

REVES *(a)* **20:** Assessing the Past, Looking to the Future



Relationship between Functional status (ADL and IADL) and WHODAS II Disability among older Malaysians

Tengku Aizan H., M.Ardjomand Hessabi, Siti Suhailah, A & Verbrugge, L. INSTITUTE OF GERONTOLOGY, UPM 7 – 9 May. REVES 2008



Objective

•Study the relationship between Functional status as measured by (ADL & IADL) the Disability which was measured by WHODAS II



Data Source

- Mental Health and Quality of Life survey 2005
 - Community living older persons aged 60 years and over.
 - 13 states, nationwide
 representation, proportionately distributed
 across states
 - 2980 respondents interviewed, 88% response rate.



Variables

Functional Status

combination of Barthel Index Activities of Daily Living (ADL), <u>7 out of 10</u> items
and Lawton & Brody Instrumental Activities of Daily Living Scale (IADL), <u>6 out of 8</u> items



Variables

- WHODAS 11
- 7 items of WHODAS II 12-Item Interviewer Administered Version
- Recoded into a dichotomous variable;
 Without Disability (<u>mild and none</u>) and With
 Disability (<u>moderate, severe and complete</u>).



Items WHODAS II (12 items version)	Domains	Disability (%)		
S1		19.6		
S7		26.8		
S1 & S7	Getting Around	23.2		
S3		17.8		
S 6		11.4		
S3 & S6	Understanding and Communicating	14.6		
S4	Participation in Society	16.2		
S10		7.9		
S11		8.7		
S10 & S11	Getting along with people	8.3		





Functional status of the respondents

	No problem	Have problem but	Problem and			
ADL	At all (%)	still do it (%)	Need help (%)			
Bathing*	94.2	3.6	2.2 1.6 2.4			
Dressing*	95	3.4				
Transfer*	91.8	5.8				
Mobility*	90.6	7.3	2			
Stairs*	87.1	9.2	<u>3.7</u>			
Grooming*	95	3.4	1.7			
Feeding*	95.9	2.7	1.3			
	No problem	Have problem but	Problem and			
IADL	At all (%)	still do it (%)	Need help (%)			
Shopping*	85.2	5.7	<u>9</u>			
Food Preparation*	87.9	5.6	6.5			
Housekeeping*	89.1	5.5	5.4			
Laundry*	86.7	6.2	<u>7</u>			
Responsibility for	91 0	7.0	<u>10.9</u>			
own medications*	81.2	1.9				
Ability to Handle Finances*	89.2	5	5.9			
*Pearson's correlation tests are significant at the 0.05 level with age and sex						



WHODAS II Scores according ICF(%)



The mean scores of the respondents were $15.5(SD \pm 20.20)$



Percentage of PWD



PWD= People With Disability

Moderate to Complete = With Disability None to Mild = Without Disability

Relationship between ADL & IADL components and WHODAS disability

ADL	Spearman Correlation			
Bathing	0.33			
Dressing	0.31			
Transfer	0.39			
Mobility	0.39			
Stairs	0.45*			
Grooming	0.32			
Feeding	0.28			
IADL	Spearman Correlation			
Shopping	0.50*			
Food Preparation	0.45*			
Housekeeping	0.44*			
Laundry	0.46*			
Responsibility for	0.41*			
own medications	0.41*			
Ability to Handle Finances	0.44*			
* Strong positive correlations with disability				



Binary logistic regression models between ADL components and WHODAS

В	S.E.	df	Sig.	OR [EXP(B	95.0% C.I. fo EXP(B)	
)]	Lower	Uppe
0.93	0.352	1	0.008	2.526	1.267	5.03
0.70	0.473	1	0.137	2.022	0.799	5.11
-1.89	0.600	1	0.002	0.151	0.047	0.48
0.27	0.306	1	0.385	1.305	0.716	2.37
1.94	0.208	1	0.000	6.977	4.636	10.49
0.26	0.276	1	0.356	1.290	0.751	2.21
0.73	0.439	1	0.094	2.084	0.881	4.92
	B 0.93 0.70 -1.89 0.27 1.94 0.26 0.73	BS.E.0.930.3520.700.473-1.890.6000.270.3061.940.2080.260.2760.730.439	BS.E.df0.930.35210.700.4731-1.890.60010.270.30611.940.20810.260.27610.730.4391	BS.E.dfSig.0.930.35210.0080.700.47310.137-1.890.60010.0020.270.30610.3851.940.20810.0000.260.27610.3560.730.43910.094	BS.E.dfSig.OR [EXP(B)]0.930.35210.0082.5260.700.47310.1372.022-1.890.60010.0020.1510.270.30610.3851.3051.940.20810.0006.9770.260.27610.3561.2900.730.43910.0942.084	B S.E. df Sig. OR 95.0% (EXP(B) 0.93 0.352 1 Sig. [EXP(B) EXP 0.93 0.352 1 0.008 2.526 1.267 0.70 0.473 1 0.137 2.022 0.799 -1.89 0.600 1 0.002 0.151 0.047 0.277 0.306 1 0.385 1.305 0.716 1.94 0.208 1 0.000 6.977 4.636 0.26 0.276 1 0.356 1.290 0.751 0.73 0.439 1 0.094 2.084 0.881

he ADL model only explained approximately 27% of the variance in disability, osmer and Lemeshow Test, chi squares was significant (9.32, df=1, p=0.002)



Binary logistic regression models between IAD components and WHODAS

Variables	В	S.E.	df	Sig.	OR	95.0% C.I.for EXP(B)		
					8	[EXP(B)]	Lower	Upper
]	Food Preparation	0.361	0.191	1	0.058	1.435	0.987	2.087
	Shopping	0.965	0.146	1	0.000	2.624	1.969	3.497
	Ability to Handle Finances	0.516	0.189	1	0.006	1.675	1.156	2.427
	Housekeeping	-0.033	0.229	1	0.886	0.968	0.618	1.516
	Laundry	0.411	0.194	1	0.034	1.508	1.031	2.206
1	Responsibility for own medications	0.180	0.107	1	0.094	1.197	0.970	1.477

The IADL model only explained approximately 31% of the variance in disability, Hosmer and Lemeshow Test, chi squares was significant (10.94, df=2, p=0.004)





The odds of being disabled are higher

- climbing stairs (OR= 6.977)
- bathing (OR= 2.526)
- shopping (OR= 2.624)
- laundry (OR= 1.508)
- financial management (OR= 1.675)
- Activities that involve movement and mobility.
 - For FMgt, not related to movement and mobility but related to cognitive ability



Conclusion

- Prevalence of disability is less than 30%. Similar with other studies.
- Disability in older people due to mobility as it shown in the models. But in IADL the financial management item fitted the model, even though; it is not related to mobility.
- Exist relationship between WHODAS II and functional status.





Limitation in interpretation as only limited items of WHODAS were utilised

Further analysis is needed to clarify the relationship controlling the socio-demographic and economic background of the respondents



Thank you

FOR YOUR KIND ATTENTION