, Hadley EC, Ferrucci L, et al. Research agenda for frailty in older adults: Toward a better understanding of physiology and etiology: Summary from the American Geriatrics Society/National Institute on Aging Research Conference on Frailty in Older Adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2006;54:991–1001.
- Strawbridge WJ, Shema SJ, Balfour JL, et al. Antecedents of frailty over three decades in an older cohort. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci* 1998;53:9–16.
- Rockwood K, Fox RA, Stolee P, et al. Frailty in elderly people: An evolving concept. *CMAJ* 1994;150:489–495.
- Fried LP, Tangen CM, Walston J, et al. Frailty in older adults: Evidence for a phenotype. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2001;56:146–156.
- Fried LP, Ferrucci L, Darer J, et al. Untangling the concepts of disability, frailty, and comorbidity: Implications for improved targeting and care. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2004;59:255–263.
- Jones DM, Song X, Rockwood K. Operationalizing a frailty index from a standardized comprehensive geriatric assessment. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2004;52:1929–1933.
- Mitnitski AB, Mogilner AJ, Rockwood K. Accumulation of deficits as a proxy measure of aging. *ScientificWorldJournal* 2001;1:323–336.
- Markle-Reid M, Browne G. Conceptualizations of frailty in relation to older adults. *J Adv Nurs* 2003;44:58–68.
- Gobbens RJ, Luijckx KG, Wijnen-Sponselee MT, Schols JM. Toward a conceptual definition of frail community dwelling older people. *Nurs Outlook* 2010;58:76–86.
- Gobbens RJ, van Assen MA, Luijckx KG, et al. The Tilburg Frailty Indicator: Psychometric properties. *J Am Med Dir Assoc* 2010;11:344–355.
- Steverink N, Slaets J, Schuurmans H, Van Lis M. Measuring frailty: Developing and testing the GFI (Groningen Frailty Indicator). *Gerontologist* 2001;41:236–237.
- Schuurmans H, Steverink N, Lindenberg S, et al. Old or frail: What tells us more? *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2004;59:962–965.
- Andela RM, Dijkstra A, Slaets JP, Sanderman R. Prevalence of frailty on clinical wards: Description and implications. *Int J Nurs Pract* 2010;16:14–19.
- Frieswijk N, Buunk BP, Steverink N, Slaets JP. The interpretation of social comparison and its relation to life satisfaction among elderly people: Does frailty make a difference? *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci* 2004;59:250–257.
- Metzelthin SF, Daniels R, van Rossum E, et al. The psychometric properties of three self-report screening instruments for identifying frail older people in the community. *BMC Public Health* 2010;10:176–184.
- Stolk RP, Rosmalen JG, Postma DS, et al. Universal risk factors for multifactorial diseases: LifeLines: A three-generation population-based study. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2008;23:67–74.
- Cantril H. *The Pattern of Human Concern*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press; 1965.
- Palmore E, Luikart C. Health and social factors related to life satisfaction. *J Health Soc Behav* 1972;13:68–80.
- Palmore E, Kivett V. Change in life satisfaction: a longitudinal study of persons aged 46–70. *J Gerontol* 1977;32:311–316.

