



PEARL

Behind the cloak of competence: Brain Injury and Mental Capacity Legislation

Moore, Sophie; Wotus, Rebecca; Norman, Alyson; Holloway, Mark; Dean, Jackie

Published in:

Journal of Adult Protection

DOI:

[10.1108/JAP-02-2019-0007](https://doi.org/10.1108/JAP-02-2019-0007)

Publication date:

2019

Link:

[Link to publication in PEARL](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Moore, S., Wotus, R., Norman, A., Holloway, M., & Dean, J. (2019). Behind the cloak of competence: Brain Injury and Mental Capacity Legislation. *Journal of Adult Protection*, 0(0). <https://doi.org/10.1108/JAP-02-2019-0007>

All content in PEARL is protected by copyright law. Author manuscripts are made available in accordance with publisher policies. Wherever possible please cite the published version using the details provided on the item record or document. In the absence of an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher or author.



Behind the cloak of competence: Brain Injury and Mental Capacity Legislation

Journal:	<i>The Journal of Adult Protection</i>
Manuscript ID	JAP-02-2019-0007.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	mental capacity, brain injury, case management, social care, executive impairment, lack of insight

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Abstract

Purpose: Brain Injury Case Managers (BICMs) work closely with individuals with Acquired Brain Injury (ABI), assessing needs, structuring rehabilitation interventions and providing support, and have significant experience of clients with impairments to decision-making. This study explored the application of the Mental Capacity Act (MCA) and its guidance when applied to ABI survivors. This research aimed to 1) highlight potential conflicts or tensions that application of the MCA might pose and 2) identify approaches to mitigate the problems of the MCA and capacity assessments with ABI survivors. It is hoped this will support improvements in the services offered.

Design: Using a mixed method approach, 93 BICMs responded to an online questionnaire about decision-making following ABI. Of these, 12 BICMs agreed to take part in a follow-up semi-structured telephone interview.

Findings: The data revealed four main themes: disagreements with other professionals, hidden disabilities, vulnerability in the community and implementation of the MCA and capacity assessments.

Practical Implications: The findings highlight the need for changes to the way mental capacity assessments are conducted and the need for training for professionals in the hidden effects of ABI.

Originality: Limited research exists on potential limitations of the application of the MCA for individuals with an ABI. This study provides much needed research on the difficulties surrounding mental capacity and ABI.

Introduction

Incidence of ABI: The incidence of acquired brain injury (ABI) is a significant concern with 348,453 admissions to hospitals due to ABI with the United Kingdom (UK) in 2016-2017 (954 admissions daily; Headway, 2018). The most commonly reported causes of ABI in the UK are bleeds to the brain, infections, or traumatic brain injuries (TBIs) caused by falls, assaults, and road traffic accidents (Rutland-Brown *et al.*, 2006). The consequences experienced by survivors can have a significant impact on their day-to-day living and often requires long term care and support (Khan *et al.*, 2003).

Impact of ABI: ABI is one of the leading causes of disability within the UK (Fleminger and Ponsford, 2005) with individuals experiencing changes emotionally, cognitively and behaviourally (Yates *et al.*, 2006). Some may experience a range of physical difficulties, including loss of coordination, speech difficulties, fatigue, and sexual problems (Headway, 2018). However, for many individuals there will be no physical indication of impairment (Higham and Phelps, 1998). Cognitive difficulties can include memory impairment (Mathias and Mansfield, 2005), reduced processing speed (Felmingham *et al.*, 2004), executive impairment (Chan *et al.*, 2008) and attentional deficits (Rohling *et al.*, 2009), and can be seen as a “silent epidemic” (Langlois *et al.*, 2006).

Executive functioning incorporates skills such as planning, cognitive flexibility, multi-tasking, initiating behaviour, inhibition, controlling emotions, and learning social “rules” (Gioia *et al.*, 2008). Executive dysfunction is often invisible and therefore not easily assessed with formal neuropsychological assessment (Parsons *et al.*, 2017; Manchester *et al.*, 2004). It can have a significant impact on functioning (Rabinowitz and Levin, 2014), and has been linked to risk-taking behaviours such as substance

1
2
3 and alcohol misuse (Parry-Jones *et al.*, 2004; Weil *et al.*, 2016), criminal activity
4
5 (Holloway, 2014) and suicidality (Simpson and Tate, 2002; Homaifar *et al.*, 2012).
6
7
8
9

10 *Mental Capacity Act (MCA)*: The Mental Capacity Act (MCA) is a legal framework to
11
12 guide the assessment of an individual's capacity to make decisions. Capacity can be
13
14 affected by an individual's inability to understand information pertaining to decision-
15
16 making, their ability to retain information, their ability to weigh up and use that
17
18 information and their ability to communicate. Capacity can also fluctuate over time. A
19
20 person is considered to lack capacity if they are unable to make decisions due to an
21
22 impairment or disturbance in the functioning of the mind or brain (Department of Health
23
24 [DoH], 2005). There are five statutory principles to the MCA; a person 1) must be
25
26 assumed to have capacity unless it is proven otherwise, 2) must not be treated as
27
28 unable to make a decision unless all practicable steps have been made to help and 3)
29
30 must not be treated as lacking capacity merely based on unwise decisions. The final
31
32 principles state that those lacking capacity should have decisions made in their best
33
34 interests () and that before a decision is made, it must be ensured that the purpose for
35
36 which it is made cannot be achieved in a way that is less restrictive to their rights (5).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Professionals, researchers and family members have argued that the act does not
45
46 meet the needs of individuals with a range of different conditions, including ABI (House
47
48 of Lords Select Committee [HoLSC, 2014]). For example, the link between executive
49
50 dysfunction and increased risk-taking behaviours brings the capacity to make decision
51
52 regarding lifestyle choices, welfare and health into question. There is limited research
53
54 and guidance on the MCA's description of 'unwise decisions' and whether this
55
56 constitutes these kinds of risk-taking behaviours. The HoLSC (2014) report highlighted
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 several issues with the MCA and its implementation. Evidence provided to the Select
4
5 Committee related to ABI identified the impact lack of insight has upon decision-
6
7 making and upon the assessment of mental capacity. Insight is an individual's partial,
8
9 or whole, awareness of changes in their abilities, functioning and emotional responses
10
11 secondary to their injury (Holloway and Fyson, 2016; Ownsworth *et al.*, 2006;
12
13 Prigitano, 2005). An ABI survivor may be able to describe their difficulties (intellectual
14
15 awareness) and even acknowledge strategies to deal with these. However this
16
17 knowledge may not manifest or affect behaviour within real-life settings (Holloway and
18
19 Fyson, 2016).
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 The functional test of capacity identified four areas in which capacity may be impaired,
27
28 through an inability to 1) understand information provided, 2) retain information long
29
30 enough to make a decision, 3) weigh up information available to make the decision
31
32 and 4) communicate their decision. A lack of insight affects the individual's ability to
33
34 use relevant information and weigh it up in order to make a decision (Prigitano, 2005).
35
36
37

38 Although it is a salient effect of ABI, it is important to note that somewhat nebulously
39
40 defined concepts, such as "lack of insight", though common in practice and clinical
41
42 discourse, are not used within the wording of the MCA. A lack of insight into the impact
43
44 of one's brain injury does not, de facto, equate to an individual having a lack of
45
46 Capacity with regards a specific decision. It is essential that BICMs, and others, to
47
48 remain compliant with the Act and Code of Practice, relate this perceived brain injury
49
50 related difficulty to the functional tests of understanding, retaining, weighing up and
51
52 using and communicating information relevant to the decision in hand (Case, 2016).
53
54
55 The evidence for this is likely to come from open discussion with family and those
56
57 working closely with the individual who are more likely to understand the nuances of
58
59
60

1
2
3 their ABI and the effects these have on their decision-making capacity (Douglas and
4 Bigby, 2018). The MCA guidance clearly highlights the importance of including others
5
6 in the assessment process (NICE, 2018).
7
8
9

