

independence'), in about 5% in the outdoor gait and even more than 30% in the gait within the home. This is another example of how dividing the two categories of independence helps provide deeper insights into the real state of activity in different groups of people.

These facts show that the division of these two levels of independence is well supported and justified by statistical evidence.

Among existing evaluation tools only the Nottingham Extended ADL index (Nouri and Lincoln, 1987) makes a distinction between 'alone easily' and 'with difficulty' (corresponding to Qualifiers 0 and 1 in our study), and between 'with help alone' (Qualifiers 2 and 3 in our study) and 'not at all' (Qualifier 4 in our study). This is, however, rather exceptional and difficult to find elsewhere.

'Complete limitation' and 'No performance'

A sharp difference, in the 'Needing care' group, in Qualifier 4 ('No performance') between the first three groups (Help, Care 1 and Care 2) and the later three groups (Care 3–Care 5), both in the outdoor gait and gait within the home was observed. This was in contrast with Qualifier 3, 'Complete limitation' that increased steadily as Grade of needed care increased. This could be considered that, as the results for Qualifier 3 reflected age and degree of disability, those for Qualifier 4 were presumably influenced by factors other than these. More specifically, many of those with Care needs 3 and over were institutionalized and limitations over their activities were more or less imposed irrespective of their real capability.

These facts show that the distinction between Qualifiers 3 and 4 is meaningful and well founded.

'Full participation' and 'Partial participation'

A phenomenon of 'neutralization' in recreation and leisure and work and employment was found. This shows

the importance of the distinction between the two levels of participation for sensitive detection of milder participation restriction.

Conclusion

The criteria for qualifiers of activity and participation in ICF designed by the Japanese ICF Committee are operationally defined and clear enough to avoid any misunderstanding. This study is based on the results of population surveys on a large scale and offers a good support for the relevance of the Provisional Criteria.

References

- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2003). *ICF Australian User Guide Version 1.0*. Canberra: AIHW.
- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2005). *Functioning and Related Health Outcome Module (FRHOM)*. Canberra: AIHW.
- Grill E, Mansmann U, Cieza A, Stucki G (2007). Assessing observer agreement when describing and classifying functioning with the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health. *J Rehabil Med* **39**: 71–76.
- Kronk RA, Ogonowski JA, Rice CN, Feldman HM (2005). Reliability in assigning ICF codes to children with special health care needs using a developmentally structured interview. *Disabil Rehabil* **27**:977–983.
- Mahony FI, Barthel DW (1965). Functional evaluation: the Barthel Index. *Md State Med J* **14**:61–65.
- Maini M, Nocentini U, Prevedini A, Giardini A, Muscolo E (2007). An Italian experience in the ICF implementation in rehabilitation: preliminary theoretical and practical considerations. *Disabil Rehabil* [Epub ahead of print]
- Nordenfelt L (2006). On health, ability and activity: comments on some basic notions in the ICF. *Disabil Rehabil* **28**:1461–1465.
- Nouri FM, Lincoln NB (1987). An extended activities of daily living scale for stroke patients. *Clin Rehabil* **1**:301–305.
- Uhlig T, Lillemo S, Moe RH, Stamm T, Cieza A, Boonen A, et al. (2007). Reliability of the ICF Core Set for rheumatoid arthritis. *Ann Rheum Dis* **66**: 1078–1084.
- United Nations (2006). *Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities. Article 31: Statistics and data collection*. New York: UN.
- WHO (1948). *The charter of the World Health Organization*. Geneva: WHO.
- WHO (1980). *International Classification of Impairments, Disabilities and Handicaps: ICIDH*. Geneva: WHO.
- WHO (1992). *International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems: ICD 10*. Geneva: WHO.
- WHO (2001). *International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health: ICF*. Geneva: WHO.
- WHO (2004). *Family of International Classifications, Current – June 2004*. Geneva: WHO.