



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Pickard, S., Cluley, V., Danely, J., Laceulle, H., Leon-Salas, J., Vanhoutte, B. & Romero-Ortuno, R. (2019). New horizons in frailty: the contingent, the existential and the clinical. *Age and Ageing*, 48(4), pp. 466-471. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afz032

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/22455/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afz032>

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).

New Horizons in Frailty: the contingent, the existential and the clinical

Journal:	<i>Age and Ageing</i>
Manuscript ID	AA-19-0199
Manuscript Category:	New Horizons
Keywords:	frailty, operationalisation, lived experience, social science, first-person perspective
Keypoints:	The rapid implementation of the frailty paradigm in clinical settings may have unintended consequences, These include disconnecting geriatric medicine from its roots in a holistic approach to health and illness in old age, They also introduce a disjunction between clinical views and patient experience of frailty, Methods drawn from the social sciences and humanities may prove useful in addressing this, They can be introduced into a multidisciplinary toolkit for practitioners across a range of settings

New Horizons in Frailty: the contingent, the existential and the clinical

Abstract

The increasing operationalisation of frailty including in primary care brings with it a risk of oversimplifying diagnostic processes and inadvertently barring access to comprehensive geriatric assessment services. The emphasis on measurement tools, despite updated guidance to the contrary, can also undermine the importance of clinical judgement, meaning that non-contractual evidence-based opportunities for medical optimisation (e.g. exercise promotion, nutrition optimisation) as well as appropriate access to social supports may be missed.

Another significant consequence is to open up an ever-widening gap between clinical approaches and lived experience, including overlooking strengths and resources in problem-based approach and inadvertently alienating the very group it is trying to assist.

This article argues that the next horizon in frailty should not be to continue to refine its operationalisations but rather to reconnect with more holistic approaches to health and illness in old age, which are more in tune with the tradition of geriatric medicine. Building on recent trends to shift conceptualisation of health and illness in old age, this project would benefit from sociological and humanities-based approaches that foreground older people's lived experience using theoretically informed description focused on a first-person perspective. In reconfiguring what we think frailty is, such a shift will bring us closer to the views and experience of older people who live with frailty. We see a brighter horizon for frailty in that direction.

Introduction

In the clinical literature, for the past decade frailty has been dominated by two approaches: the phenotype model, proposed by Linda Fried and colleagues, and the Frailty Index proposed by Kenneth Rockwood's group, with a vast and multiplying literature devoted to applying and reaffirming one or other of those two positions. Both of these are centred on signs and symptoms of the individual body. Following the 2017 GMS contract, all primary care practices have been incentivised to identify older patients with moderate or severe frailty, extending the use of these and similar 'appropriate' tools into primary care. One of the unintended consequences of the dominance of the operationalisation of frailty in either of these forms include clinical assumptions that frailty is a diagnosis, rather than a syndrome or state caused by other factors, which brings the danger of oversimplifying diagnostic processes and inadvertently barring access to comprehensive geriatric assessment services. The emphasis on measurement tools, despite updated guidance to the contrary [1], can also undermine the importance of clinical judgement, meaning that non-contractual evidence-based opportunities for medical optimisation (e.g. exercise promotion, nutrition optimisation) as well as appropriate access to social supports may be missed. Another significant consequence is to open up an ever-widening gap between clinical approaches and lived experience and inadvertently alienate the very group it is trying to assist.

In this article we argue that the next horizon in frailty should not be to continue to refine its operationalisations and have them compete for their rapid implementation into clinical practice, but rather to take a step back, look critically for unintended consequences, and reconnect with more holistic approaches to health and illness in old age, which are more in tune with the tradition of geriatric medicine. As well as building on recent trends [2] to shift

1
2
3 conceptualisation of health and illness in old age, in so doing it would benefit from
4
5 sociological and humanities-based approaches that foreground older people's lived
6
7 experience using theoretically informed description focused on a first-person perspective. In
8
9 reconfiguring what we think frailty is such a shift will also bring us closer to the views and
10
11 experience of older people who live with frailty. We see a brighter horizon for frailty in that
12
13 direction.
14
15

