

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

OUTCOME MEASURES IN BRAIN INJURY REHABILITATION.

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of Master
of Arts in Psychology
at Massey University, Wellington, New Zealand.

CHRISTINA MARY ROBINSON

2004

Abstract

Brain injury rehabilitation services require competent measures of outcome to monitor the progress made by individuals in their care. The FIM + FAM is the measure most widely used for this purpose. However, research suggests that this measure contains a number of limitations and does not adequately assess the activity limitations and participation restrictions experienced by individuals who have suffered brain injuries. The current study examined five outcome measures (BICRO-39, MPAI-4, R-CHART, CIQ, and DRS) for their suitability as possible replacement measures at Cavit ABI in Wellington and Auckland. Ten participants with brain injuries (eight males, two females; seven with TBI, three with injuries due to stroke) were administered six different outcome measures by therapists at Cavit ABI centres in Wellington and Auckland on admission and again at six weeks into the rehabilitation programme. Outcome measures were examined in relation to a set of specified criteria, and feedback regarding the performance of each outcome measure was collected from each therapist using a staff questionnaire. The results of the study show that there does not seem to be one adequate outcome measure currently available for use within post-acute brain injury rehabilitation settings. Although the FIM + FAM was found to contain a number of strengths particularly in assessing physical independence, the MPAI-4 was found to be more useful in identifying goals related to activity limitations and participation restrictions, which was the key area of focus.

Acknowledgments

Firstly, I would like to give thanks to Professor Janet Leathem for her guidance and support throughout the completion of this thesis.

Thank you to the therapists at Cavit ABI Rehabilitation centres in Auckland and Wellington. Their time, effort and input were crucial to this study.

I would also like to thank the clients at Cavit ABI who gave consent to participate in this study.

Finally, I would like to thank Dr Ross Flett for generously giving his time to assist with the data analysis.

Table of Contents

Title	Page
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	viii
List of Figures	ix
CHAPTER 1: OVERVIEW	1
CHAPTER 2: BRAIN INJURY	3
Traumatic Brain Injury	3
Stroke	5
Domains of Functioning	5
Attention and Concentration	6
Memory	6
Executive Functioning	7
Emotional and Behavioural Dysfunction	8
Communication Disorders	9
Mobility	10
CHAPTER 3: MODELS OF REHABILITATION	12
Professional Roles	12
Models of Rehabilitation	14
Rehabilitation in New Zealand	18
The New Zealand Disability Strategy	18
ACC	19
CHAPTER 4: REVIEW OF OUTCOME MEASURES	21
The Functional Independence Measure (FIM) and Functional Assessment Measure (FAM)	21
The Disability Rating Scale (DRS)	22
The Community Integration Questionnaire (CIQ)	23

The London Handicap Scale (LHS)	24
The Revised Craig Handicap Assessment and Reporting Technique	24
The Mayo-Portland Adaptability Inventory (MPAI-4)	25
The Brain Injury Community Rehabilitation Outcome Scales (BICRO-39)	26
The Hoensbroeck Disability Scale (HBDS)	27
The Frenchay Activities Index (FAI)	27
CHAPTER 5: THE PRESENT STUDY	31
Aims of this Study	32
Hypotheses	32
CHAPTER 6: METHOD	34
Research Setting	34
Participants	35
Design	36
Measures	38
Procedure	42
Pre-study	42
The Study	42
CHAPTER 7: RESULTS	44
Staff Questionnaire Ratings	44
Hypothesis 1	44
Hypothesis 2	45
Hypothesis 3	46
Hypothesis 4	47
Hypothesis 5	48
Measured Abilities	50
Hypothesis 6	50
Hypothesis 7	52
Hypothesis 8	52
Hypothesis 9	53

CHAPTER 8: DISCUSSION	55
BICRO-39	55
CIQ	56
DRS	56
R-CHART	57
MPAI-4	57
FIM + FAM	58
Conclusions	58
Using Different Measures to Suit the Severity of the Brain Injury	58
Using Two or More Measures Together to Replace the FIM +FAM	58
Is There an Outcome Measure More Useful Than the FIM + FAM?.....	59
Limitations of the Study	60
Considerations For Future Research	61
Summary	62
 REFERENCES	 63
 APPENDICES	 72
Information Regarding the Study	73
Appendix 1: Information Sheet	73
Appendix 2: Participants Consent Form	75
Appendix 3: Relatives Consent Form	76
Appendix 4: Information Letter to Therapists	78
Measures Used in the Study	80
Appendix 5: FIM + FAM	80
Appendix 6: DRS	82
Appendix 7: CIQ	84
Appendix 8: R-CHART	87
Appendix 9: MPAI-4	95
Appendix 10: BICRO-39	98
Appendix 11: Level of Fatigue Scale	104

Appendix 12: Staff Questionnaire 105

List of Tables

TABLE	Page
3.1	Objectives of the Disability Strategy 19
4.1	Domains of Functioning Held By Each Measure 29
4.2	Competency Criteria Held By Each Measure 30
6.1	Level of Functioning Criteria 37
6.2	Outcome Measure Competency Criteria 38
7.1	Mean Ranks of Outcome Measures For Identifying Rehabilitation Goals 44
7.2	Mean Ranks of Outcome Measures For Administration Simplicity 45
7.3	Mean Ranks of Outcome Measures For User-friendliness 46
7.4	Frequency of Outcome Measures Chosen For Continued Use 48
7.5	Ability to Measure Change in Functioning As Shown By Significance Scores Generated By a Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test 50
7.6	Change in Functioning Between Time 1 & Time 2 on Domains of Function Within Outcome Measures 52
7.7	Change in Functioning Between Time 1 & Time 2 on All Outcome Measures For Mild-Moderate & Severe Group..... 53
7.8	Percentage of Participants Who Reached the Ceiling &/or Boundaries of Each Outcome Measure For Time 1 & Time 2 54

List of Figures

FIGURE		Page
3.1	Traditional Biomedical Model	15
3.2	Model of Rehabilitation	16
6.1	Number of Domains of Functioning Covered By Each Outcome Measure	41
7.1	Staff Ratings For Level of Fatigue	47