

Vol 5 Issue 11 August 2016

ISSN No : 2249-894X

*Monthly Multidisciplinary
Research Journal*

*Review Of
Research Journal*

Chief Editors

Ashok Yakkaldevi
A R Burla College, India

Ecaterina Patrascu
Spiru Haret University, Bucharest

Kamani Perera
Regional Centre For Strategic Studies,
Sri Lanka

Review Of Research Journal is a multidisciplinary research journal, published monthly in English, Hindi & Marathi Language. All research papers submitted to the journal will be double - blind peer reviewed referred by members of the editorial Board readers will include investigator in universities, research institutes government and industry with research interest in the general subjects.

Regional Editor

Dr. T. Manichander

Advisory Board

Kamani Perera Regional Centre For Strategic Studies, Sri Lanka	Delia Serbescu Spiru Haret University, Bucharest, Romania	Mabel Miao Center for China and Globalization, China
Ecaterina Patrascu Spiru Haret University, Bucharest	Xiaohua Yang University of San Francisco, San Francisco	Ruth Wolf University Walla, Israel
Fabricio Moraes de Almeida Federal University of Rondonia, Brazil	Karina Xavier Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), USA	Jie Hao University of Sydney, Australia
Anna Maria Constantinovici AL. I. Cuza University, Romania	May Hongmei Gao Kennesaw State University, USA	Pei-Shan Kao Andrea University of Essex, United Kingdom
Romona Mihaila Spiru Haret University, Romania	Marc Fetscherin Rollins College, USA	Loredana Bosca Spiru Haret University, Romania
	Liu Chen Beijing Foreign Studies University, China	Ilie Pinteau Spiru Haret University, Romania
Mahdi Moharrampour Islamic Azad University buinzahra Branch, Qazvin, Iran	Nimita Khanna Director, Isara Institute of Management, New Delhi	Govind P. Shinde Bharati Vidyapeeth School of Distance Education Center, Navi Mumbai
Titus Pop PhD, Partium Christian University, Oradea, Romania	Salve R. N. Department of Sociology, Shivaji University, Kolhapur	Sonal Singh Vikram University, Ujjain
J. K. VIJAYAKUMAR King Abdullah University of Science & Technology, Saudi Arabia.	P. Malyadri Government Degree College, Tandur, A.P.	Jayashree Patil-Dake MBA Department of Badruka College Commerce and Arts Post Graduate Centre (BCCAPGC), Kachiguda, Hyderabad
George - Calin SERITAN Postdoctoral Researcher Faculty of Philosophy and Socio-Political Sciences Al. I. Cuza University, Iasi	S. D. Sindkhedkar PSGVP Mandal's Arts, Science and Commerce College, Shahada [M.S.]	Maj. Dr. S. Bakhtiar Choudhary Director, Hyderabad AP India.
REZA KAFIPOUR Shiraz University of Medical Sciences Shiraz, Iran	Anurag Misra DBS College, Kanpur	AR. SARAVANAKUMARALAGAPPA UNIVERSITY, KARAIKUDI, TN
Rajendra Shendge Director, B.C.U.D. Solapur University, Solapur	C. D. Balaji Panimalar Engineering College, Chennai	V.MAHALAKSHMI Dean, Panimalar Engineering College
	Bhavana vivek patole PhD, Elphinstone college mumbai-32	S.KANNAN Ph.D , Annamalai University
	Awadhesh Kumar Shirotriya Secretary, Play India Play (Trust), Meerut (U.P.)	Kanwar Dinesh Singh Dept.English, Government Postgraduate College , solan

More.....



PSYCHOSIS RISK AND PREVENTION OF PERSISTENT AND SEVERE MENTAL ILLNESS: IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIAL WORK PRACTICE

Dr. D. G. Nejkar

Associate Professor , Department of Social Work
Karmaveer Hire Arts, Science, Commerce and Education
College, Gargoti, Kolhapur.

ABSTRACT

The prognosis schizophrenia and other psychotic disorders might be enhanced through endeavors to recognize at-hazard people and to give early intercessions preceding the primary scene of psychosis. Psychosis-hazard disorder is picking up acknowledgment as an unmistakable clinical condition, and might be incorporated as a finding in the forthcoming adaptation of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-V). As immediate psychological well-being practitioners, social specialists are in a perfect position to both address the different psychosocial needs and enhance the openness of services for this hard to-characterize populace. As full scale level practitioners, social specialists can give a profitable viewpoint on moral issues while upholding to lessen the disgrace encompassing the arrangement of escalated psychological wellness administrations to people battling with psychosis-risk syndrome.

