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Background
There is a long history of research into the attributes of carers of people with psychosis, but few interventions target their distress or their difficulties.

Aims
To describe an empirically based model of the relationships of those caring for people with psychosis to inform clinical and theoretical advances.

Method
We developed a model of informal carer relationships in psychosis, based on an integration of the literature elaborating the concept of expressed emotion. The model accounts for divergent outcomes of three relationship types: positive, overinvolved and critical/hostile relationships.

Results
Good evidence supports a number of hypotheses concerning the origin and maintenance of these relationship outcomes, which relate to specific differences in carer attributions, illness perceptions, coping behaviour, social support, distress, depression and low self-esteem predicted by our model. We propose that interventions aimed at modifying the specific maintenance factors involved in the different styles of relationships will optimise therapeutic change both for service users with psychosis and for their carers.

Conclusions
Family work in psychosis, which improves relationships through problem-solving, reduces service user relapse. It is now time to consider theory-based interventions focused on improving carer outcomes.
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Impact of care
Caring for a family member with psychosis is demanding, often prolonged, and associated with increased levels of stress and distress.6,9–11 Recent evidence suggests that as many as a third of carers meet criteria for post-traumatic stress disorder.12 Carers also experience a great sense of loss, comparable to levels recorded in physical bereavement.13 The first carer study evaluated the impact on the wives of men discharged from psychiatric hospital.14 This was the start of research into the so-called ‘burden’ of such care. As can be seen from the use of this terminology, caring was felt to be a solely negative experience, ‘burden’ of such care. As can be seen from the use of this terminology, caring was felt to be a solely negative experience, and the early researchers did not ask about positive effects. In these early stages burden was defined as ‘the difficulties felt by the family of a psychiatric patient’ (Pai & Kapur: p. 334)15 or more broadly as ‘the effect of the patient upon the family’ (Goldberg & Huxley: p. 127).16

Expressed emotion
Pioneering research made it clear that, although family involvement could be helpful, some reactions – particularly if critical or overinvolved – were associated with subsequent relapse of the person being cared for, who is to some extent dependent’ (Kuipers & Bebbington: p. 217).17 There are other definitions. The mental health charity Mind (www.mind.org.uk/help/people_groups_and_communities/how_to_access_services-information_for_carers#whois) states that ‘you are a carer if you provide help and support to someone with a mental health problem and/or a physical disability.’ They go on to distinguish between friends and family who provide unpaid care and paid professionals, and underline that the caring relationship can be mutual. The website of the Princess Royal Trust for Carers (not restricted to mental health carers) defines a carer as ‘someone who, without payment, provides help and support to a partner, child, relative, friend or neighbour, who could not manage without their help’ (www.carers.org).

Definition
Carers of people with psychosis are usually family members, mainly parents or partners.7 There is an ongoing issue about how carers define themselves (e.g. ‘carer’, ‘parent’ or ‘supporter’), but this does not affect the undoubted strains of the role. In our view, caring for people with psychiatric problems is not generally a matter of choice.8 It is often impossible to walk away, although carers vary in their degree of acceptance of the role. We have identified that it is ‘an inherently unequal role; the person doing the caring has more responsibility, and has more to do than the person being cared for, who is to some extent dependent’ (Kuipers & Bebbington: p. 217).17 There are other definitions. The mental health charity Mind (www.mind.org.uk/help/people_groups_and_communities/how_to_access_services-information_for_carers#whois) states that ‘you are a carer if you provide help and support to someone with a mental health problem and/or a physical disability.’ They go on to distinguish between friends and family who provide unpaid care and paid professionals, and underline that the caring relationship can be mutual. The website of the Princess Royal Trust for Carers (not restricted to mental health carers) defines a carer as ‘someone who, without payment, provides help and support to a partner, child, relative, friend or neighbour, who could not manage without their help’ (www.carers.org).
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Caring for a family member with psychosis is demanding, often prolonged, and associated with increased levels of stress and distress.6,9–11 Recent evidence suggests that as many as a third of carers meet criteria for post-traumatic stress disorder.12 Carers also experience a great sense of loss, comparable to levels recorded in physical bereavement.13 The first carer study evaluated the impact on the wives of men discharged from psychiatric hospital.14 This was the start of research into the so-called ‘burden’ of such care. As can be seen from the use of this terminology, caring was felt to be a solely negative experience, and the early researchers did not ask about positive effects. In these early stages burden was defined as ‘the difficulties felt by the family of a psychiatric patient’ (Pai & Kapur: p. 334)15 or more broadly as ‘the effect of the patient upon the family’ (Goldberg & Huxley: p. 127).16

