

VILLA BELLOMBRA

ATTACHMENT STYLE AND CLINICAL REHABILITATION: STROKE PATIENTS AND THEIR CAREGIVERS



X CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL NEUROPSYCHOANALYSIS SOCIETY Montreal 2008

Farinelli, M*°, Gestieri, L.*°, Tabarroni, S.*°, Baldoni, F.*, Chattat, R.*, Ercolani M.*, Leo, M.R.°; Fossi, C.A.°, Lupi, G.°, Marasti N. °

*Department of Psychology, University of Bologna, Italy; ° Clinical Psychology Service, Villa Bellombra private rehabilitation clinic, Bologna, Italy

e-mail: marina.farinelli@tiscali.it

There are neurobiological foundations for attachment (Moriceau, Sullivan, 2005). Individuals' attachment systems are activated by sudden and acute pathological events that are perceived as a physical threat. The literature indicates the existence of a link between attachment style, illness and psychological distress: attachment patterns influence symptom perception (Ciechanowsky, 2002), susceptibility to illness and illness behaviour (Maunder e Hunter, 2001). Few studies so far have examined the manifestation and/or modification of attachment styles in patients with cerebral lesions. Given the fact that attachment is a relational concept, the patient-caregiver dyad is extremely significant within this context.

Aims

The aim of this study of patients and their caregivers is to ascertain whether:

- 1. there is a link between degree of psychological distress and attachment style,
- 2. patient-caregiver relationships exhibiting secure attachment styles are associated with positive outcomes on discharge and whether insecure attachment strategies are associated with less successful outcomes.

| Sampl | e | | | Psychometric Instruments | | |
|-------|---------------|--------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|--|---|
| | PATIENTS | | CAREGIVERS | | | · Attachment atula. Deletionship |
| | STROKE (N=35) | ORTHOPEDIC (N=30) | STROKE (N=35) | ORTHOPEDIC (N=30) | | Attachment style: Relationship Questionnaire (RQ) (Bartholomew, K., |

| Gender | M = 23 (66%) | M = 8 (27%) | M = 15 (43%) | M = 15 (50%) | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | F = 12 (44%) | F = 22 (73%) | F = 20 (57%) | F = 15 (50%) | | | | |
| Age | M = 69.4; SD = 9.68 | M = 75.6; SD= 9.26 | M = 53.4; SD= 15.02 | M = 61.4; SD= 14.18 | | | | |
| | MIN = 46; MAX = 82 | MIN = 38; MAX = 89 | MIN = 25; MAX = 79 | MIN = 35; MAX = 87 | | | | |
| Civil condition | Married: 23 (66%) | Married: 15 (50%) | Married: 26 (74%) | Married: 24 (80%) | | | | |
| | Single: 3 (8%) | Single : 0 | Single : 7 (20%) | Single : 2 (7%) | | | | |
| | Divorced: 4 (12%) | Divorced : 1 (3%) | Divorced : 1 (3%) | Divorced : 4 (13%) | | | | |
| | Widow: 5 (14%) | Widow : 14 (47%) | Widow : 1 (3%) | Widow : 0 | | | | |
| Profession | Retired: 28 (80%) | Retired: 25 (84%) | Retired: 13 (37%) | Retired 15 (50%) | | | | |
| | Housewife: 2 (6%) | Housewife: 4 (13%) | Housewife: 3 (9%) | Housewife: 0 | | | | |
| | Employedi: 5 (14%) | Employed: 1 (3%) | Employed: 16 (45%) | Employed: 15 (50%) | | | | |
| | | | Unemployed: 2 (6%) | Unemployed: 0 | | | | |
| | | | Student: 1 (3%) | Student: 0 | | | | |
| Caregiver | Husband/wife: 15 (43%) | Husband/wife : 14 (47%) | | lesion in stroke patients | | | | |
| | Son/daughter: 16 (46%) | Son/daughter : 15 (50%) | DEX = 21 (60%) ISCH = 23 (66%) ANT = 24 (69%) | | | | | |
| | Others: 4 (11%) | Others: 1 (3%) | SIN = 14 (40%) EM0 = 12 | 2 (34%) POST = 9 (26%) MIX = 2 (5%) | | | | |

Horowitz, L.M.; 1991) and Attachment Style Questionnaire (ASQ) (Feeney et al,)

- Depression and anxiety in patients on admission and discharge, Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HAD) (Zigmond e Snaith, 1983)
- Functional independence of patients on admission and discharge, *Functional Independence Measure (FIM)* (Dodds et al., 1993)
- Depressive symptoms in caregivers on admission and discharge, Center for Epidemiologic Studies-Depression Scale (CES-D) (Fava, G.A.; 1982)

Results

1. CLINICAL COURSE OF STUDY GROUP

•On admission, anxiety was found in 43% of the stroke patients and in 50% of the orthopaedic patients, while depression was found in 72% of the former group and in 67% of the latter group; both groups showed a statistically significant (p<.05) reduction in symptoms shortly before discharge.

•The degree of functional recovery (FIM) was statistically significant (p <.05) when admission and discharge were compared; stroke patients had significantly lower scores than orthopaedic patients on both admission and discharge (i.e., they had lower levels of functional independence).