10
11
12 A review of contested cases relating to Mental Capacity before the Courts identified
13 that of the functional tests, it was “weighing up and using” that appeared to be the one
14 that was most frequently noted to be cited as the reason for perceived lack of capacity
15 (Ruck Keene et al., 2019). The authors of this study note that the whole concept of
16
17 “using and weighing up” is a newer legal construct and one that will need more
18 attention in both clinical and legal research to better clarify.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Thornton (2011) identified potential conflict between two core principles of the MCA.
31 The first being that assessment of capacity must be decision-specific; being deemed
32 to lack capacity to make a particular decision does not mean that capacity is lacking
33 to make another decision. Thornton (2011) claims that this is potentially at odds with
34 the principle that capacity should be assessed as being independent of the ‘wisdom’
35 of the decision being made as multiple ‘unwise decisions’ may be indicative of an
36 impairment in capacity. This hints at an ambiguity over what differentiates a “lack of
37 capacity”, from an ‘unwise decision’. Differences of opinion regarding what is an
38 “unwise” decision, a “lifestyle-choice” and an incapacitous decision are central to
39 conflicts relating to the implementation of the MCA. Tensions have developed between
40 a potentially paternalistic risk-averse and controlling approach and the abandonment
41 of brain-injured people to the impact of their cognitive and executive impairments in
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the context of a society that does not recognise and respond to their needs (HoLSC,
4 2014; Flynn 2016; Norman 2016).
5
6
7
8
9

10 A lack of knowledge of ABI and the invisible disabilities that characterise it, can lead
11 professionals to treat an individual's decision as being a result of their own free will,
12 not as a result of a lack of capacity to make an informed choice (Flynn, 2016). This
13 can result in individuals making repeated unwise decisions, with direct impact on
14 themselves and others, but still being deemed capacious, sometimes with fatal
15 consequences (Preston-Shoot, 2018; Flynn, 2016).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Additionally, standardised capacity assessments do not take into account the impact
27 of emotional state on decision-making (Beadle-Brown, 2015). Within the MCA
28 guidance, the examples of assessments place emphasis on making information
29 available, rather than assessing real-life, dynamic situations (Brown and Marchant,
30 2013). Thus, when the individual steps out of this structured environment, and is
31 required to make complex multi-faceted decisions that may have an emotional
32 component, problems may arise which may affect their safety and wellbeing (Brown
33 and Marchant, 2013). The implementation of the MCA and assessment in this way can
34 lead to wrongful assumptions of capacity that leave survivors in vulnerable situations
35 without appropriate support and safeguarding in place (George and Gilbert, 2018).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Should an individual be deemed to lack capacity, the MCA enables professionals to
52 make a 'best interest' decision on their behalf. What exactly constitutes a 'best interest'
53 decision is also unhelpfully vague. Marshall and Sprung (2017) reviewed the literature
54 from 2007-2016 and found that professionals lack confidence in understanding and
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 making best interest decisions. They concluded that this confusion was a result of a
4 lack of knowledge from professionals regarding MCA legislation as a whole (Marshall
5 and Sprung, 2017).
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 *Case Management:* Case management is a process devoted to the coordination,
13 rehabilitation, care and support of individuals with complex needs, with the aim of
14 facilitating independence to improve quality of life for individuals, whilst taking into
15 account personal preferences, the social and familial context and issues of risk
16 management (Clark-Wilson, 2006). British Association of Brain Injury Case Managers
17 (BABICM) members are usually qualified and registered professionals from a range of
18 health and social care backgrounds, most especially Occupational Therapy, Nursing
19 and Social Work and have a specialist knowledge of the nuances and complexities of
20 ABI (Holloway and Fyson, 2016).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 The study aimed to explore the views and experiences of BICMs working within the
36 MCA and its relevant guidance to 1) highlight potential conflicts or tensions that
37 application of the MCA might pose when applied to individuals affected by ABI and 2)
38 identify approaches to mitigate the problems of the MCA and capacity assessments
39 with individuals with ABI.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Method**

50 *Participants:* Participants were recruited through the British Association of Brain Injury
51 Case Managers (BABICM). Ninety-three participants completed the online survey in
52 the first stage of the study. All participants had experience of working with clients with
53 ABI in the last five years. Experience ranged from BICMs who had worked with less
54 than four clients in the last five years through to those that had worked with over 20
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (mean = 13.2 clients). Of the original sample, 12 participants agreed to take part in
4 further semi-structured interviews in the second phase of the study. Ethical approval
5 was granted from the University of Plymouth, Faculty of Health and Human Science
6 Research Ethics Committee.
7
8
9
10

11
12
13
14
15 *Design and Procedure:* The project employed a mixed-methods research design
16 (Hanson *et al.*, 2005). This was chosen as mixing different methods can strengthen a
17 study by neutralising some of the disadvantages of the models, as well as
18 incorporating the benefits of both (Creswell *et al.*, 2003; Johnson *et al.*, 2007).
19 Furthermore, triangulation of findings within a mixed-method approach is a way of
20 ensuring credibility of the research, and thus increases the trustworthiness of the
21 findings (Ravalier, 2018). The online questionnaire was administered via the survey
22 platform Survey Gizmo and contained both qualitative free text sections and
23 quantitative questions taking the form of predominately Likert scales.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 Quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics and correctional analyses
39 where appropriate. Qualitative data were analysed using conventional content
40 analysis. At the end of the questionnaire, participants were given the option to provide
41 their email address if they wish to take part in the semi-structured interviews. Of the
42 18 participants who expressed an interest, 12 took part in the second phase.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Semi-structured interviews were conducted over the telephone using a series of
53 prompt questions designed to elicit elaboration on the key themes raised from the
54 original survey data (e.g. can you describe some of the issues you have encountered
55 regarding the assessment of capacity in your clients?) Interviews lasted between 30
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 minutes and one hour and audio-recorded for later transcription using an orthographic
4 method where every spoken word was transcribed verbatim. The transcribed
5 interviews were then analysed using a mixed thematic approach.
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 *Data Analysis:* The data from the online questionnaire were analysed using a mixed
13 methods approach whereby quantitative questions were analysed using descriptive
14 statistics and where appropriate correlations were conducted to assess the
15 relationships between responses to questions. The qualitative sections were then
16 analysed using conventional content analysis (CCA) to provide a deeper
17 understanding of the issues associated with supported decision-making with ABI
18 survivors. Data were analysed separately and then combined using a triangulation
19 approach (Hanson et al., 2005). As the qualitative responses were designed to elicit
20 information about a topic with limited pre-existing literature, CCA was used to explore
21 the data (Hsieh and Shannon, 2005) as it allows direct information to be gathered from
22 the participants responses, without placing it in predefined categories (Hsieh and
23 Shannon, 2005). Analysis began with reading the data repeatedly to gain a complex
24 understanding of the responses (Tesch, 1990) and writing exploratory comments.
25 Responses were read again to derive codes within the data that capture key thoughts
26 and concepts (Miles and Huberman, 1994). These codes were then organised into
27 related categories and then meaningful clusters (Patton, 2002), which identified the
28 master themes. A validation analysis of the codes was conducted by another member
29 of the project team. Further validity checks took place through integration with the
30 responses to the interview questions.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The interview data were analysed using a mixed thematic approach using deductive
4 and inductive methods, as described by Braun and Clarke (2006). An initial deductive
5 framework was applied to the data in order to identify pre-constructed themes based
6 on the CCA conducted from the questionnaires. A further inductive analysis was
7 subsequently applied to the data, in order to look for any new themes that had not
8 formed part of the original analysis. This triangulation process led to a restructuring of
9 the data collected in stage one of the study. Validity checks were performed on the
10 data by other members of the research team.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Results**

25
26 *Quantitative survey findings:* BICMs were asked to rate how many clients with ABI
27 they had seen in the last five years, the number with multiple capacity issues (more
28 than one decision where capacity was questioned) and the numbers of those with
29 fluctuating capacity (Figure 1). Over half the participants (62%) reported that they had
30 experiences where clients have made unwise decisions but were thought to have
31 capacity following an assessment by other professionals who were often not brain
32 injury specialists. In the past five years, over half of BICMs (63%) reported having
33 disagreements with other professionals/services regarding the capacity of a client.
34 This was picked up as a theme in the qualitative analysis and discussed below. In the
35 written responses, the most commonly highlighted issues were regarding the welfare
36 of clients, risk-taking behaviours and living arrangements. When asked to rank the
37 domains in which participants felt their clients would be most likely to demonstrate a
38 lack of capacity “weighing up and using” the information relevant to a decision was
39 ranked highest, followed by “understanding information”. Difficulties with
40 communication and retention of information were ranked as being less problematic.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 This potentially indicates that it is easier to support retention and communication
4 issues in clients to support decision-making than it is to compensate for cognitive
5 impairment, particularly executive impairment in practice and functioning.
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 ***Insert Figure 1 here***
13
14
15