KEYWORDS :Psychosis Risk ,Social Work Practice , Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM).

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, an increasing emphasis has been placed on early identification and intervention in mental health research. A diagnosis known as psychosis-risk syndrome may soon be included in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM), and will eventually be incorporated into general mental health practice (Yung, Nelson, Thompson, & Wood, 2010;



Corcoran, First, & Cornblatt, 2010). Emerging evidence supports the potential for early assessment and intervention to improve the long-term prognosis of schizophrenia and other psychotic disorders (Miller et al., 2003; 2002; McGorry et al., 2002). Developing effective treatments for the attenuated symptoms that present prior to the onset of the illness may improve outcomes and possibly even prevent the chronic mental illness from occurring in its entirety. These symptoms can include non-diagnosis-specific negative symptoms such as social withdrawal and a lack of motivation, as well as less-intense forms of the positive symptoms unique to psychosis, such as paranoid delusions and hallucinations (Miller et al., 1999). The definition of psychosis risk is based on either the presence of attenuated psychotic symptoms, the occurrence of

a brief and self-remitting psychotic break, or by a family history of a psychotic disorder, accompanied by a recent decline in functioning (Yung, McGorry, McFarlane, Jackson, Pat-ton, & Rakkar, 1996; Yung et al., 1998).

Social work constitutes a substantial portion of mental health services provided nationwide, often serving as the first point of contact with the mental health system for many individuals. Therefore, the social work profession is integral to the development and implementation of practice and policy for the psycho- sis-risk population. The present paper examines psychosis risk in the context of micro- and macro-level social work. The clinical segment focuses on the early identification of psychosis-risk symptoms and the potential for psychosocial intervention approaches that are specific to this population. Clinical involvement at this early stage allows a rapid response to the first psychotic episode, which greatly influences the severity of disability associated with schizophrenia and other psychotic disorders (Marshall, Lewis, Lockwood, Drake, Jones, & Croudace, 2005; Drake, Haley, Akhtar, & Lewis, 2000). Macro-level issues of interest to social workers focus on addressing the ethics of treating a population that has not yet developed a mental illness, as well as ameliorating the stigma involved in seeking treatment at this vulnerable stage.

ASSESSMENT OF PSYCHOSIS

Clinical methods used to identify individuals at an elevated risk for schizophrenia have recently progressed from heredity based estimates to comprehensive assessments of psychosis- risk symptoms. Early definitions used the family history method, in which the high-risk designation was based solely on genetic relatedness. In the absence of other diagnostic strategies, the family history method carried a rather modest predictive validity of approximately 10%, and was limited to offspring of a parent with schizophrenia (Cornblatt & Obuchowski, 1997). Such a low conversion rate raises significant ethical questions, as providing treatment at this stage would mean treating nine “well” individuals for everyone “sick” person (Addington, 2003).

Recently, dedicated assessment tools have been used to identify

individuals who meet the relatively stringent criteria of psychosis-risk syndrome, a diagnosis proposed for inclusion in the DSM-V (Yung, et al., 2010; Corcoran, et al., 2010). Contemporary definitions of psychosis risk revolve around symptoms rather than heredity. These symptoms can be similar to those ex-perienced in schizophrenia, but of attenuated severity or duration. Psychosis risk can still be defined based on family history as well, but only when it is accompanied by a recent decline in functioning (Yung et al., 1996). The Structured Interview for Prodromal Syndromes and Scale of Prodromal Symptoms (SIPS/SOPS) looks specifically at recent symptoms and changes in functioning. SIPS/SOPS is an assessment tool that allows clinicians to identify psychosis risk with greater validity than the family history method used in earlier studies (Miller et al., 1999). Individuals identified by the SIPS/SOPS diagnostic instrument convert to psychosis at rates as high as 43-46% after 6 months and up to 50-54% after 12 months (Miller et al., 2003; 2002). Social work training in SIPS/SOPS and other assessment tools may lead to increased identification of psychosis-risk syndrome in the general population, allowing more opportunities for early intervention.