27. Atkinson T. The stability and validity of quality of life. *Soc Indic Res* 1982;10: 113–132.
28. Katz S, Ford AB, Moskowitz RW, et al. Studies of illness in the aged. The index of ADL: a standardized measure of biological and psychosocial function. *JAMA* 1963;185:914–919.
29. Brooks R. EuroQol: The current state of play. *Health Policy* 1996;37:53–72.
30. Ware JE Jr, Kristin KS, Kosinski M. SF-36 Health Survey Manual and Interpretation Guide. Boston: The Health Institute, New England Medical Center; 1993.
31. Huysse FJ, Lyons JS, Stiefel FC, et al. "INTERMED": A method to assess health service needs. I. Development and reliability. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry* 1999;21: 39–48.
32. Stiefel FC, de Jonge P, Huysse FJ, et al. "INTERMED": A method to assess health service needs. II. Results on its validity and clinical use. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry* 1999;21:49–56.
33. Huysse FJ, Lyons JS, Stiefel F, et al. Operationalizing the biopsychosocial model: The intermed. *Psychosomatics* 2001;42:5–13.
34. Stiefel FC, Huysse FJ, Sollner W, et al. Operationalizing integrated care on a clinical level: The INTERMED project. *Med Clin North Am* 2006;90:713–758.
35. Asberg KH, Sonn U. The cumulative structure of personal and instrumental ADL. A study of elderly people in a health service district. *Scand J Rehabil Med* 1989;21:171–177.
36. Cohen JA. power primer. *Psychol Bull* 1992;112:155–159.
37. Kuder GF, Richardson MW. The theory of the estimation of test reliability. *Psychometrika* 1937;2:151–160.
38. Nunally JC. *Psychometric Theory*. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill; 1978.
39. Streiner DL, Norman GR. *Health Measurement Scales: A Practical Guide to Their Development and Use*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2008. p. 261–263.
40. Levers MJ, Estabrooks CA, Ross Kerr JC. Factors contributing to frailty: Literature review. *J Adv Nurs* 2006;56:282–291.
41. Schultz-Larsen K, Avlund K. Tiredness in daily activities: A subjective measure for the identification of frailty among non-disabled community-living older adults. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr* 2007;44:83–93.
42. Pol RA, van Leeuwen BL, Visser L, et al. Standardised frailty indicator as predictor for postoperative delirium after vascular surgery: A prospective cohort study. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg* 2011;42:824–830.
43. Aaldriks AA, Maartense E, le Cessie S, et al. Predictive value of geriatric assessment for patients older than 70 years, treated with chemotherapy. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol*; 2010:205–212.
44. Biesma B, Wymenga AN, Vincent A, et al. Quality of life, geriatric assessment and survival in elderly patients with non-small-cell lung cancer treated with carboplatin-gemcitabine or carboplatin-paclitaxel: NVALT-3 a phase III study. *Ann Oncol* 2011;22:1520–1527.
45. Jansen JC, Abma EM, Hegeman JH, et al. Kwetsbaarheid als indicator voor herstel na een fractuur. *Ned Tijdschr Traum*; 2011:51–57.
46. Daniels R, van Rossum E, Beurskens A, et al. The predictive validity of three self-report screening instruments for identifying frail older people in the community. *BMC Public Health* 2012;12:69.

Appendix 1

Groningen Frailty Indicator

Physical components

Are you able to carry out these tasks single-handedly and without any help? (The use of help resources, such as a walking stick, walking frame, or wheelchair, is considered to be independent.)

1. Shopping
2. Walking around outside (around the house or to the neighbors)
3. Dressing and undressing
4. Going to the toilet
5. What mark do you give yourself for physical fitness? (scale 0 to 10)
6. Do you experience problems in daily life because of poor vision?
7. Do you experience problems in daily life because of being hard of hearing?
8. During the past 6 months have you lost a lot of weight unwillingly? (3 kg in 1 month or 6 kg in 2 months)
9. Do you take 4 or more different types of medicine?

Cognitive component

10. Do you have any complaints about your memory?

Social component

11. If you are at work, with your family, or at church do you believe that you are part of the social network?*
12. Do other people pay attention to you?*
13. Will other people help you if you are in need?*

Psychological component

14. In the past 4 weeks did you feel downhearted or sad?*
15. In the past 4 weeks did you feel calm and relaxed?*

Scoring:

Questions 1–4:

Yes = 0; No = 1

Question 5:

0–6 = 1; 7–10 = 0

Questions 6–9:

No = 0; Yes = 1

Question 10:

No = 0; Sometimes = 0; Yes = 1

Questions 11–13:

Never = 1; Sometimes = 1; Often = 0; All the time = 0[†]

Question 14:

Never = 0; Seldom = 0; Sometimes = 1; Often = 1; Very often = 1; All the time = 1[†]

Question 15:

Never = 1; Seldom = 1; Sometimes = 1; Often = 1; Very often = 0; All the time = 0[†]

*Psychosocial items were slightly rephrased compared with the previous published self-report version.²²

[†]Likert scales were adapted compared with the previous published self-report version.