Expressed emotion
Pioneering research made it clear that, although family involvement could be helpful, some reactions – particularly if critical or overinvolved – were associated with subsequent relapse of the person being cared for, who is to some extent dependent’ (Kuipers & Bebbington: p. 217).17 There are other definitions. The mental health charity Mind (www.mind.org.uk/help/people_groups_and_communities/how_to_access_services-information_for_carers#whois) states that ‘you are a carer if you provide help and support to someone with a mental health problem and/or a physical disability.’ They go on to distinguish between friends and family who provide unpaid care and paid professionals, and underline that the caring relationship can be mutual. The website of the Princess Royal Trust for Carers (not restricted to mental health carers) defines a carer as ‘someone who, without payment, provides help and support to a partner, child, relative, friend or neighbour, who could not manage without their help’ (www.carers.org).
service user. We have shown, in an analysis of prospective studies, that high levels of this expressed emotion (EE) are a reliable predictor of patient outcomes in schizophrenia: overall, the relapse rate for those returning to families with low EE was 21% compared with a 50% relapse rate in families with high EE. Further studies confirmed that ‘burden’, particularly as assessed by the carers themselves, was strongly correlated with high EE. It was also related to poorer carer outcomes such as stress, distress and low self-esteem, and to less effective, avoidant coping, even at first episode.

**Attributes**

Another strand of research originated from Weiner’s theory of attribution, emotion and behaviour: whether events were good or bad, and why they happened. An attributional model of EE, including the concepts of intention and control, was first put forward by Hooley. Since then it has become clear that high-criticism carers are more likely to make ‘controllable’ and ‘personal’ attributions, both in psychosis and in other disorders such as diabetes. In other words, if carers are critical, their attributions are more likely to lead to assertions that patients are substantially in control of – and therefore to blame for – negative events. This in turn relates to greater carer distress and negative evaluations of the caring role. Carers’ appraisals of and reactions to their role not only affect their own well-being, but also may improve or impede recovery in those they care for. More recent evidence suggests a mechanism for this: service users are able to perceive criticism from their carers accurately, and perceptions of carer criticism have in turn been linked to poorer service user functioning.

**Illness perceptions**

Other methods of evaluating the caring role have developed from Leventhal et al’s conception of illness perceptions. As in physical ill health, carer illness perceptions and the consequent behavioural decisions are more likely to predict carer outcomes than illness severity. This has been shown to be equally relevant for informal caring in psychosis. If carers feel that they are not in control of their relative’s illness and that it will last a long time, they experience more stress and depression and have more negative views of the impact of care. Moreover, if carers and service users disagree about these illness perceptions, carers tend to have lower mood and self-esteem. Such disagreements tend to be observed more in high-EE relationships.

**Positive caregiving experiences**

In the past decade, as part of an attempt to explore caregiving within a broader framework, attention has been given to the positive aspects of the caregiving relationship and their links with carer and service user outcomes. Thus, we know that many carers report positive caregiving experiences, including feelings of satisfaction and improved self-esteem. Further, carer warmth can serve as a protective factor against relapse, particularly in some Black and minority ethnic groups.

**Coping**

There is now some literature on the coping responses optimal for carers of people with psychosis. This is based on the ideas of Lazarus & Folkman that coping itself depends on accurate appraisal of situations, on one’s resources and on how these are marshalled. In psychosis, avoidant coping (a style of emotional response characterised by ‘hoping problems will go away’) may be useful for problems that resolve naturally, but not with more enduring or worsening problems. Active and proactive strategies seem better at reducing the impact on levels of carer burden, even in the early stages of illness. These sorts of strategies are usually shaped and encouraged as part of family interventions.

**Social support**

The stigma and shame associated with mental ill health can lead to a significant reduction in social networks, even for carers. The importance of social support in reducing distress and encouraging more proactive coping in carers has been confirmed.

**Intervention studies**

Carer outcomes have been primary objectives in few intervention studies. The research impetus in relation to caregiving in psychosis has so far been towards improving service user outcomes. This has had some success. Family intervention in psychosis, involving the whole family in negotiating problem-solving, reappraisal and reattribution of difficulties, and emotional processing of the loss and grief, has shown some improvements in carer burden. However, most improvement has been in reducing service user relapses. In the small number of studies focusing on carer outcomes, only two have demonstrated a positive impact on carer well-being. However, this is not surprising, as there is evidence that carer well-being relates closely to service user outcome.