Intervention

Opportunity for the development of preventive treatments has expanded as researchers have become increasingly adept at identifying an at-risk period for psychosis. Research in this area is promising, with one randomized-control trial demonstrating the superiority of low-dose risperidone in

combination with cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) over “needs-based intervention” finding a significant difference in rates of transition to psychosis (9.7% versus 35.7% for the control condition) and a reportedly low incidence of side effects (McGorry et al., 2002). Another randomized-control trial of psychosis-risk intervention found a strong but statistically insignificant trend supporting the efficacy of olanzapine over placebo in preventing the onset of psychotic disorder (34.5% versus 16.1% conversion). This study likely suffered from deficiencies in statistical power, as it had a low sample size limited by the lack of research participants who met psychosis-risk criteria (McGlashan et al., 2004). The authors believed that these results showed promise for the intervention; however, this must be interpreted with caution because of the failure of the effect to withstand statistical testing.

Regarding treatment modalities, medication alone and interventions focused primarily on attenuated psychotic symptoms may not produce the widespread changes in personal and social functioning that would be needed to prevent long-term psychiatric disability. Instead, this group may require intensive multi-systemic interventions that incorporate issues related to school, employment, housing, family, and other interpersonal relationships as integral components of the pathway to recovery (Fowler et al., 2010). However, psychosocial intervention for psychosis-risk syndrome is a new and developing field, with strong promise but little available published data.

The only published data on psychosocial intervention at this phase comes from McGorry et al. (2002), who identified a significant reduction in rates of conversion to psychotic disorder among participants receiving CBT. However, the CBT group was simultaneously receiving a low-dose antipsychotic medication, preventing a clear interpretation of whether this effect was due to the pharmacological treatment, psychosocial treatment, or both. Despite the lack of published data, most psychosis-risk clinics do include supportive therapy sessions as well as case management for addressing specific problems, such as housing and income issues, while some also include additional psychosocial interventions such as stress-management treatment (Gleeson, Larsen, & McGorry, 2003; Addington et al., 2007).

Many psychosis-risk clinics embrace the use of family interventions to address psychosocial issues in the client (Lefley, 2009). The psychosis-risk period is an ideal time for family-based interventions, as many families are present and willing to provide support and assistance to the client. These families do not show the resentment that tends to emerge in family members at later stages of chronic mental illness (Wong, Davidson, McGlashan, Gerson, Malaspina, & Corcoran, 2008). Emotional involvement, warmth, and positive comments from family members are associated with an improved symptom profile in the client, suggesting that early psychosocial interventions targeting the family may improve prognosis among adolescents with psychosis-risk syndrome (O'Brien, Gordon, Bearden, Lopez, Kopelowicz, & Cannon, 2006). Although evidence for the efficacy of interventions in the psychosis-risk stage is lacking, there is maintained conviction that the potential benefits of developing an effective intervention justify further exploration (Wyatt & Henter, 2001). In this realm, social work can establish itself as a driving force in the prevention of psychotic disorders through the development of effective psychosocial and family interventions.

REDUCING THE DURATION OF UNTREATED PSYCHOSIS

One potential point of intervention for social workers involved with at-risk clients pertains to the early identification of conversion to psychosis. Duration of untreated psychosis (DUP) is the interval between the onset of psychotic symptoms and the initial contact with mental health services. Surprisingly, despite the widespread impact of symptoms, individuals in their first episode of psychosis delay initiating treatment for a substantial period of time. Studies estimate that the DUP lasts a median

of 26 weeks and a mean of 1-2 years, with some patients waiting many years to seek treatment (Larsen et al., 2001; Loebel, Lieberman, Alvir, Mayerhoff, Geisler, & Szymanski, 1992).

However, early detection programs can significantly reduce the duration of untreated psychosis (Melle et al., 2004; Johannessen et al., 2001). Ongoing psychotherapy through psychosis-risk services provides a venue for rapid identification and assessment at the onset of psychosis. For those not in treatment, community early detection programs in conjunction with utilization of psychiatric care improves access to early interventions and leads to widespread decrease of DUP. In one study, researchers documented a reduction in mean DUP from 114 weeks to a mean of 26 weeks, following the implementation of an early detection program (Johannessen, et al., 2001). Empirical studies associate longer DUP with increased symptoms and decreased quality of life, as well as a lower likelihood of remission and, consequently, impaired functioning between episodes of psychosis (Marshall et al., 2005; Drake et al., 2000). Shorter DUP, on the other hand, is associated with improved functioning, reduced symptoms, and improved responsiveness to ongoing treatment (Perkins, Gu, Bo-teva, & Lieberman, 2005; Robinson, Woerner, McMeniman, Mendelowitz, & Bilder, 2004).