•On admission, depression was found in 69% of the of stroke patients caregivers, compared to 57% of the of orthopaedic patients caregivers. Both groups showed a statistically significant reduction (p <.05) in symptoms on discharge.

| 2. CLINICAL COURSE BY ATTACHMENT STYLE: | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|--|-----------|--|-------------------------|-------------------------------|----------|----------|--|
| Pattern distribution | | | Anxiety-depression patients (HAD) FIM scores | | | | Depression caregivers (CES-D) | | | |
| PATIENTS | STROKE | ORTHOP | 14 | 40 - | | | 30 | | | |
| SECURE | 15 (43%) | 14 (46%) | | ORTHOP 35 | STROKE | ORTHOP | | | DRTHOP | |
| FEARFUL | 14 (40%) | 11 (37%) | 10 | 30 - 25 - | | | 20 | | | |
| PREOCCUPIED | 5 (15%) | 4 (13%) | | 20 | | | 15 | | | |
| DISMISSING | 1 (3%) | 1 (3%) | 4 | | | | 10 | | | |
| | · · · · | | 2 | | | | 5 | | | |
| CAREGIVER | STROKE | ORTHOP | HAD ANX HAD | | FIM COGN FIM MOT | FIM COGN FIM MOT | CES-D | | CES-D | |
| SECURE | 23 (66%) | 17 (57%) | DEPR. | DEPR. | | | DYAD PT-CG | STROKE | ORTOP | |
| FEARFUL | 6 (17%) | 6 (20%) | RQ/HAD/CES-D: patients | - | ASQ: the Confider negatively with the | nce subscale correlates | SECURE | 9 (26%) | 7 (23%) | |
| PREOCCUPIED | 2 (6%) | 6 (20%) | insecure attachment style of psychological distress | • | | tress in both patients | | , , | | |
| DISMISSING | 4 (11%) | 1 (3%) | secure attachment styles (| | and caregivers. | | SECURE+INSECURE | 20 (57%) | 17 (57%) | |
| | | | | | | | INSECURE | 6 (17%) | 6 (20%) | |
| | | | | | | | | • | | |

3. ATTACHMENT AND RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PATIENT AND CAREGIVERS

| STROKE | BOTH SECURE | ONE MEMBER INSECURE | BOTH INSECURE | F and P | Post-hoc | A relationship in which both patient and caregiver manifest secure | ORTHOP | BOTH SECURE | ONE MEMBER INSECURE | BOTH INSECURE | F and P | Post-hoc |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--------------------------------|--|---|--|---|-----------------------|
| HAD ANX. 1 HAD DEP. 1 | AV = 4.77 SD = 1.56 AV = 7.22 SD = 1.92 | AV = 8.3 SD = 2.77 AV = 10.7 SD = 3.81 | AV = 9SD = 2.68 $AV = 16.5SD = 2.88$ | F = 7.374 $P = .002$ $F = 14.299$ $P = .000$ | 1 different from 2 and 3 All different | hospitalisation and also fosters the | HAD ANX. 1 HAD DEP. 1 | AV = 6.57 SD = 3.82 AV = 7.14 SD = 2.26 | AV = 7 SD = 2.17 AV = 9.05 SD = 3.54 | AV = 9.16 SD= 1.94 AV = 12.66 DS = 2.25 | F = 1.932 NOT SIG F = 5.331 P = .011 | 1 different from 3 |
| CES-D 1 | AV = 15.77 SD = 6.45 | AV = 18.9 SD = 8.19 | AV = 29 SD = 5.51 | F = 6.083 P = .006 | 3 different from 1 and 2 | attachment strategies are | CES-D 1 | AV = 9.71 SD = 4.27 | AV = 17 SD = 10.91 | AV = 25.83 SD = 12.33 | | 1 different from 3 |

Discussion

Conflict between emotional and cognitive needs may emerge in insecure attachment configurations, as evidenced by the greater incidence of manifest psychological distress in individuals with insecure attachment styles. Moreover, in insecure (patient-caregiver) dyads, the distortion of the dynamic relationship between thoughts and emotions has a negative effect on adjustment to the illness and on functional recovery.

Future research: Closer examination of the relationship between manifestation and modification of attachment styles and lesion location.

1. Bartholomew, K., Horowitz, L. .M. (1991) Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, pp. 226-244. **2.** Ciechanowsky, P.S., Walker, E.A., Katon, W.J., Russo, J.E. (2002) Attachment Theory: A Model for Health Care Utilization and Somatization. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 64, pp. 660-667 **3.** Dodds, T.A., Martin, D.P., Stolov, W.C., Deyo, R.A. (1993) A validation of the functional independence measurement and its performance among rehabilitation impatients. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 74(5), pp.531-536. **4.** Fava, G. A. (1982) Versione italiana del CES-D per la valutazione degli stati depressivi. In R. Canestrari (a cura di), *Nuovi metodi in psicometria*, O.S. Organizzazioni Speciali, Firenze, pp. 51-53. **5.** Feeney, J.A., Noller, P., Hanharan, M. (1994) Assessing Adult Attachment. In: M.B. Sperling & W.H. Berman (Eds) *Attachment in adults: Clinical and developmental prospectives*, pp. 128-152. Guilford Press, NJ. **6.** Maunder, R.G., Hunter, J.J. (2001) Attachment and Psychosomatic Medicine: Developmental Contributions to Stress and Disease. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 63, pp. 556-567. **7.** Moriceau, S., Sullivan, R.M. (2005) Neurobiology of infant attachment. Developmental Psychobiology, 47(3), pp 230-42 **8.** Zigmond, A.S., Snaith, R.P. (1983) The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 67, pp.361-370.