**Cognitive model of caregiving**

On the basis of a growing and complex literature, we propose that caregiving appraisals and reactions in psychosis can be usefully described in a model as shown in Fig. 1. It is these appraisals that engender carer cognitive and affective reactions, and lead to a range of carer behaviours towards service users and towards services, and to different carer outcomes. The pathways and their interactions constitute testable hypotheses, and suggest that...
specific interventions targeting these appraisals and their maintenance factors might improve outcomes. Most existing research is of analyses restricted to a single domain. Our model integrates this prior research for two linked purposes: to set up testable hypotheses of interactions, and to develop interventions, the evaluation of which will then form collateral tests of the original model. The research to test these hypotheses has yet to be done. It is hoped that both the model and the interventions that might arise from it will be developed further.

Given the overall model, we suggest further that three different styles or types are at present supported by the evidence, interpreted in the light of clinical experience of intervention with families dealing with psychosis. Although our typology of the characteristics of caregiving can never be exact, it is based in empirical research, and we think it will be of use in shaping interventions to the needs of caregivers. Analysis in terms of the three styles will, we propose, maximise the likelihood of change and of change being sustained. They provide testable hypotheses to evaluate both the maintenance effects and the interventions themselves.

**Positive relationships**

The first type of caregiving is represented by those who, for whatever reason, previously had a positive relationship with the person developing psychosis (Fig. 2). Before the illness, relations were warm and communicative, and interactions were positive. The carer thus sees the service user as a person, not just as a compendium of problems. The problems that do emerge are then more likely to be understood as unusual, not as part of normal ‘adolescent’ bad behaviour, and therefore as something requiring a different reaction. The service user is seen as needing care and help, while respect for their autonomy is nonetheless maintained. Because problems are recognised, even if the cause is not yet identified, these carers are able to ask for help, both from formal sources and from their social network, in a manner that is likely to be effective and sustainable. They thus do not become isolated. Moreover, when they are offered help, they are more likely to accept it and to act upon it. They are able to make decisions confidently. Their key appraisals are positive: that the care recipient is not to blame but needs help for their problems, and that these might be solvable if carer and recipient work together.

Such carers still require intervention. At the very least they need information, support, respite and help in integrating a caring role into other roles in their lives. They are more likely to continue with their other roles such as work and childcare, not abandoning them to care only for the service user. Although these carers may be stressed and sad, they are rarely clinically depressed. They respond positively to offers of help from services, and they may themselves be particularly helpful to other carers. However, there is a danger that services may ignore this group of carers, feeling that they are coping well, and thus fail to be responsive or proactive.

**Emotionally overinvolved relationships**

Emotional overinvolvement in those caring for people with psychosis is a strong marker of poor current psychological and physical health. The evidence suggests that it may also be an indicator of poor future health. Emotional overinvolvement has strong positive links with feelings of loss, self-blame and guilt about being responsible for the person’s illness. Carers with this style are more likely to be parents, as this is a parenting style perfectly appropriate for younger children. Relationships have typically been good but seem rooted in the past. Such carers will talk about how ‘wonderful’ or ‘beautiful’ the person used to be when a small child. The loss and transformation of this child into, first, a difficult adolescent, and then into someone with mental health problems, is accompanied by understandable grief and distress. The appraisal at this stage is that the person is not to blame, but needs to be buffered against all difficulties. This becomes the carer’s life work. It is often taken up at the cost of other roles, including employment.

We propose that interventions need to focus on finding positives about service users as they are now, not just as they were in the past. Such carers also need permission to take back their own lives, to address issues related to their own health and well-being, and to have perspectives beyond those related to the caring role. Because caring for people with mental health problems can be both isolating and stigmatising, these people are likely to have lost their own support network. Thus it can be useful to help them re-engage with confidantes and social support, either through other carers, or informally.

Such carers are often those who continue to search for a cure. This would bring back the potential of the ‘lost child’. Anything less than this can feel as if they are giving up, or not caring enough. Offering information and advice to these carers may be unproductive, as the mere provision of facts will not help. Instead, it is necessary to foster a caring style that assists the care recipient to become more independent, thereby reducing the buffering role of the carer, while encouraging carers to re-engage with their own plans and interests. A problem-solving approach may reveal that the person with psychosis is still capable of adult roles. It can then be used as the basis for gradually giving these roles back to the person. This can parallel encouragement for carers to find other roles for themselves. Offers of respite and breaks can be particularly helpful to reduce stress and to allow other interests to develop (Fig. 3).