16
17 All BICMs that responded reported supporting their clients with making decisions.
18 However, the majority of participants (73%) responded that they were not aware of
19 any specific resources to support this process. BICMs identified the need to help
20 clients generate ideas (48%), help clients consider pros and cons of outcomes (58%),
21 support clients to see the potential implications of outcomes (57%) and 58% reported
22 that they provide written feedback to clients to support decision-making.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32
33 Participants in the survey considered the involvement of others, mainly family, and the
34 client in the decision-making process. Just over half of participants (53%) agreed that
35 they support clients by engaging trusted family members and others with decision-
36 making conversations. In contrast, 61% neither agreed nor disagreed that family
37 members are best placed to support decision-making, with 30.1% disagreeing and
38 1.6% strongly disagreeing. This was also picked up in the qualitative analysis in the
39 consideration around financial abuse. Finally, 65% of participants reported that
40 knowing the client and family well helped them support decision-making and 34%
41 agreed that their relationship with the client was the main factor in supporting decision-
42 making. Working with clients and their families allows BICMs to build good
43 relationships with them. This close relationship aids supported decision-making and
44 was highlighted in the qualitative analysis, with BICMs reporting a lack of relationship
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and understanding of clients by professionals who undertake capacity assessments
4
5 as a reason for discrepancies between assessments.
6
7
8
9

10 A series of correlational analyses were conducted to identify relationships in the data
11 set. A significant correlation was found between the number of clients case managed
12 and the number of clients with fluctuating capacity $r(66) = .411, p < .001$, between the
13 number of clients managed with capacity issues and the number of clients with
14 fluctuating capacity $r(64) = .423, p < .001$. These findings suggest that more
15 experienced BICMs have greater experience of working with clients with capacity
16 issues and may be better placed to identify difficulties. A significant correlation was
17 also found between the number of clients with multiple capacity issues and BICMs
18 response to providing feedback in writing to support their clients $r(59) = .301, p < .05$,
19 highlighting, perhaps, that more experienced BICMs were more likely to provide
20 written feedback as a way to support decision making.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 *Qualitative findings:* As part of understanding the issues surrounding mental capacity
39 and the need for supported decision-making, participants were encouraged to provide
40 qualitative feedback on their experiences. The qualitative analysis identified four main
41 themes; disagreements with other professionals, implementation of the MCA and
42 mental capacity assessments, ABI as hidden disability and the vulnerability of ABI
43 survivors (see Figure 2).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 ***Insert Figure 2 here***
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Theme 1: Disagreements with other professionals:* The quantitative data identified that
4
5 92% of BICMs reported having disagreements with other professionals over the
6
7 capacity of their clients to make decisions with one participant stating that they occur
8
9 “on a day to day basis”. BICMs discussed instances of contradictory assessments
10
11 taking place that suggested capacity despite poor insight and high levels of executive
12
13 impairment, cases where non-specialist professionals failed to undertake
14
15 assessments where they were warranted, and instances of ill-informed assessments
16
17 being conducted by non-specialist professionals. BICMs identified five main reasons
18
19 for disagreements with professionals;
20
21
22

- 23 • a lack of knowledge of ABI by non-specialist professionals
- 24 • “false” appearances of capacity by individuals who sound more competent in
25
26 discussion than in practice
- 27 • a lack of collaboration by assessors with family members or involved
28
29 professionals
- 30 • the framing of questions, the “question and answer” method of assessment
- 31 • professionals having their own agenda (see figure 2).

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43 The most common sub-theme was of other professionals “*undertaking assessments*
44
45 *[without] [...] a clear understanding of brain injury*”. The majority of these experiences
46
47 referred to individuals employed by statutory services. Social services employees
48
49 received the most criticism “*because they don’t have the knowledge of brain injury [...]*
50
51 *they don’t know the kind of questions that they need to ask [...] and they take*
52
53 *everything that they see at face value*”. It was also noted that the “*invisible*” difficulties
54
55 of ABI meant that other professionals often missed the “*subtleties about actually how*
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *vulnerable they are*". Participants explained how these disagreements hindered their
4
5 ability to support clients by preventing access to funds or access to safeguarding.
6
7

8
9
10 *"We couldn't apply for funding, we had to wait months before another person came out to*
11 *come to the pretty obvious conclusion that this person does not have capacity".*
12 (Interview participant (P)2).

13
14 *"...actually stops any safeguards being put in place and [...] stops them from being*
15 *supported to be able to make decisions".* (P2).

16
17 *"Where client was deemed to have capacity to make decisions about medication but*
18 *repeatedly forgot the reasoning and they failed to take it".* (Survey participant (S)161)

19
20 *"Client was assessed as being able to have sexual relationships. She subsequently slept*
21 *with numerous partners who she believed loved her...she was subsequently raped".*
22 (S124).

23
24
25 All participants reported assessors taking what clients say *"at face value"* due to a
26
27 failure to understand how hidden disabilities, such as lack of insight and executive
28
29 impairments, impact upon real world functioning. When paired with intact intellectual
30
31 ability and retained social skills, these executive impairments may mean that clients
32
33 may have a *"cloak of competence"* which results in the false appearance of capacity.
34
35 The difference between the presentation of clients during an office-based assessment
36
37 and their functioning in the real world ran throughout this discussion.
38
39
40

41
42
43 *"The reality is, they can talk the talk but they can't follow it through, if they encounter any*
44 *problem, if there's any distraction, if there's anything on their mind, some days they'll*
45 *initiate it but others they don't. Their difficulties are completely changeable day by day*
46 *and people don't believe it because the person presents very very well with this cloak of*
47 *competence."* (P6).

48
49
50 *I have found that my clients can sometimes understand information given to them about*
51 *a significant decision, and can take part in a discussion of pros and cons about the*
52 *decision, but are not able to take those discussions into account when they are alone*
53 *and in the heat of the moment".* (S58).

54
55 Many participants described the failure, and sometimes refusal, of other professionals
56
57 to collaborate with BICMs. Some participants explained how other professionals are
58
59 *"dismissive"* and seem to be *"suspicious"* of BICMs because they work in the private
60

1
2
3 sector so are “sometimes [...] seen as outsiders” or thought of as being “in it to make
4
5 money”.

6
7
8
9 *“Certainly within social services, they’re very suspicious of solicitors and don’t talk to
10 them and you know ‘they’re always on the make’ [...] case management is also being
11 tarred with the same brush”. (P10).*

12
13
14
15 Participants noted that when other professionals seek out the perspectives of others,
16
17 this is often limited to family members. Participants highlighted that in some instances
18
19 these family members may not always have a client’s best interests at heart, putting
20
21 clients at risk. One participant described a client whose father, he believed, had
22
23 motivations to “get his hands on his son’s money” and how a neuropsychologist was
24
25 unaware of this and involved him in the decision-making process with his son. He
26
27 explained how this caused “havoc [...] and had that neuro-psychologist then come and
28
29 had a chat with us about the father [...] it would have been a lot easier”.

30
31
32
33
34
35
36 Participants also explained how some assessors “ask [...] questions in the way that
37
38 facilitates just getting the open response, rather than any direct questions” and how
39
40 professionals who lack knowledge of ABI fail to understand the framing of a question,
41
42 can influence a client’s response.