SOCIAL WORKERS' MACRO ROLE

As a profession devoted to the integration of direct clinical services with community level interventions, social workers are positioned to address macroscopic issues related to the ethics, accessibility of services, and social perception of psychosis-risk syndrome. Social workers can advocate for greater access to and use of preventive services for psychosis risk while at the same time addressing the ethical impact on the provision of services prior to illness onset.

Ethics of Intervention Prior to Onset of Mental Illness

Ethical issues are prevalent in psychosis-risk research. By definition, some individuals who meet criteria for psychosis risk will never develop a full psychotic disorder, regardless of whether or not they received treatment. Individuals with psychosis-risk syndrome who later exhibit a remission of symptoms are known as "false-positives," in that they were incorrectly identified as positive for developing a psychotic disorder (Miller et al., 2003; Yung et al., 2003). In lieu of the benefits of early intervention, the primary benefit of treatment is lost to those who turn out to be false-positives. For this group, the negative effects of unnecessary treatment include the stigma of receiving psychiatric treatment and the effects of unneeded medication, which may outweigh the perceived benefits.

Receiving treatment as a false-positive means that counseling, and possibly medications, are being provided for a syndrome that will never develop. However, individuals with psychosis-risk syndrome do still have clinically significant psychiatric symptoms and would benefit from treatment. In a chart review of 47 individuals enrolled in services at a psychosis-risk research clinic, 90% of individuals identified as at-risk had previously received psychiatric services (Preda, Miller, Rosen, Somjee, McGlashan, & Woods, 2002). Even clients who do not develop a psychotic disorder often develop other Axis I psychiatric disorders and still have psychological issues that can benefit from early intervention (Schaffner & McGorry, 2001). For example, the McGorry et al. (2002) study, which provides the only published evidence for an efficacious intervention at the psychosis-risk stage, also found improved scores across all areas of functioning among the group that did not develop a psychotic disorder. This indicates that psychosis-risk treatment does not solely benefit those that later develop schizophrenia.

Ethical issues relating to non maleficence, or treatment risk, become more complex when antipsychotic medications are prescribed. An early intervention study showed that at-risk individuals who were given low doses of antipsychotic medication converted to psychosis at a much lower rate

than those who simply received case management (McGorry et al., 2002). The trade off is that these drugs may have quite severe side effects. Psycho- sis-risk studies conducted to date have prescribed very low doses of antipsychotic medications, such as olanzapine and risperidone, which only produced minor side effects that were easily managed through consultations with the psychiatrist (McGorry et al., 2002; McGlashan et al., 2004). Despite negligible medical side effects, antipsychotic medications cause significant weight gain that negatively affects self-image and long-term risk of obesity and diabetes (Corcoran, et al. 2005). This will continue to be a difficult ethical issue as further research is conducted on the pharmacotherapy of psychosis-risk syndrome.

ADVOCACY

As the issue of psychosis risk becomes more recognized in the community, it will be met by novel manifestations of stigma and barriers to treatment. In these circumstances, responsibility for addressing communal and societal issues falls under the purview of the social work profession. One topic of concern is the inequity in access to services early in the course of mental illness. For example, African Americans have historically been vulnerable to prolonged exclusion from treatment due to greater levels of community stigma and socioeconomic disparities. Consequently, this population can be less likely to receive psychiatric care following their initial contact with service providers compared to other racial and ethnic groups (Merritt-Davis & Keshevan, 2006).

One study found that African Americans compared to Asians or Whites are significantly more likely to make three or more contacts with mental health service providers before receiving treatment, are less likely to be referred by their general practitioner, and are more likely to have police involvement in their initiation of mental health services (Commander, Cochrane, Sa- shidharan, Akilu, & Wildsmith, 1999). Furthermore, a nationwide study by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention identified numerous barriers to recruitment among racial minority populations, including the knowledge of human subject abuses by past researchers, an absence of information regarding current re-search practice, distrust of informed consent and institutional review boards, and suspicion of research scientists. These barriers exist despite a general belief among this population that medical research is important and beneficial (Freimuth, Quinn, Thomas, Cole, Zook, & Duncan, 2001). Although complicated racial inequities endure, social workers can provide community psycho education in an effort to reduce stigma while simultaneously working to rectify racial disparities in the attention paid to psychiatric issues by primary care physicians.