20 **The disjunction between clinical approaches and lived experience**

21
22
23 There is an emerging body of research, coming from the social sciences, humanities, social
24
25 work and nursing and focused on empirical work with older people themselves, that is highly
26
27 critical of clinical representations of frailty. This critique focuses, inter alia, on its failure to
28
29 take into account the role played in precipitating frailty by domains outside the biological,
30
31 including social disadvantage [3]; its overlooking of positive aspects of frail
32
33 embodiment/resilience [4]; its incorporation of psycho-social aspects in a dualistic framework
34
35 that posits the separation of mind and body [5]; its perpetuation of decline narratives; and
36
37 ultimately its potentially (albeit unintentionally) harmful impact on older people who are
38
39 labelled 'frail', which may in turn trigger frailty identity crises [6] precipitating a 'cycle of
40
41 decline' [7]. The importance of subjectivity is also highlighted in clinical literature: for
42
43 example, negative representations of ageing may underpin a decline in objective walking
44
45 speed [8]; in addition, the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing suggested that older people
46
47 who have a more positive attitude to ageing may be at reduced risk of becoming physically
48
49 frail or pre-frail [9].
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In the wider social domain, the influence of frailty discourses on reconfiguring old age have
4 been significant, separating the 'third' age (productive, healthy, associated with 'successful'
5 ageing) from the fourth age (devalued, decrepit, senescent, 'geriatric'), into which latter
6 category a frailty label may serve as a key gateway. The fourth age as a social imaginary [10]
7 undermines any concept that old age may contain value and meaning. It stresses separation
8 rather than continuity both from other (more 'successfully' ageing) older people and from
9 experiences of vulnerability common through the life course including those precipitated by
10 structural conditions configuring socio-economic insecurity and increased social inequality
11 that undermine well-being and increase poor health as summed up in the term 'precarity'
12 [11]. For all these reasons, older people themselves fear and resist the label, thus potentially
13 alienating them from practitioners and 'frailty' services. This has resulted in calls in some
14 quarters for the term to be dropped altogether [12] or for its use to be limited *because* of its
15 significant limitations, calling instead for a broader strengths-based approach to older
16 people's health and illness, 'defined by what they can, as much as what they cannot, do' [13]
17 and thinking "diversabilities" rather than just "disabilities".
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 However, a similar understanding is emerging in medicine. This is reflected in the emerging
42 concept of "intrinsic capacity". Defined in the World Health Organisation's (WHO) World
43 Report on Ageing and Health [14] as the combination of physical and cognitive attributes of
44 an individual, its interplay with the individual's social environment shapes the functional
45 ability that the WHO posits as the definition of healthy ageing [2]. This concept moves away
46 from a disease-centred approach to one that emphasizes the positive attributes that ordinarily
47 support 'health' in the sense of being able to be and do what one values [15]. Professional
48 assessment within this framework would require a longitudinal observational approach rather
49 than a single 'snapshot' assessment; intervention can then move from a preventive or reactive
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 focus to an emphasis on supporting the everyday capacity of the individual. This conceptual
4 apparatus has been hailed as a potentially revolutionary transformation to viewing health and
5 illness in old age [2]; as such it is well-placed to capture the complexity of frailty, both as a
6 clinical state and as a lived experience, as well as to support interventions aimed at restoring
7 functionality.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 **The expertise of geriatric medicine: clinical and social**

20
21 Whilst agreeing with the rationale behind the critiques of frailty as it is currently
22 operationalised – particularly the disjunction between clinical approaches and lived
23 experience that has emerged- we are not advocating that the term be dropped. Clearly frailty
24 exists and signifies something ‘real’. Nor do we think clinical ‘frailty’ is necessarily and
25 inherently too limited to be able to encompass lived experience, even though since its
26 operationalisation over the past two decades it has been almost entirely focused on
27 physiological or functional limitations. Indeed, our view is that frailty is broader than clinical
28 symptoms and encompasses more than a medical syndrome alone and that geriatric medicine
29 has the particular knowledge-base to overcome this disjunction. Historically, geriatric
30 medicine has roots in the understanding that social and medical problems are inextricably
31 intertwined in the lives of older patients and indeed that this linkage forms part of the unique
32 nature of health and illness in old age, recognition of which is part of the unique expertise of
33 geriatrics. As found in the works of pioneering geriatricians such as Amulree, Sheldon,
34 Brocklehurst and others, going all the way back to Marjory Warren, the discipline was
35 established to take a holistic approach, remedy as much as possible and focus on restoring
36 function in such a way as to enable patients to return to their own homes and their lives [16].
37 Revisiting this may inspire the reintegration of not just the social and medical, as advocated
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 by the WHO's approach to healthy ageing, but also of a rapprochement between clinical
4
5 knowledge and lay experience of frailty.
6
7
8
9