43
44
45
46
47
48 *“Any question that he had directed towards him, would influence his response in the way
49 of the phrasing of the question and the type of question, whereas if it was an open
50 question he couldn’t answer it, but [...] if it was [...] a direct question that was expecting
51 the answer ‘no’ he would say ‘no’. Everything from statutory services is generally at face
52 value and [...] because the clients can say yes, they think that they’ve got the capacity to
53 make that decision”. (P1).*

54
55
56
57 Participants’ suggested that professionals may have their own agendas which
58
59 influence capacity assessments. This discussion focused on the pressures
60

1
2
3 experienced by statutory services who have large caseloads and limited finances and
4
5 time to spend with service-users. It was theorised that this led to some professionals
6
7 failing to engage with BICMs:
8
9

10 *"It's an easy life if you go 'well they said they planned it so its fine here's the money'*
11 *rather than ask the question", and another participant stated that "there's a certain level*
12 *of complacency across the board of practitioners who are just doing it [...] 'cause they*
13 *have to [...] it's a tick-box exercise". (P12).*
14
15

16
17
18 *Theme 2: Hidden disabilities:* Participants explained that many assessors do not
19
20 understand the variation and extent of the hidden disabilities associated with ABI,
21
22 which led to clients being deemed, wrongly, to have capacity. As one participant
23
24 summarised, *"you really can't judge somebody's capacity if you don't understand the*
25
26 *underlying problems"*. Specifically case managers identified that a lack of knowledge
27
28 of executive dysfunction, lack of insight, initiation problems, difficulties with idea
29
30 generation and communication difficulties, the impact of mood and environment on
31
32 decision-making and, fluctuations in capacity can lead to inappropriate assumptions
33
34 of capacity.
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 Executive dysfunction was identified as *"the biggest issue and [...] the most*
42
43 *challenging in terms of assessment"*. One participant explained how other cognitive
44
45 difficulties like poor memory are *"more tangible"* as it is easier to assess an individual's
46
47 ability to retain information, while another explained how they influence assessments
48
49 *"because they can [...] mask issues [...] like [...] planning, and they know in the*
50
51 *moment [...] how to answer [in] [...] assessment settings"*. Another participant stated
52
53 that *"executive skills are [...] difficult to grasp if [the assessor has] [...] never had*
54
55 *training"* and described executive dysfunction as *"a stumbling block"* that is *"not really*
56
57 *specifically covered in the Mental Capacity Act"*.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 A lack of insight was identified as “*massively*” affecting their clients’ capacity and
7
8 makes them more vulnerable as not being “*able to recognise their difficulties*” means
9
10 that “*they can put themselves in so many difficult situations where they can become a*
11
12 *target for physical, verbal, [and] financial abuse*”. One participant explained how an
13
14 individual they worked with is “*not able to present to anybody the sort of support that*
15
16 *they need [...] or they’re not able to identify for themselves what potential risks they*
17
18 *might be taking, so they’re not even identifying what the information is that they need*
19
20 *to be weighing up*”. Another recurring point was that many professionals struggle to
21
22 understand this because “*it’s very abstract in nature*”.

23
24
25
26
27 “Someone not being able to [...] realise that [...] they can’t do a drumroll because they
28 haven’t got one arm and [...] arguing that they can [...] seems a very strange concept
29 and that’s a really obvious lack of insight, but [...] our clients all the time say ‘I can
30 manage my money, I want more money’ and [...] then they’ll spend it all and [...] and [...] it’s just a repeating cycle”. (P9).

31
32
33 “Lack of insight, executive issues, processing information, understanding the context of
34 the decision in situ, generating ideas and problem solving, and seeing the implications of
35 the decision in reality. Prospective decision making can be tricky, if the context is not fully
36 understood or able to be put into practice. Vulnerabilities and influence from others, for
37 instance, in the phrasing of questions and doing what others want them to do rather than
38 independent decision making. Fluctuations of mood, effects of anxiety, rigidity of thinking
39 and lack of empathy impacts on decisions”. (S50).

40
41
42 Associated with executive impairments, BICMs identified that professionals often do
43
44 not understand that what a client may say during a structured, office-based
45
46 assessment, is drastically removed from what they are capable of outside of that
47
48 environment. Participants described how mood and the environment, specifically
49
50 distractors and stressors, can worsen clients’ hidden disabilities; “*their ability to*
51
52 *manage and mediate [...] executive skills are hugely impacted by their emotional*
53
54 *regulation*”.

1
2
3 Discussion of the impact of the environment was very much focused on the view that
4 assessing capacity in a very structured, office-based setting was not suitable for ABI
5 as this does not take the effects of environment into account. One participant
6 explained how she might support a client to come to a decision, but that "*when you*
7 *leave and they're in the real world [...] being bombarded with information within the*
8 *community or they're struggling with impulse control [...] they stumble at the first hurdle*
9 *because in real life they often can't initiate doing that thing".* Initiation problems were
10 also highlighted as a problem during office-based assessments as the ability to
11 discuss action in such a setting does not equate to the ability to initiate and implement
12 those decisions outside of that setting and that "*assessors are often not aware of or*
13 *misunderstand [this] [...] difference".*

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31 Fluctuating capacity came into much of the discussion of executive dysfunction, and
32 of the impact of mood and the environment. One participant described it as "*the red*
33 *mist"* that means that clients "*can really struggle in the heat of the moment to enact*
34 *sensible plans and apply them".* Participants also highlighted how working with clients
35 for a long duration of time, meant that they could support their clients more effectively,
36 as they were "*able to [...] see how their capacity might fluctuate"* and develop a greater
37 understanding of "*what affects it [...] and what supports it".*

38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49 In relation to the difficulties of how questions are framed in assessments, participants
50 highlighted that idea generation problems can often be overlooked during
51 assessments of capacity. The appearance of capacity during assessments does not
52 mean that clients are able to generate ideas in order to begin making those same
53 decisions when at home in the presence of stressors and distractions.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 *"You might say to a client "oh what do you want to eat today?" and they'll say "oh I'm not*
5 *hungry" but actually it's not because they're not hungry it's because they can't generate*
6 *an idea of what they might want to have [...] if you went to them and said "would you like*
7 *pizza or pasta today?" they'll go "I want pizza" because you're generating that idea and*
8 *they're making a choice."* (P9).
9

10
11 Memory problems were often discussed in relation to unwise decisions and lack of
12
13 insight. Participants described how these impairments meant that clients frequently do
14
15 not believe them when they remind them of times when unwise decisions have ended
16
17 badly and how often *"they believe that they are correct even if you showed them*
18
19 *something that's been written down [...] it doesn't mean a lot to them"*.
20
21

22
23
24 Finally, 33% of participants highlighted communication difficulties as a factor that
25
26 influences their clients' presentation during capacity assessments, as participants
27
28 emphasised the importance of using *"communication aids like talking mats"* and
29
30 *"making sure that the clients have had all the opportunity to communicate and that*
31
32 *actually their levels of communication are accurately assessed"*. One participant
33
34 explained that typically she finds that with clients with *"profoundly injured [...] level[s]*
35
36 *of understanding, their level of communication tends to be overestimated [...] because*
37
38 *[...] they may have retained some of the social elements of language and*
39
40 *communicating, the nodding and smiling, turn-taking"* and so *"people tend to think they*
41
42 *understand much more than they actually do"*.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 *Theme 3: Vulnerability in the community:* Participants talked at length about their
51
52 concerns that non-ABI-specialist professionals often failed to appreciate the level of
53
54 vulnerability of ABI survivors in the community. The term vulnerable has connotations
55
56 associated with legal frameworks around protecting "vulnerable adults", a term that is
57
58 no longer used. Vulnerability in this context is used more generally to reflect a
59
60

1
2
3 population who are at risk from harm, abuse or self-neglect. Thus we are using a wider
4 dictionary definition of the term rather than a legal one. BICMs can have long
5 relationships with clients and their families and therefore witness circumstances and
6 patterns of behaviour or situations which increase risk of harm, including from others
7 in the wider community, both known and unknown. Participants discussed welfare
8 issues associated with their clients, including being put at risk of financial
9 mismanagement (particularly by family members and falling victim to scams).
10 Vulnerability to substance misuse was discussed in relation to the right to make unwise
11 decisions and of other professionals perceiving these as “*lifestyle choices*”, and in
12 relation to sexual behaviour where participants described clients who funded their drug
13 habits through prostitution. Participants also highlighted that their clients’ capacity to
14 consent to sex was not considered and explained the difficulty they have with clients
15 who are mistreated by unsuitable sexual partners, as intervening would deny them
16 their autonomy.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Criminal behaviour also emerged as a theme, as clients were described as being
39 manipulated by those involved in criminal activities such as drug dealing, theft and
40 prostitution. Participants explained the challenges of having to explain to the police
41 “*why their clients behaved in a certain way and trying to explain the impacts of [...] the*
42 *brain injury, so that they can see [that there’s] [...] more to [...] what’s gone on*”. This
43 challenge was described as being due to the fact that “*a lot of the impairments are*
44 *invisible and therefore that person is judged in a way that certainly as case managers*
45 *we don’t want them to be judged*”. Living arrangements and homelessness were also
46 mentioned, as well as participants explaining how they struggle with facilitating
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 independence while their clients live in unsanitary conditions or lead sedentary
4
5 lifestyles.
6
7