**Critical and hostile relationships**

Critical and hostile attitudes are the more common negative reactions to the stresses of the caring role in psychosis, and can

---

**Fig. 2** Positive relationships. EE, expressed emotion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial relationship previously positive</th>
<th>Service user has an episode of psychosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carer appraisal</td>
<td>Service user not to blame, but has problems that need support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carer reactions</td>
<td>Stressed, worried, but confident decision-making, non-avoidant coping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efforts to access support network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sad, with grief and loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Still see the person underneath the problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High warmth, optimism for the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Able to keep own interests and own life, caring only one role out of several</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low EE and low negative impact of care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not clinically depressed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Interventions                          | Information, contact with other carers, ongoing support for practical and emotional problems while caregiving role continues |
Interventions

- Contact with other carers
- Information, given over long periods, to counteract ‘search for cure’
- Permission to look after self, have a life of one’s own
- Respite, practical help
- Emotional processing of loss, grief and guilt
- Reattribution of control – giving adult roles back to service user
- Reduction of the ‘buffering’ role of caring
- Focus on small tasks relating to independence, autonomy and letting service users do things for themselves again

Fig. 3 Overinvolved relationships. EOI, emotional overinvolvement.

Discussion

Consistent with an increasing trend to categorise subgroups of carers, we have developed a testable model that could be used in future research: for instance, to test the maintaining factor of avoidant coping and resultant carer distress. We have also provided a typology of relationships between people with psychosis and their informal carers. In some families there will have been difficult problems including previous neglect and abuse. These kinds of families will not usually be in caring roles, but likely to be a parent, not partner. Carers themselves are likely to be angry, upset, anxious and depressed. They may have low self-esteem, and feel that nothing they can do will make any difference. They will exert pressure on services to be helpful, and on the service user to improve by their own efforts. Such carers will often try to cope by using emotional strategies such as avoidance – waiting for things to get better by themselves.

Interventions for critical carers may not always be possible. The more rejecting carers may not take on the caring role at all, may abandon it during the initial phase of illness, or may not engage productively with services. For those who remain, the provision of information can be crucial. These are the carers who may respond best to information and advice. Even so, the information will probably need to be given more than once, over quite long periods, as it will be new and often unwelcome. Unwelcome information and disconfirmation is never processed and acted on as easily as confirmatory information. Sharing information with a group of carers, answering questions and discussing answers, is often better and more easily understood than information given in a didactic format.

An important part of intervention for this group of carers is the reattribution of control and consequences, by suggesting to them that service users are not totally in control of their thinking and behaviour, as it is now strongly influenced by symptoms of psychosis. It is a useful strategy to discuss directly with carers and service users the impact of such symptoms as voices, and how carers can help in dealing with them. Negotiated problem-solving is another key focus, with both parties encouraged to change a small part of their behaviour as a way of finding out whether this can improve things.

Negative communication patterns may be particularly unhelpful as they are associated with negative affect in patients. Carers may be unaware of this. Demonstrating and then modifying the impact of such communications can be another useful goal of family therapy sessions. Finally, an appreciable proportion (around a third) of carers in these critical relationships have clinical levels of depression. This is associated with more avoidant coping, low self-esteem and an understandable pessimism. We recommend working directly on this either in family sessions or individually with carers. This should include a focus on negative cognitions as well as on behavioural activation and activity scheduling (Fig. 4).
therapy or family intervention. These findings are a welcome change from the more negative views of caregiving, and are consistent with a growing body of research suggesting service users obtain better outcomes when they have carers. However, it is not yet clear exactly how carers exert positive influences, nor whether these effects also relate to carer outcomes. Both topics require investigation, but there are indications that good problem-solving skills in patients and carers may have a role. Improving carer outcomes requires a theoretical and practical understanding of the mechanisms that develop and maintain carer distress, together with those that optimise the positive aspects of the role. Although carers remain a resource of the greatest importance in the effective management of psychosis, they very much merit the attention of clinicians in their own right.