10
11 There is recognition of the importance of a more holistic approach within the field of frailty
12
13 itself, especially through CGA [17]. Firstly, running alongside the trend to operationalise
14
15 frailty in terms of individual and largely physiological deficits is the agreement that frailty is
16
17 a state of pre-existing vulnerability which, combined with a stressor of some kind (either
18
19 illness or an external crisis or both), can have significant negative consequences [18, 19].
20
21 Campbell and Buchner point out: 'the interaction of the individual with the environment is
22
23 central to this concept of frailty' [18]. Although the kinds of stressors discussed usually relate
24
25 to health – a minor illness or infection, starting new medication and so on [19] - this
26
27 conceptual framework is elastic enough theoretically to encompass events in the social world
28
29 that are contingent (such as falls, illness and other risks arising from systemic and structural
30
31 conditions) or existential (dilemmas that affect everyone as well as those that are specific to
32
33 old age, such as bereavement, grief, loneliness, loss of meaning or value) [20]. The
34
35 connection between social events and health is corroborated in neuroendocrinology [21] and
36
37 potentially traceable through biomarkers [12] conceptualised through the allostatic load [23].
38
39 This framework can also take into account the strengths and resources that co-exist and which
40
41 may require additional support at this time.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Secondly, rather than seeing 'frail elderly people as complex systems on the brink of failure'
53
54 [24] there is increasing recognition that frailty is dynamic, involving improvement as well as
55
56 continued decline [25] and that over time, indeed, the 'usual' pattern of frailty involves older
57
58 people moving between pre-frail, robust and frail positions [25]. Thus the 'brink' may in
59
60

1
2
3 many instances be one of renewed or improved health. Given that prefrail older people are far
4 more likely to move to the robust position than are those already classified as frail
5
6 (approximately 25 per cent compared to 3 per cent respectively) [25], this suggests the
7
8 importance of interventions that are both sensitive and timely. However, currently in primary
9
10 care the obligation on GPs, following routine identification, is to intervene only in cases of
11
12 severe frailty, thus missing an opportunity to delay or reverse frailty earlier in its trajectory
13
14 [1]. Moreover, there is no consistent approach to the kinds of interventions that GPs should
15
16 utilise. A recent review of the evidence [26] suggest that a combination of strength exercises
17
18 and protein supplementation is best for a combination of ease and effectiveness in improving
19
20 frailty and suggests that a toolkit should be made available to GPs summarising the most
21
22 effective interventions. Missing from this mooted toolkit, however, is any reference to social
23
24 support dimensions.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Bridging the gap**

35
36
37 Sociological studies comprising interviews and thick observational data report that older
38
39 people talk about adapting to and indeed thriving in the ‘ordinary’ conditions of ageing,
40
41 involving ‘diminished everyday competence’ [27] which comprises a range of ‘problems’ all
42
43 the way from weaker sight and hearing to stiff joints and frailty. Part of the experience of
44
45 adaptation is the learning of new skills, ways of coping with reduced strength and the
46
47 challenges of the environment. Disruption of this everyday competence, for example through
48
49 the occurrence of contingent or existential events is what leads to felt frailty. A mixture of
50
51 appropriate interventions at this point can support the older person to return to a pre-frail or
52
53 robust state rather than fluctuate into further frailty. The experience of older people strongly
54
55 suggests that, although frailty is a severe diminishment of everyday competence, it is still part
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of that continuum, can be reversed or delayed, and is not, therefore, something separate. This
4
5 is what is recognised in the clinical arena in claims that the aim of frailty interventions is to
6
7 stabilise frailty and reduce the more general vulnerability it signals [19] (rather than, for
8
9 example, 'combat' frailty). Earlier versions of the frailty index directly reference John
10
11 Brocklehurst's 'balance beam model' which incorporates social and relational factors into its
12
13 understanding of frailty as a dynamic state [28]. The task then for geriatricians is to go from
14
15 acknowledging this in the abstract, viewing biology and the social as important but separate
16
17 in the 'frailty syndrome', or seeing its existence as lying beyond the domain of medicine, to
18
19 an appreciation of this 'damage' as something that involves not just cells, tissues and organs
20
21 (where it might have been present for a considerable length of time) but the lived self. The
22
23 clinical gaze intuitively grasps these principles, in the 'know it when I see it' approach but
24
25 this 'art' of medicine is in danger of being subsumed in the increasingly technical approaches
26
27 that characterise approaches to frailty detection and management, especially in busy settings.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **The contribution of approaches from social sciences and the humanities to bridging the** 38 39 **gap** 40