8
9 *“Client being used as an unpaid sex worker, extremely vulnerable in the*
10 *community...drug using client who was sex working to fund her habit and other people’s”*
11 *(S32).*

12 *“A young male adult, was deemed to have capacity to live independently and manage a*
13 *small budget. Client was particularly vulnerable and repeatedly lost/sold/gave away his*
14 *possessions” (S60).*
15

16
17
18 In relation to vulnerability, participants discussed the involvement of family members
19 in the decision-making process. All participants felt the involvement of family members
20
21 *“very much depends on [...] the case manager’s view of family” and “what matters to*
22 *the client”*. Family involvement was seen by most to be *“a careful balance [...] of family*
23 *considerations and having to protect [...] the person with the brain injury from families*
24 *often as well”*. All participants described this balance explaining that most family
25
26 members are *“incredible”* as they *“know everything about the client” and that they “see*
27 *the patterns” and “they understand where the problems are”*. However, they also
28
29 described how family members *“sometimes can be quite destructive or can have their*
30 *own agenda”* where they did not have the client’s best interests at heart.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Vulnerability was also linked to the inability of clients to access services, or only access
44 to services unsuitable to their needs. This included the prison system, the NHS,
45 housing associations, and social services. One participant described a client who *“was*
46 *supposed to go to prison”* but they said that he should be in a rehabilitation unit, which
47 he could not access due to finances. The NHS and social services deemed his criminal
48 behaviour as *“a lifestyle choice”* and the housing association could not accommodate
49 him because *“he had too many needs”*. This resulted in the client being *“stuck in a tent*
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *for 3 months*". She explained how despite *"ringing people every night" in an attempt to*
4 *get someone to act, that this was met with the response "he has capacity"*.
5
6
7
8
9

10 Participants also argued that ABI survivors were especially vulnerable because they
11 *"have no voice because of their [...] brain injury"* and they felt it was part of their role
12 to act as that voice for their clients.
13
14
15

16
17
18 *"I had a client who [...] wanted to change the [...] care provider and*
19 *[...] the social worker was like fighting against him [...] he wasn't really being listened to*
20 *at all [...] asked me to come in and [...] get his voice heard so we did that and the agency*
21 *was changed then but [...] if he didn't have my help he could have just been left with an*
22 *agency he wasn't happy with" (P12).*
23
24
25
26

27 Finally, BICMs highlighted specific difficulties surrounding the *"maturation process"* of
28 clients who had received their brain injury as a child and the challenge of achieving *"a*
29 *balance" between making "sure that clients are moving forwards [...] into adulthood"*
30 whilst dealing with family members who still viewed these individuals as children. The
31 importance of facilitating positive risk and maintaining clients' right to make unwise
32 decisions was emphasised. One participant exemplified how care is tailored to the
33 individual as BICMs *"have to make sure that we safeguard the client but maybe in a*
34 *different way from how they have been when they were younger"*.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 *Theme 4: Implementation of the MCA and assessments:* This final theme relates to
47 the difficulties that participants raised about the use of the MCA, and the methods of
48 assessment, with clients with ABI. This was associated with sub-themes such as
49 *"unwise decisions"* and discussions of the *"constant [...] balancing act"* between
50 participants promoting their clients' autonomy and of their right to make unwise
51 decisions, whilst protecting their welfare. Participants explained how promoting
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 autonomy “empowers” clients and as “*it’s important that people have the feeling of*
4 *being in control [as] [...] that’s an essential part of any rehab*”. One participant stated
5
6 that although difficult it is a crucial part of a BICM’s job “*to rehabilitate, not just not just*
7 *protect and care*”. Multiple participants expressed the importance of taking “*managed*
8 *risks*”, as one participant stated that “*risk aversion [...] just causes more problems*” as
9
10 it results in “*conflict [...] lack of trust, [...] lack of [...] motivation and willingness [of*
11 *clients] to work with the professionals*”.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 Within the survey, 17% of participants compared working as BICMs before and after
22 the MCA was implemented. One participant felt that “*it’s better than it was but it’s not*
23 *good enough*” as “*people who now are deemed to retain capacity or who may lack*
24 *capacity but remain under review and then regain it would in the older days [...] be*
25 *deemed to lack capacity*” and that “*more people are found to retain capacity now*”.

26
27
28
29
30
31
32 Whereas another described a client who she had worked with for 27 years who abused
33 alcohol and whose rehabilitation “*always broke down in the community*” when “*she*
34 *goes in and out of rehab units or [...] hospitals*”. She said that despite this pattern of
35
36 repeated unwise decisions “*no one would pick her up*” because the MCA rules that
37
38 she has the right to make those unwise decisions. She explained that “*the vulnerable*
39 *clients are more vulnerable in my experience now than they were before [the MCA]*”
40
41 as this principle, as well as the principle that individuals must be assumed to have
42
43 capacity until it is proven otherwise, meant that she could not get anyone to intervene
44
45 in this case that “*was getting higher risk by the minute*”.

46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55 As well as difficulties with the MCA, participants also referred to difficulties with the
56
57 assessment process and structure; mainly that assessments too often take place one-
58
59 to-one in office-based meetings in a “*very time specific*”, “*controlled*” or “*structured*”
60

1
2
3 environment and that this means that the effect on environment and distractors on the
4 individual are not taken into account. The actual process of capacity assessments was
5 also explored, largely focusing on who actually conducts them. Participants identified
6 that clients are often “*assessed through generic services [...] especially social*
7 *services, who have absolutely zero understanding of brain injury and how people may*
8 *present*” and that “*the things that [BICMs] [...] are pointing out are the things that they*
9 *will miss or don’t take into account*”.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 Participants also expressed concerns about how the MCA was applied to ABI. Here
22 participants explained how capacity assessments are not tailored enough to ABI as
23 they do not account for the hidden disabilities that may influence them, particularly
24 fluctuating capacity, executive dysfunction, and lack of insight. The general view was
25 that although “*there’s a bit of a nod to brain injury*” in the MCA itself, that “*it’s not really*
26 *covered*”.

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

“*Most of the brain injury barely comes into it in the in the code of practice it’s all [...] dementia, people with learning disability, and the sorts of capacity issues that I deal with my clients so, ‘does this person have capacity to be buying cocaine from the dealer that rings him?’ ‘Does this person have capacity to enter into a sexual relationship with a girl and does [...] he appreciate whether or not she’s under 16? [...] there’s nothing about any of that.’ (P6).*”

61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Within the survey, 92% of participants described the guidance within the MCA as unclear with the MCA failing to “*give a definition really of what an ‘unwise decision’ is*” and that the concept of unwise decisions is “*hugely subjective*”. Furthermore, participants commented on how “*if somebody lacks capacity, decisions have to be made in their best interests*”, yet “*there is no definition in the actual guidance of what best interest actually is*”. Participants felt the guidance “*should be much more refined and less open to interpretation*”, while many concluded that the problem lies in “*the*

1
2
3 *process surrounding*” the principles as *“there’s no real enforcement of everybody*
4 *doing it the same way”*.
5
6
7

