

Name of Instrument: **The Timed Up & Go Test (TUG)--  
Research Report**

Author: Anne Shumway-Cook, Sandy Brauer, and Marjorie Woollacott

**Contact Info:**

**Name:** Dr. Shumway-Cook, Associate Professor

**Address:** Division of Physical Therapy  
University of Washington  
Box 356490, Seattle, WA 98195

**Phone:**

**Fax:**

**E-mail:**

**Privacy Use Cost:** \$

**Public Use Cost:** \$

**Year Developed:** 2000

**Where to obtain Instrument:**

- Contact author

**Description of the Instrument**

- Patients are timed (in seconds) when performing the TUG—3 conditions
  1. TUG alone—from sitting in a chair, stand up, walk 3 meters, turn around, walk back, and sit down..
  2. TUG<sub>cognitive</sub>-complete the task while counting backwards from a randomly selected number between 20 and 100.
  3. TUG<sub>manual</sub>-complete the task while carrying a full cup of water.
- The time taken to complete the task is strongly correlated to level of functional mobility, (i.e. the more time taken, the more dependent in activities of daily living).
- The cutoff levels for TUG is 13.5 seconds or longer with an overall correct prediction rate of 90%; for TUG manual is 14.5 seconds or longer with a 90% correct prediction rate; and Tug cognitive is 15 seconds or longer with an overall correct prediction rate of 87%.

**Form of instrument:**

- Hazard/Risk Assessment Tools

**Method of delivery:**

- In-person interview/assessment

**Relevance to injury/ Percentage of the instrument specific to injury**

- To identify/screen elderly individuals who are prone to falls

## **Time to administer or complete the instrument**

### **Methods of data analyses:**

- Quantitative

### **Setting/sample instrument used in:**

- 15 older adults with no history of falls and 15 older adults with a history of 2 or more falls in the previous 6 months.

### **Was it pilot tested? Yes**

- see Podsiadlo and Richardson for details.

### **Pilot test sample:**

- 60 patients who were referred to a Geriatric Day Hospital

### **Reliability Measures**

- Interrater reliability was very high, with  $r=.98$ ,  $.99$ , and  $.99$  for the TUG, TUG<sub>manual</sub>, and TUG<sub>cognitive</sub> respectively
- The TUG alone correctly classified 13/15 fallers (87% sensitivity) and 13/15 nonfallers (87% specificity).

### **Validity Measures**

- Older adults who take longer than 14 seconds to complete the TUG have a high risk for falls. This cutoff is different from Podsiadlo and Richardson, which is 30 seconds.

### **Reference**

Lundlin-Olsson, L., Nyberg, L., & Gustafson, Y. (1998). Attention, frailty, and falls: the effect of a manual task on basic mobility. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, *46*, 758-761.

Podsiadlo, D., & Richardson, S. (1991). The timed "up & go": A test of basic functional mobility for frail elderly persons. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, *39*, 142-148.

Shumway-Cook, A., Brauer, S., & Woollacott, M. (2000). Predicting the probability for falls in community-dwelling older adults using the timed up & go test. Physical Therapy, *80*(9), 896-903.

### **Other References**

**Keywords:** falls, balance, functional mobility, fall prevention.