41
42 In this aim, medicine can learn from sociological approaches to the lived experience of health
43
44 and illness. A well-established interpretive tradition critiques the reductionist nature of
45
46 biomedical readings of the body and disease, and stresses the importance of embodied,
47
48 biographical and social factors in the illness experience. Narrative-based methods can aid the
49
50 geriatrician in understanding how illness is experienced as a biographical event related to
51
52 meaning and identity [29, 30]. Phenomenological methods, influenced by the work of
53
54 Merleau-Ponty, can aid the geriatrician to understand health and illness from the perspective
55
56 not of medicine but of the older person [31]. It contrasts the objective anatomical body
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (Körper) with that of the lived body (Leib), the biological body with the existential body, and
4
5 stresses the importance of the latter in understanding how a person experiences illness,
6
7 including in its fluctuations [32]. Phenomenology aims at ‘direct description of our
8
9 experience as it is’[33], although more sociologically informed accounts look not so much for
10
11 ‘essential’ structures of experience, as sought by philosophers, but are more sensitised to the
12
13 way experiences are structured through social forces, which can in turn increase vulnerability,
14
15 highlighting the role of age, gender, class and so on in shaping and mediating the trajectories
16
17 of frailty. Interpretive concepts and methods can explain how, for example, the ‘normality’ of
18
19 long-term conditions and other illness may be experienced more in the oldest patients than in
20
21 the young-old for whom sudden illness/impairment may feel like a biographical ‘rupture’,
22
23 with adverse consequences for coping and well-being [34, 35]. Both experience and onset of
24
25 frailty have been shown to be strongly dependent on life history, with accumulated
26
27 disadvantages leading to an earlier experience of frailty and poorer outcomes [36].
28
29 Interpretive methods can tease out if and how, under such circumstances, the social context in
30
31 which frailty arises might be more impactful on the subsequent frailty trajectory than the
32
33 health crisis which precipitated it. Similarly, it is known that gender is a factor in the
34
35 experience of frailty in that whilst more women than men are frail, they are also more likely
36
37 to fluctuate between health and frailty, although frailty is less of a ‘risk’ for them, at all
38
39 stages, than men in a paradox that is currently not well understood [2]. Exploring lived
40
41 experience through an interpretive lens may shed light on this paradox and help tailor
42
43 interventions accordingly. For example, different interventions are appropriate for contingent
44
45 and existential frailty factors respectively. The former are potentially modifiable by
46
47 multidisciplinary interventions to address the risk of falls, poor nutrition, ensure aids and
48
49 adaptations; what is needed for the latter, by contrast, is social, relational and spiritual
50
51 support [37]. These are promising new horizons for frailty.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 A phenomenological toolkit for use by both patients/carers and clinicians to increase mutual
7
8 understanding and communication was developed by the philosopher Havi Carel [38]. It
9
10 includes three elements: (i) shifting the focus away from the disease entity toward the
11
12 experience of illness; (ii) highlighting the contrasting perspectives of clinicians, patient,
13
14 carers in ways that help mutual understanding; (iii) recognising and identifying the ways in
15
16 which illness changes the experience of one's body, identity, relationships, interaction with
17
18 the environment, habits, routine, meanings, values and norms. Such a toolkit acknowledges
19
20 the importance of both the biological and social but also, and most importantly perhaps, the
21
22 interweaving of both as factors jointly underpinning an older person's movement along the
23
24 continuum of robust, pre-frail and frail. In so doing it opens up the chance to restore healthy
25
26 ageing by sensitive means in appropriate domains in (iii).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 CGA is a highly sensitive vehicle for delivering such interventions and the introduction of a
36
37 CGA toolkit into primary care is thus a promising development. However, there is still a
38
39 danger that frailty is decoupled from CGA and thus it will be important to ensure that these
40
41 principles are not just applied in older people with frailty syndromes of any stage, or with
42
43 severe frailty [17], but that they inform the understanding of health, illness and normality in
44
45 all older patients, as well as the concept of, and practices around, frailty itself. A
46
47 reconfiguring of the understanding of and approach to frailty to include a broader approach
48
49 lies at the heart of a reconceptualisation of health and illness in old age, which in turn gives
50
51 geriatric medicine, as it is deployed by all branches of medicine [39] a key role in an ageing
52
53 world, not just in terms of intervening in frailty but in supporting health ageing in the wider
54
55 population.
56
57
58
59
60