8
9 Participants went on to provide suggestions for improvements to the MCA and
10 capacity assessments for ABI survivors, including the need for more specific guidance
11 for ABI *“particularly of looking at people who lack capacity and lack executive*
12 *functioning”*. It was felt that the MCA *“should specify that assessments of somebody*
13 *with a brain injury are carried out by somebody that has some knowledge and*
14 *experience [of ABI]”* and that *“there should be a need for people to look at the client*
15 *over a longer period of time”*. It was also noted that *“decisions should be made*
16 *collectively”* and that rules should be implemented to *“make sure they’ve gathered*
17 *evidence from other people”*. Participants stated that policy-makers should be
18 *“informed by practice”*, and how the sharing of information between assessors would
19 aid their practice. One participant suggested that because *“multiple agencies and [...]*
20 *professionals all [work] [...] alongside each other but separately”* that *“some kind of*
21 *centralisation of information of what assessments had taken place and [...] by which*
22 *agencies and [...] documentation of these assessments” would benefit clients*. She
23 stated that the *“recording [...] storing and sharing of information”* might make
24 assessments less subjective.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Discussion**

49
50 This research aimed to explore the views of BICMs experiences of mental capacity,
51 the MCA, and its relevant guidance, when applied to individuals with ABI to 1) highlight
52 potential conflicts or tensions that application of the MCA might pose and 2) identify
53 approaches to mitigate the problems of the MCA and capacity assessments with
54 individuals with ABI. The results suggest that BICMs had ongoing experience of clients
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 with ABI who have mental capacity issues, including multiple issues and fluctuating
4 capacity. It further highlighted that participants working with clients with mental
5 capacity issues often had disagreements with other services/professionals regarding
6 the outcome of an MCA assessments and the application of the MCA guidance. Failing
7 to take account of the nuances of ABI leads to clients becoming increasingly
8 vulnerable within community settings. The findings identify the need for professional
9 expertise and functional assessment as methods of mitigating the problems with the
10 MCA and capacity assessments of those with ABI.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Participants consistently reported occasions where capacity assessment conducted
25 by other professionals had led to assumptions of capacity in individuals with ABI
26 despite their opposing views. BICMs work long-term with clients and therefore have
27 the opportunity to build therapeutic alliances and understanding of the clients and their
28 families to support decision-making (Clark-Wilson and Holloway, 2015). Furthermore,
29 supporting clients to make informed decisions is a key activity undertaken by BICMs
30 (Clark-Wilson, 2006). This is in contrast to the working practice of other professionals
31 who may be expected to do a mental capacity assessment where the time and
32 resources are often unavailable to build up a complete picture of the person's
33 functioning, build rapport with the client or include the involvement of trusted others
34 involved in their care. This alongside a lack of expertise in ABI often resulted in
35 discrepancies between assessors who meet a client only very briefly and those that
36 know the client best and over very lengthy time periods. The MCA code of practice
37 encourages joint assessments with individuals that best know the client (George and
38 Gilbert, 2018), however these results suggest this is not consistently practiced.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 This structure of assessment is particularly problematic when conducting capacity
4 assessments with those with ABI. The interview setting enables individuals with ABI
5 to mask their disabilities, due to their intact intellect (Acquired Brain Injury and Mental
6 Capacity Act Interest Group [ABIAMCAIG], 2014), intellectual awareness of their
7 disability (Crosson *et al.*, 1989), and intact language abilities (McCrea and Sharma,
8 2008), but also as their difficulties manifest outside of that structured environment
9 (George and Gilbert, 2018). Decisions in reality are a complex and multi-faceted
10 process and often require the integration and weighing up of multiple factors, which
11 the MCA fails to take account of (Brown and Marchant, 2013). Within the assessment,
12 it is the individuals stated intention in that moment that is assessed, rather than their
13 actual functioning (ABIMCAIG, 2014; Dawson and McDonald, 2000). To the untrained
14 eye, a client with intellectual awareness can present with a “cloak of competence”
15 resulting in them appearing more capable during the assessment than they would be
16 in a functional environment (Owen *et al.*, 2018). This further demonstrates the issues
17 with isolated assessments, and the need for the integration of information from those
18 that know and understand the client out of this structured environment (Douglas and
19 Bigby, 2018).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 This problem with assessment is linked with a lack of knowledge and understanding
46 of ABI. One of the key issues highlighted by BICMs as a reason for this discrepancy
47 is the assessors lack of knowledge regarding the impacts of ABI, particularly the
48 hidden effects of executive dysfunction and insight. Langlois *et al.*, (2006) commented
49 that there is a tendency among professionals to overlook these invisible consequences
50 of ABI, thus overlooking the client’s support needs. This lack of knowledge prevents
51 assessors from seeing the nuances of brain injury and the limitations of the MCA for
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 this population. This assumption of capacity and disregard for the hidden disabilities
4 associated with ABI can leave clients in vulnerable positions without the appropriate
5 safeguards in place (George and Gilbert, 2018).
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 The experiences given by BICMs often involved clients making repeated unwise
13 decisions. Although the third principle of the MCA states that an individual should not
14 be deemed to lack capacity based on unwise decision making (DoH, 2005), it is often
15 the very nature of unwise decisions (often repeatedly) that are a prominent concern
16 for individuals with ABI (Lennard, 2016; Owen *et al.*, 2017). The executive dysfunction
17 and lack of insight following injury can impair an individual's ability to learn from
18 previous experiences and mistakes, and to generalise this to guide future behaviour
19 (Wood and Worthington, 2017). This can make the differentiation between unwise
20 decisions made with and without capacity unclear (Hubbeling, 2014).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Participants in this study highlighted many examples of clients being left vulnerable as
36 a result of assumptions of capacity. These examples reflect previous research that
37 demonstrates an increased vulnerability and risk of homelessness (Hwang *et al.*,
38 2008; Oddy *et al.*, 2012; Topolovec-Vranic *et al.*, 2012), incarceration (Mclsaac *et al.*,
39 2016), financial mismanagement (Dreer *et al.*, 2015), suicide (Fisher *et al.*, 2016),
40 abuse (Holloway and Lymbery, 2007; Mantell, 2010), self-neglect (Preston Shoot,
41 2018) and substance use (Weil *et al.*, 2016) following ABI. A recent report by the All
42 Party Parliamentary Group for ABI (APPG-ABI, 2018) highlighted some of these
43 multiple risk factors, along with the need for ongoing community health and social care
44 support following ABI.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Limitations:* The participants in this study consisted of specialist BICMs across the UK.
4
5 In order to provide a wider perspective of mental capacity following ABI and to allow
6
7 comparisons of experiences, the inclusion of other professional bodies may have
8
9 provided a clearer picture of current practices and difficulties. Furthermore, the families
10
11 of clients living with ABI may also have experiences regarding the MCA and
12
13 assessment. Inclusion of this wider sample would have led to a more holistic
14
15 understanding of the experiences of ABI and mental capacity.
16
17
18
19

20
21 *Policy and Practice Implications:* The study supports the findings from previous
22
23 research recommending that health and social care professionals have more in-depth
24
25 training regarding the invisible consequences of ABI and the effect this has on decision
26
27 making (ABIMCAIG, 2014; Flynn 2016; Norman, 2016). The principles of the MCA are
28
29 focused on ensuring that decisions about care are aligned closely with the wishes of
30
31 clients, and the importance of personalised care where it is assumed that service users
32
33 are best placed to understand their individual needs (Dickinson and Glasbery, 2010).
34
35 The difficulties associated with executive dysfunction and lack of insight mean that this
36
37 perspective is sometimes unrealistic, and at points, a dangerous approach to apply in
38
39 some cases of individuals with ABI (Preston-Shoot, 2018; Holloway and Fyson, 2016).
40
41 Further training is required to support professionals in their understanding of these
42
43 factors when assessing capacity.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Where possible, assessments should not be conducted in isolation, rather assessors
52
53 should either know the client, or take the time to know the client and their
54
55 circumstances (Douglas and Bigby, 2018). Information from trusted others, for
56
57 example family members and professionals, that know the client well should be
58
59 incorporated into assessments, with professionals ensuring they do not take
60

1
2
3 information from office-based interviews at face value. It is important for professionals
4 to possess knowledge of the client's pre-injury history and post-history functioning
5 through collaboration with professionals and family members (Flynn, 2016; Norman,
6 2016).
7
8
9
10
11
12