Fig. 4 Critical and hostile relationships. DUP, duration of untreated psychosis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial relationship previously poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely to have comorbid substance misuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely to have long DUP, characterised by poor social functioning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service user has psychotic episode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May be dramatic presentation, as service user more likely to refuse help, symptoms may have to be severe before services can be involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer DUP likely, as service user may withdraw and not discuss problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carer appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carer may be parent, spouse, sibling or child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service user to blame, personality a problem (e.g. lazy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service user needs to get better and to control problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carer reactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angry, stressed, anxious, worried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of own social network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant coping – hope problems will go away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low self-esteem, depression, frustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry with services who do not ‘get service user better’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical of service user’s behaviour, may reject service user</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pessimistic that anything can change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact with carers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer confidante, emotional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information given over long periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct help with interactions with service user</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiated problem-solving jointly with service user, focused on improving social and role functioning, helping service user and carer cope differently with stresses and distressing symptoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respite Practical help – with housing, benefits, contacts with legal system and police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional processing of anger, grief and loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reattribution that service user not totally in control of outcomes, and that carer can help directly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies to reduce carer depression, improve problem-focused coping and self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue support while problems continue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Ethnic minorities and mental health services: developing a more sustainable approach

Ovais F. Badat

Over the past 20 years, it has been encouraging to see the interest in minority groups’ mental health. When efforts to investigate or understand certain groups are met with resistance, observers are often tempted to be apologist in stance: the particular group may not have a culture of discussing mental health issues, or it is proffered that the stigma of mental health problems within the group is too great to allow transparent investigation and approach.

In my particular community (a mixture of Indian and West Pakistani economic and political migrants), we are a little amused at the proliferation of so-called services purporting to want to come to our aid. It would seem that every surgery, every government website, and every White worker is nervously brandishing as many ethnic cues as possible, all assertively trained-up on ‘ethnic awareness’.

Every ethnic community also has its busybodies: there are people from within who regularly proclaim themselves as being guides or conduits to understanding ‘our people’. They spend their time running around from one ethnically diverse, politically sympathetic meeting to another, often just keeping themselves in a position of purpose. We know who they are in our community, and they often do not get much respect from us because they are the opinionated ones who are better dealt with by simply humouring them.

There are several problems with too much adjustment being made by the host country. First, one cannot argue with the fact that an old White man, who may have fought for this country, is upset because he cannot get around or go out whereas his immigrant neighbour, a man of colour who is regularly offered free recreational bus and has a translator on hand to help him along. Although this man is getting the better service, it would seem that his White counterpart, and the wider White community, may be justifiably aggrieved at this over-swinging of the pendulum.

Second, minority communities can become entrenched, and perhaps a little disabled, in a culture of expectation and entitlement. In alternative times, they may have generated their own means of self-sufficiency and moral policing, much like the vibrant immigrant communities in America.

Third, there is the danger in the denting of the communities’ pride because of all the well-intentioned but overbearing well-wishing. Put succinctly and brutally, we have a proud, functional, complete culture; we acknowledge and try to accomplish the need to become part of British life, if only the British would allow us the breathing space to do so.

Finally, within every community there are the unfortunate elements who will exploit the cultural card. The media rightly bays for blood on news that a Muslim man gets let off a speeding ticket in court because he claims he was late for prayers at the mosque. He knows he is wrong; he should not have sped. But he has played the race/culture card; he has escaped justice under a smokescreen of British apologism. He failed to take responsibility, but he did lean on an open door.

The world of correspondence and counter-correspondence is sharp; I have absolutely no wish to set back all the good work done by those working in the field of minorities’ general or mental health. Since this is a strong opinion piece, however, I ventured to state that there is a certain fatigue generated among us as ethnic minorities about the tawdry policies and lazy theories concerning how we manage or more frequently mismanage our mental health.

What to do? Effective integration demands the need for a compensated integration by the immigrant groups arriving to live in the UK; it would be remiss and destructive of them not to do so. Ethnic minority communities could be educated about how health professionals work rather than the other way round; people could be encouraged to expedite their understanding of the western models and management of illness. This is one way in which future generations can feel the benevolent but assertive pull of their host country. In turn, they can also feel more empowered to communicate with Western healthcare professionals in a way that they know they will be understood.

We are British, and by silent majority, integrating in a slow, but steady way. In the translated and blunt words of my grandmother, they know they will be understood. We are British, and by silent majority, integrating in a slow, but steady way. In the translated and blunt words of my grandmother, they know they will be understood.
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