Conclusion

Geriatric medicine as a specialty has the skills and expertise to bridge the gap between older people's lived experience of both old age and frailty and the current clinical approach to frailty by placing commitment to the principles on which it was founded at the very heart of its approach. It can do this by reinstating the importance of the social alongside the medical, appreciating the two as both distinguishable elements and one that are always, like yin and yang, already intertwined. Together and relatedly this will involve a recognition of resources as well as deficits present in the state of being frail and of the continuum of health, illness and frailty. We suggest that concepts and methods from the social sciences and humanities will be particularly helpful in this project. Invigorated by such principles, such a medical approach has the powerful potential to influence cultural views towards ageing in a more positive way, reducing the dread towards the fourth age and the 'othering' of (frail) older people that is detrimental to the well-being not just of the older people themselves but of a society that fears, dreads and denies ageing. This is important if frailty as a construct is to realise its full potential to ameliorate the vulnerabilities of later life, without itself inducing undesirable effects, and thus to engage most productively and sensitively with the people whom it is dedicated to help.

References

1. NHS England, Updated guidance on supporting the routine frailty identification and frailty care through the GP contract, 2017/18, Long Term Conditions Unit, Medical Directorate

- 1
2
3 2. Cesari, M, Araujo de Carvalho, I, Amuthavalli Thiyagarajan, J et al, Evidence for the
4 domains supporting the construct of intrinsic capacity, *J Gerontol, A, Biol Sci Med Sci*, 2018,
5
6 73(2): 1653-1660
7
- 8
9
10 3. Stolz, E Mayerl, H Waxeneger, A et al Impact of socioeconomic position on frailty
11 trajectories in 10 European countries: evidence from the Survey of Health, Ageing and
12 Retirement in Europe (20014-13). *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 2017
13
14 71(1):73-80
15
16
- 17
18 4. Nicholson, C, Meyer, J, Flatley, M et al. Living on the margin: understanding the
19 experience of living and dying with frailty in old age. *Social Science and Medicine* 2012:
20
21 75(8): 1426-32
22
23
- 24
25 5. Pickard, S Health, illness and frailty in old age: a phenomenological exploration, *Journal*
26
27
28 of Ageing Studies, 2018 doi:10.1016/j.jaging.2018.10.002
29
- 30
31 6. Fillit, H and Butler, RN (2009) The frailty identity crisis, *Journal of the American*
32
33 Geriatrics Society, 57(2): 348-52
34
- 35
36 7. Warmoth, K, Lang, I.A, Phoenix, C et al ‘Thinking you’re old and frail’: a qualitative
37 study of frailty in older adults, *Ageing and Society*, 2016, 36, 1483-1500
38
39
- 40
41 8. Robertson, DA, Savva, G.M, King-Kallimaris, B.L, Kenny, R.A Negative perceptions of
42 ageing and decline in walking speed: a self-fulfilling prophecy, *PloS ONE*, 2014, 10(4)
43
44 :e0123260.doi:10.1371/
45
- 46
47 9. Gale, C.R, Mötus, R, Deary, I.J, Cooper, C and Sayer, A.A Personality and risk of frailty:
48 the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing, *Ann Behav Med*, 2017: 51(1): 128-136
49
50
- 51
52 10. Higgs, P and Gilleard, C Rethinking old age: theorising the fourth age, 2015, London:
53
54 Palgrave Macmillan
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 11. Grenier, A, Lloyd, L and Phillipson, C Precarity in late life: rethinking dementia as
4
5 'fraild' old age, *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 2017, 39(2): 318-330
6
7
- 8
9 12. Age UK and the British Geriatrics Society. Britain Thinks. Frailty: Language and
10
11 Perceptions, 2015.
12
- 13 13. Nicholson, C, Gordon, A.L, Tinker, A Changing the way 'we' view and talk about frailty,
14
15 *Age Ageing*, 2017, 46(3): 349-51; p. 350
16
17
- 18 14 World Health Organization (2015) Summary. World report on ageing and health:
19
20 <https://www.who.int/ageing/events/world-report-2015-launch/en/>
21
22
- 23 15. Rahman, S, *Living with frailty: from assets and deficits to resilience*, 2019, London:
24
25 Routledge
26
27