13
14 Finally, changes within the MCA guidance and its application should be considered to
15 take into account the complex needs and hidden effects of ABI to help safeguard
16 individuals affected by ABI. It is important for professionals to move away from
17 performing office-based assessments of capacity, based upon verbal output alone,
18 and instead consider routinely using more functional assessments of capacity that are
19 more likely to detect the invisible disabilities associated with ABI. Resources to support
20 decision-making should either be made more explicit or be adapted for use with ABI.
21 Changes need to be considered to the way in which "unwise decisions" are classified
22 within mental capacity assessments. The current MCA guidance is unclear with regard
23 to the principles of unwise decisions in terms of how to incorporate treating capacity
24 as decision-specific alongside the consideration of repeated unwise decisions
25 associated with poor executive impairment (Mantell, 2010).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Since this research was conducted, the National Institute for Clinical Excellence
45 (NICE) has updated the guidelines for the MCA (NICE, 2018). This new guidance
46 recommends the need for training amongst professionals, assessors and advocates
47 in supporting people who have communication difficulties and specifically refers to the
48 need for training in understanding condition-specific deficits, such as those associated
49 with brain injury. Furthermore, the guidance concluded that with consent,
50 professionals should seek to involve relevant others in the assessment process to
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 create a “complete picture of the person’s capacity”. Specific reference is also made
4
5 to the need to be aware of the difficulties associated with executive dysfunction. It is
6
7 hoped that these guidelines will go some way to improving future practice, yet further
8
9 consultation into updating the code of practice has been noted as important for
10
11 ensuring those with ABI are appropriately supported by the legislation (UK Acquired
12
13 Brain Injury Forum, UKABIF, 2019)
14
15
16
17
18

19 Furthermore, a recent priority setting partnership conducted in association with the
20
21 James Lind Alliance identified 10 priorities for future research in the area of adult social
22
23 work (Department of Health & Social Care [DoHSC, 2018]). Top ten priorities included
24
25 research into; the ways in which adult social care professionals interact with those with
26
27 communication difficulties, how the MCA is embedded into practice, and the need to
28
29 explore partnership working with other health and social care practitioners. All these
30
31 priorities fit with the findings of this research – the need for a better understanding of
32
33 the deficits associated with ABI, an improved understanding of the MCA and how it
34
35 relates to those with ABI, and a need for collaboration in mental capacity assessments
36
37 with other professionals. Although it did not make it into the top ten, the need for
38
39 research into more effective ways of working with people with ABI was ranked 11th
40
41 (DoHSC, 2018).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 In conclusion, this study has highlighted the experiences and issues BICMs face
50
51 regarding the capacity of their clients and the application of the MCA. The MCA is
52
53 currently not appropriately applied to support safeguarding these individuals, resulting
54
55 in them making repeated unrealistic and unwise decisions that can sometimes be
56
57 unintentionally self-harming/self-sabotaging. Training should be offered to non-
58
59
60

1
2
3 specialist assessors working with clients to highlight the hidden effects of ABI.
4
5 Changes need to be made to the assessment processes undertaken under the MCA
6
7 to take into account the complicated and diverse effects of brain injury, particularly
8
9 executive dysfunction and insight, in order that assessments are informed by more
10
11 than verbal output alone.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **Acknowledgements:**

23
24 Special thanks to the British Association of Brain Injury Case Managers (BABICM) for
25
26 supporting this research study and enabling recruitment through their membership.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Acquired Brain Injury and Mental Capacity Act Interest Group. (2014) *Making the Abstract Real: Recommendations for action following the House of Lords Select Committee Post-Legislative Scrutiny Report into the Mental Capacity Act*. Available at: <http://www.biswg.co.uk/blog/acquired-brain-injury-and-mental-capacity-making-abstract-re/> (Accessed 20 August 2018).
- Austin, Z. and Sutton, J. (2014), Qualitative research: getting started. *The Canadian Journal of Hospital Pharmacy*, 67, 436-440.
- Beadle-Brown, J. (2015), Supported decision-making in the United Kingdom: Lessons for future success. *Research and Practice in Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 2, 17-28.
- Bombardier, C. H. Temkin, N. R. Machamer, J. et al. (2003), The Natural History of Drinking and Alcohol-Related Problems After Traumatic Brain Injury. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 84, 185-191.
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006), Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101
- Brown, H. and Marchant, L. (2013), Using the Mental Capacity Act in complex cases. *Tizard Learning Disability Review*, 18, 60-69.
- Case, P. (2016). Dangerous liaisons? Psychiatry and law in the Court of Protection—Expert discourses of ‘insight’(and ‘compliance’). *Medical law review*, 24, 360-378.
- Chan, R. C. K. Shum, D. Touloupoulou, T. et al., (2008), Assessment of executive functions: Review of instruments and identification of critical issues. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*, 23, 201-216.

- 1
2
3 Clark-Wilson, J. (2006), "What is brain injury case management?" in Parker, J (Ed).
4
5 *Good Practice in Brain Injury Case Management*. Jessica Kinsley Publishers:
6
7 London:
8
9
- 10 Clark-Wilson, J. and Holloway, M. (2015), Life care planning and long-term care for
11
12 individuals with brain injury in the UK. *Neurorehabilitation*, 36, 289-300.
13
- 14 Creswell, J.W. Plano, C.V.L. Gutmann, M.L et al., (2003), "Advanced mixed methods
15
16 research designs". In Tashakkori, A, & Teddlie, C (Eds.), *Handbook of Mixed*
17
18 *Methods in Social and Behavioural Research*. Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA
19
- 20 Crosson, B. Barco, P.P. Velozo, C.A. et al. (1989), Awareness and compensation in
21
22 post-acute head injury rehabilitation. *Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation*,
23
24 4, 46-54.
25
26
- 27 Dawson, C and McDonald, A. (2000), Assessing mental capacity: a checklist for
28
29 Social workers. *Practice*, 12, 5-20.
30
31
- 32 Department of Health. (2005), *Mental Capacity Act*. London: HMSO. Available at:
33
34 <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2005/9/contents>. (Accessed: 25 April
35
36 2018).
37
38
- 39 Department of Health and Social Care (2018). *Priorities for adult social work research*.
40
41 *Results from the James Lind Alliance Priority setting partnership for adult social*
42
43 *care*. Available at: [http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/adult-](http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/adult-social-work/downloads/Adult-Social-Work-PSP-final-report.pdf)
44
45 [social-work/downloads/Adult-Social-Work-PSP-final-report.pdf](http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/adult-social-work/downloads/Adult-Social-Work-PSP-final-report.pdf) (Accessed 22
46
47
48 December 2018).
49
- 50 Dickinson, H. and Glasbery, J. (2010), *The Personalisation Agenda: Implications for*
51
52 *the Third Sector*. Third Sector Research Centre: Birmingham, UK.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Dreer, L.E. DeVivo, M.J. Novack, T.A. et al. (2012), Financial Capacity Following
4 Traumatic Brain Injury: A Six-Month Longitudinal Study. *Rehabilitation*
5
6 *Psychology*, 57(1), 5-12.
7
8

9
10 Douglas, J.M. and Bigby, C. (2018), Development of an evidence-based practice
11 framework to guide decision making support for people with cognitive
12 impairment due to acquired brain injury or intellectual disability. *Disability and*
13
14 *Rehabilitation*, DOI: 10.1080/09638288.2018.1498546
15
16
17

18
19 Felmingham, K.L, Baguley, I.J, and Green, A.M. (2004), Effects of diffuse axonal
20 injury on speed of information processing following severe traumatic brain
21 injury. *Neuropsychology*, 18, 564-571.
22
23
24

25
26 Fisher, L.B. Pedrelli, P. Iverson, G.L. et al. (2016), Behaviour following traumatic
27 brain injury: Longitudinal follow-up data from the NIDRR Traumatic Brain
28 Injury Model Systems. *Brain Injury*, 30, 1311-1218.
29
30
31

32
33 Fleminger, S. and Ponsford, J. (2005), Long term outcome after traumatic brain injury.
34 *British Medical Journal*, 331, 1419-1420.
35
36

37
38 Flynn, M. (2016) *The death of 'Tom': A Serious Case Review*. Somerset
39 Safeguarding Adults Board. Available at:
40
41 <https://www.headway.org.uk/media/4752/tom-sar-final-june-2016.pdf>.
42
43
44 (Accessed 10 January 2018).
45
46

47 George, M. and Gilbert, S. (2018), Mental Capacity Act (2005) Assessments: Why
48 everyone needs to know about the frontal lobe paradox. *The*
49
50 *Neuropsychologist*, 5, 59-66.
51
52

53
54 Gioia, G. Isquith, P. and Kenealy, L. (2008), Assessment of Behavioral Aspects of
55
56
57 Executive Function. *In*: Anderson, V. Jacobs, R. and Anderson, P. (eds.)
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Executive functions and the frontal lobes: a lifespan perspective. Psychology:

Hove.