CONCLUSION

Despite growing evidence for a distinct psychosis-risk period preceding the onset of schizophrenia, individuals at risk for psychosis have received minimal attention on a societal level. New issues may arise once psychosis risk becomes a more recognized diagnosis and treatment shifts from research clinics to community care. The psychosis-risk population exists on the cusp of mental illness. It is difficult to predict the issues that may arise for this group, as no equivalent group has been so formally defined in the past; mental illness tends to be identified by existing behavior rather than susceptibility. Formal recognition is needed to pave the way for the development of evidence-based interventions aimed specifically during the psychosis-risk phase, as well as to allow treatment coverage by insurance providers. Concurrently, this group needs support in the recognition that they may not develop a full psychotic disorder and should not be inflicted with the stigma that unfortunately accompanies chronic mental illness.

In looking toward the future, the proposed addition of psychosis risk syndrome to the upcoming

DSM-V (Yung, et al., 2010; Corcoran, et al., 2010) highlights the increasing prominence of preventive measures in the treatment of schizophrenia and other psychotic disorders. In both macro- and micro-realms, social workers are well poised to influence the development and implementation of services for this population. Effective intervention at this phase may depend less on psychiatric hospitalizations and antipsychotic medications and more on modifying learned behaviors, providing emotional and family support, and making accurate assessments early in the course of illness. As this diagnosis develops and evolves from a set of symptoms to a formal syndrome, there will be a growing need to alleviate stigma related to seeking treatment, and to carefully consider ethical issues regarding appropriate treatments for an at-risk population.

REFERENCES

- 1.Cullberg, J., Thoren, G., Abb, S., Mesterton, A., & Svedberg, B. (2000). Integrating intensive psychosocial and low dose medical treatments: a 3 year follow-up. In B. Martindale, A. Bateman, M. Crowe, F. Margison,(Eds.), *Psychosis: Psychosocial approaches and the effectiveness*. London: Gaskell Press.
- 2.De Haan, L., Linszen, D. H., Lenior, M. E., De Win, E. D., & Gorsira, R. (2003). Duration of untreated psychosis and outcome of schizophrenia: delay in intensive psychosocial treatment versus delay in treatment with antipsychotic medication. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 29, 341-348.
- 3.Gleeson, J., Larsen, T. K., & McGorry, P. (2003). Psychological treatment in pre- and early psychosis. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis and Dynamic Psy-chiatry*, 31, 229-245.
- 4.Henter I., Wyatt R.J. (2001). Rational for the study of early inter-vention. *Schizophrenia Research*. 1, 69-76.
- 5.Corcoran, C. M., First, M. B., & Cornblatt, B. (2010). The psy-chosis risk syndrome and its proposed inclusion in the DSM-V: a risk-benefit analysis. *Schizophrenia Research*, 120, 16-22.
- 6.Lefley, H. P. (2009). *Family psychoeducation for serious mental illness*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 7.Addington, J. (2003). The prodromal stage of psychotic illness: observation, detection or intervention? *Journal of Psy-chiatry & Neuroscience*, 28, 93-97.
- 8.Bola, J. R., Lehtinen, K., Cullberg, J., & Ciompi, L. (2009). Psy-chosocial treatment, antipsychotic postponent, and low- dose medication strategies in first-episode psychosis: a review of the literature. *Psychosis*, 1, 4-18.



Dr. D. G. Nejkar

Associate Professor , Department of Social Work Karmaveer Hire Arts, Science, Commerce and Education College, Gargoti, Kolhapur.

Publish Research Article

International Level Multidisciplinary Research Journal For All Subjects

Dear Sir/Mam,

We invite unpublished Research Paper, Summary of Research Project, Theses, Books and Books Review for publication, you will be pleased to know that our journals are

Associated and Indexed, India

- ★ Directory Of Research Journal Indexing
- ★ International Scientific Journal Consortium Scientific
- ★ OPEN J-GATE

Associated and Indexed, USA

- DOAJ
- EBSCO
- Crossref DOI
- Index Copernicus
- Publication Index
- Academic Journal Database
- Contemporary Research Index
- Academic Paper Database
- Digital Journals Database
- Current Index to Scholarly Journals
- Elite Scientific Journal Archive
- Directory Of Academic Resources
- Scholar Journal Index
- Recent Science Index
- Scientific Resources Database

Review Of Research Journal
258/34 Raviwar Peth Solapur-
413005, Maharashtra
Contact-9595359435

E-Mail-ayisrj@yahoo.in/ayisrj2011@gmail.com