- 28 16. Martin, M *Medical Knowledge and Medical Practice: geriatric medicine in the 1950s*,
29
30 *Social History of Medicine*, 1995 8: 443-61
31
32
- 33 17. Gordon, A.L, Masud, T, Gladman, J.R.F Now that we have a definition for physical
34
35 frailty, what shape should frailty medicine take? *Age Ageing*, 214 (1): 8-9
36
37
- 38 18. Campbell AJ and Buchner DM Unstable disability and the fluctuations of frailty. *Age*
39
40 *Ageing*, 1997 26: 315-8. 3
41
- 42 19. Turner and Clegg Best practice guidelines for the management of frailty: a British
43
44 Geriatrics Society, Age UK and Royal College of General Practitioners report, *Age Ageing*,
45
46 2014; 43(6): 744–747; p. 745
47
48
- 49 20. Laceulle, H Virtuous ageing and existential vulnerability, *Journal of Aging Studies*, 2017,
50
51 43: 1-8
52
53
- 54 21. McEwen, B.S, Brain on stress: how the social environment gets under the skin, *PNAS*,
55
56 2012, 109(suppl.2) 17180-17185
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 22. Kamiya, Y, Timonen, V, Romero-Ortuno, R and Kenny, R.A Back to basics or into a
4 brave new world? The potential and pitfalls of biomarkers in explaining the pathways
5 between social engagement and health, in Hoque, N, McGehee, M and Bradshaw, BS (eds)
6 Applied Demography and Public Health, pp. 313-336, Springer, Dordrecht, 2013.
7
8
9
10
11
12 23. Van Deurzen, I and Vanhoutte, B. Trajectories of allostatic load in later life: the role of
13 sex, birth cohorts and risk accumulation. Research on Ageing, 2018 doi:
14
15 10.1177/0164027518813839.
16
17
18
19 24. Rockwood, K and Mitniski, A Frailty defined by deficit accumulation and geriatric
20 medicine defined by frailty, Clin Geriatr Med, 2011, 27: 17-26; p. 23
21
22
23 25. Kojima, G, Taniguchi, Y, Illife, S et al, Transitions between frailty states among
24 community-dwelling older people: a systematic review and meta-analysis, Ageing Research
25 Review, 2019, 50: 81-88
26
27
28
29
30 26. Travers, J, Romero-Ortuno, R, Bailey, J and Cooney, M-T Delaying and reversing frailty:
31 a systematic review of primary care interventions, British Journal of General Practice, 2018:
32 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp18X700241>
33
34
35
36
37 27. Torres, S and Hammarström, G Speaking of 'limitations' while trying to disregard them:
38 a qualitative study of how diminished everyday competence and aging can be regarded,
39 Journal of Aging Studies, 2006, 20: 291-302
40
41
42
43
44 28. Rockwood, K, Fox, R.A, Stolee, P, et al Frailty in elderly people: an evolving concept,
45 Canadian Medical Association Journal, 1994, 150, 4, 489-495
46
47
48
49 29. Williams, S.J Medicine and the Body, 2003, London and Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage
50
51
52 30. Bury, M Chronic illness as biographical disruption, Sociology of Health and Illness, 1982,
53 4(2): 167-1822
54
55
56 31. Pickard, S and Rogers, A. Knowing as practice: self-care in the case of chronic multi-
57 morbidities, Social Theory and Health, 2012, 10(2):101-120
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 32. Leder, D *The absent body*, 1990, Chicago: University of Chicago Press
4
5 33. Merleau-Ponty, M *The phenomenology of perception*, 1964, London: Routledge, p. vi
6
7 34. Pound, P, Gompertz, P and Ebrahim, S, *Illness in the context of older age: the case of*
8
9 *stroke*, *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 1998, 20(4): 489-506
10
11 35. Faircloth, CA, Boylstein, C, Rittman, M et al *Sudden illness and biographical flow in*
12
13 *narratives of stroke recovery*, *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 2004, 26(20):242-261
14
15 36. Marshall, A, Nazroo, J, Tampubolon, G and Vanhoutte, B, *Cohort differences in the*
16
17 *levels and trajectories of frailty among older people in England*, *Journal of Epidemiology and*
18
19 *Community Health*, 2015, 69(4): 316-321
20
21 37. Huber, M, Knoffnerus, JA, Green, L et al, *How should we define health?* *BMJ*, 2011:
22
23 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.d4163>
24
25 38. Carel, H *Phenomenology of Illness*, 2016, Oxford University Press
26
27 39. Coni, N, *The unlikely geriatricians*, *JRSoc Med*, 1996, 89: 587-589
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60