

Recovery in Severe Mental Illnesses: A Literature Review of Recovery Measures

Citation: Scheyett, A., DeLuca, J., & Morgan, C. (2013). Recovery in Severe Mental Illnesses: A Literature Review of Recovery Measures. *Social Work Research*, 37(3), 286–303.



UNIVERSITY OF
SOUTH CAROLINA
College of Social Work

Prepared by H. Goldstein

Background

- There is a lack of clarity and consistency in social work literature regarding recovery conceptualization
- There are two basic models of recovery:
 - Traditional medical model
 - Passive, strong focus on problems, assume that the client will never have a “normal” life (Carpenter, 2002)
 - Contemporary, consumer-based model
 - Dynamic, strength-based process, believe that consumers recover from mental illnesses (Center for Mental Health Services, 2006)

Background, cont.

- 2 major variations in theories of recovery
 - Locus of recovery
 - frames recovery along a continuum, from internally defined meaning state to externally observable state (Carpenter, 2002)
 - Developmental and temporal nature of recovery
 - recovery is a process but variation in views about process
 - most literature says each recovery is unique but some have posited a more predictable progression (Andresen, 2007)

Background, (cont.)

- It can be hard for a social worker to choose a recovery instrument that can help track a client's progress
 - Difficult to identify a recovery instrument
 - Difficult to understand which aspect of recovery the instrument measures
 - Difficult to understand how well the instrument measures recovery

Research Questions

- How do the recovery instruments define recovery?
 - Where do the instruments fall in the internally defined/externally observable and unique/predicable stages of recovery domains?
- What was the nature of consumer involvement in the development of the recovery instruments?
- What are the psychometric properties (validity and reliability) of the various recovery instruments?

Methods

- Strategy and Results
 - 5 parameters for inclusion
 - Evaluate a specific quantitative instrument
 - Focus on adults with severe mental illnesses
 - Instrument must specifically use the term “recovery”
 - Instrument must measure consumer recovery, not recovery attitudes of providers or recovery environments
 - Must be written in article form, even if unpublished
 - Ended up with 17 articles discussing 12 instruments

Results

- Concept of recovery varied substantially across instruments
 - 3 had a traditional externally observed clinical view of recovery
 - 2 defined recovery by considering both internal meaning and externally observable variables
 - Remaining majority focused on internally defined meaning states
 - Few examined temporal patterns of recovery—those that did viewed recovery as a process and measured consumer's current point in that process

Results, (cont.)

- Considering the importance of consumer involvement, instruments that may better fit recovery purposes are:
 - the Mental Health Recovery Measure (Bullock, 2009),
 - the Recovery Assessment Scale (Corrigan et al., 1999),
 - the Stages of Recovery Inventory (Andresen et al., 2006),
 - the Self-Identified Stages of Recovery (SISR) (Andresen, 2007),
 - the Short Interview to Assess Stages of Recovery (SIST-R) (Wolstencroft et al., 2010)

Results, (cont.)

- Based on psychometric properties, the strongest reviewed instruments were:
 - the Consumer Recovery Outcomes System (Bloom & Miller, 2004),
 - the Recovery Assessment Scale (Corrigan et al., 1999),
 - the Recovery Process Inventory (Jerrell et al., 2006)

Implications for Practice

- No gold standard recovery instrument exists yet
 - A single “ideal” instrument may not be necessary, because of unique client experiences
- There are several important characteristics that social workers should consider when choosing a recovery instrument, including:
 - How the instrument conceptualizes recovery
 - Emphasis of the importance of consumer voice
 - Sound psychometric characteristics

References

- *Andresen, R. (2007). The experiences of recovery from schizophrenia: Development of a definition, model, and measure of recovery [Doctoral dissertation]. Retrieved from University of Wollongong, Wollongong, Australia. Web site: <http://ro.uow.edu.au/theses/814/>.
- *Andresen, R., Caputi, P., & Oades, L. (2006). Stages of Recovery Instrument: Development of a measure of recovery from serious mental illness. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 40, 972–980.
- *Bloom, B., & Miller, A. (2004). The Consumer Recovery Outcomes System (CROS 3.0): Assessing clinical status and progress in persons with severe and persistent mental illness. Retrieved from <http://www.crosllc.com/CROS3.0manuscript-090204.pdf>
- *Bullock, W. (2009). The Mental Health Recovery Measure (MHRM): Normative data and psychometric properties. Retrieved from http://psychology.utoledo.edu/images/MHRM_-_Bullock_-_Updated_Normative_and_Psychometric_Data_12-09.pdf
- Carpenter, J. (2002). Mental health recovery paradigm. *Health & Social Work*, 27, 86–94.

References, (cont.)

- Center for Mental Health Services. (2006). National consensus statement on mental health recovery (SMA05-4129). Retrieved from http://www.samhsa.gov/samhsa_news/volumexiv_2/article4.htm
- *Corrigan, P.W., Giffort, D., Rashid, F., Leary, M., & Okeke, I. (1999). Recovery as a psychological construct. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 35(3), 231–239.
- *Jerrell, J., Cousins, V., & Roberts, K. (2006). Psychometrics of the Recovery Process Inventory. *Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research*, 33, 464–473.
- *Wolstencroft, K., Oades, L., Caputi, P., & Andresen, R. (2010). Development of a structured interview schedule to assess stage of psychological recovery from enduring mental illness. *International Journal of Psychiatry in Clinical Practice*, 14, 182–189.