Hanson, W.E. Creswell, J.W. Clark, V.L. et al. (2005). Mixed methods research designs in counselling psychology. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 52, 224-235.

Hardie, E. and Brooks, L. (2009), *Brief guide to the Mental Capacity Act 2005: Implications for people with Learning Disabilities*. British Institute of Learning Disabilities: Worcestershire, UK.

Headway. (2018). Statistics. Headway: the brain injury association. Available at: <https://www.headway.org.uk/about-brain-injury/further-information/statistics/> (Accessed 25 April 2018).

Higham, P. and Phelps, K. (1998), *Careers of Care: Survivors of Traumatic Brain Injury and the Response of Health and Social Care*. Ashgate Publishing Ltd: Farnham, UK

Holloway, M. (2014), How is ABI assessed and responded to in non-specialist settings? Is specialist education required for all social care professionals? *Social Care and Neurodisability*, 5, 201-213.

Holloway, M and Fyson, R (2016), Acquired Brain Injury, Social Work and the Challenges of Personalisation. *British Journal of Social Work*, 46(5),1301-1317.

Holloway, M. and Lymbery, M. (2007). Caring for people: social work with adults in the next decade and beyond. *The British Journal of Social Work*, 37, 375-386.

Homaifar, B.Y, Brenner L, Forster, J.E. et al. (2012), Traumatic Brain Injury, Executive Functioning, and Suicidal Behaviour: A Brief Report. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 57(4), 337-341

- 1
2
3 House of Lords Select Committee on the Mental Capacity Act 2005. (2014), *Mental*
4
5 *Capacity Act 2005: post-legislative scrutiny*. House of Lords: London, UK.
6
7
8 Hsieh, H.F. and Shannon, S.E. (2005), Three approaches to qualitative content
9
10 analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288.
11
12
13 Hubbeling, D. (2014), Decision-making capacity should not be decisive in emergencies.
14
15 *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy*, 17, 229-238.
16
17
18 Hwang, S.W. Colantonio, A, Chiu, S. et al. (2008), The effect of traumatic brain injury
19
20 on the health of homeless people. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 179,
21
22 779-784.
23
24
25 Khan, F. Baguley, I.J. and Cameron, D. (2003), Rehabilitation after traumatic brain
26
27 injury. *MJA Practice Essentials*, 178, 290-295.
28
29
30 Lennard, C. (2016), Fluctuating capacity and impulsiveness in acquired brain injury:
31
32 the dilemma of unwise decisions under the Mental Capacity Act. *Journal of*
33
34 *Adult Protection*, 18, 229-239.
35
36
37 Manchester, D. Priestley, N. and Jackson, H. (2004), The assessment of executive
38
39 functions: coming out of the office. *Brain Injury*, 18, 1067-1081.
40
41
42 Mantell, A. (2010). Traumatic brain injury and potential safeguarding concerns.
43
44 *Journal of Adult Protection*, 12, 31-42.
45
46
47 Marshall, H. and Sprung, S. (2017), The Mental Capacity Act: 'Best interests' – a
48
49 review of the literature. *British Journal of Community Nursing*, 22(8), 384-390.
50
51
52 Mathias, J. L. and Mansfield, K. M. (2005). Prospective and declarative memory
53
54 problems following moderate and severe traumatic brain injury. *Brain Injury*,
55
56 19, 271-282.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 McCrea, J. and Sharma, R. (2008), "Training staff to work with clients with executive
4 disorder". In Oddy, M. and Worthington, A. (Eds.), *The Rehabilitation of*
5
6 *Executive Disorders: A Guide to Theory and Practice*. Oxford University
7
8 Press: Oxford.
9
10
11
12 Mclsaac, K.E. Moser, A. Moineddin, R. et al. (2016), Association between traumatic
13 brain injury and incarceration: A population-based cohort study. *CMAJ Open*,
14
15 4, 746-753.
16
17
18
19 Miles, M. B. and Huberman, A. M. (1994), *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded*
20
21 *Sourcebook*. Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA.
22
23
24 National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE). (2018). Decision-making and mental
25 capacity. NICE guideline [NG108]. Available at:
26
27 [https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng108/chapter/Recommendations-for-](https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng108/chapter/Recommendations-for-research#1-training-and-support-for-practitioners)
28
29 [research#1-training-and-support-for-practitioners](https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng108/chapter/Recommendations-for-research#1-training-and-support-for-practitioners). (Accessed 22 December
30
31 2018).
32
33
34
35 Norman A. (2016), A preventable death? A family's perspective on an adult
36 safeguarding review regarding an adult with traumatic brain injury. *Journal*
37
38 *of Adult Protection*, 18(6), 341-352
39
40
41
42
43 Oddy, M. Moir, J. Fortescue, D. et al. (2012), The prevalence of traumatic brain injury
44 in the homeless community in a UK city. *Brain Injury*, 26, 1058-1064.
45
46
47 Owen, G. ., Freyenhagen, F., & Martin, W. (2018) Assessing Decision-Making
48 Capacity After Brain Injury: A Phenomenological Approach. *Philosophy,*
49
50 *Psychiatry, & Psychology*, 25(1), 1-19.
51
52
53
54 Owen, G.S. Freyenhagen, F. Martin, W. et al. (2017), Clinical assessment of
55 decision-making capacity in acquired brain injury with personality disorder.
56
57 *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation*, 27(1), 133-48.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Ownsworth, T. Clare, L. and Morris, R. (2006), An integrated biopsychosocial
4 approach to understanding awareness deficits in Alzheimer's disease and
5 brain injury. *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation*, 16, 415-438.
6
7
8
9
10 Parry-Jones, B.L. Vaughan, F.L. and Cox, W.M. (2004), Traumatic brain injury and
11 substance misuse: A systematic review of prevalence and outcomes research
12 (1994-2004). *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation*, 16(5), 537-560.
13
14
15
16
17
18 Parsons, T.D. Carlew, A.R. Magtoto, J. et al. (2017), The potential of function-led
19 virtual environments for ecologically valid measures of executive function in
20 experimental and clinical neuropsychology. *Neuropsychological*
21 *Rehabilitation*, 27, 777-807.
22
23
24
25
26
27 Patton, M.Q. (2002), *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. Sage: Thousand
28 Oaks, CA.
29
30
31
32 Preston-Shoot, M. (2018), Learning from safeguarding adult reviews on self-neglect:
33 addressing the challenge of change. *Journal of Adult Protection*, 20, 78-92.
34
35
36
37
38
39 Prigitano, G.P. (2005), Disturbances of Self-awareness and Rehabilitation of
40 Patients with Traumatic Brain Injury: A 20-Year Perspective. *Journal of Head*
41 *Trauma Rehabilitation*, 20, 19-29.
42
43
44
45
46 Rabinowitz, A.R. and Levin, H.S. (2014), Cognitive sequelae of traumatic brain
47 injury. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 37, 1-11.
48
49
50 Ravalier, J. M. (2018), Psycho-social working conditions and stress in UK social
51 workers. *British Journal of Social Work*, bcy023,
52
53
54
55 <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcy023>.
56
57
58
59
60


- 1
2
3 Rohling, M. L., Faust, M. E., Beverly, B., & Demakis, G. (2009). Effectiveness of
4
5 cognitive rehabilitation following acquired brain injury: A meta-analytic re-
6
7 Neuropsychology, 23, 20-39.
8
9
- 10 Ruck Keene, A., Kane, N. B., Kim, S. Y. & Owen, G. S. (2019). Taking capacity
11
12 seriously? Ten years of mental capacity disputes before England's Court of
13
14 Protection. *International journal of law and psychiatry*, 62, 56-76.
15
16
17
- 18 Rutland-Brown, W. