

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
<b>CHAPTER 1: OVERVIEW .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CHAPTER 2: BRAIN INJURY .....</b>	<b>3</b>
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
<b>CHAPTER 3: MODELS OF REHABILITATION .....</b>	<b>12</b>
Professional Roles .....	12
Models of Rehabilitation .....	14
Rehabilitation in New Zealand .....	18
The New Zealand Disability Strategy .....	18
ACC .....	19
<b>CHAPTER 4: REVIEW OF OUTCOME MEASURES .....</b>	<b>21</b>
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
<b>CHAPTER 5: THE PRESENT STUDY .....</b>	<b>31</b>
Aims of this Study .....	32
Hypotheses .....	32
<b>CHAPTER 6: METHOD .....</b>	<b>34</b>
Research Setting .....	34
Participants .....	35
Design .....	36
Measures .....	38
Procedure .....	42
Pre-study .....	42
The Study .....	42
<b>CHAPTER 7: RESULTS .....</b>	<b>44</b>
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



<b>CHAPTER 8: DISCUSSION</b> .....	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
 <b>REFERENCES</b> .....	 63
 <b>APPENDICES</b> .....	 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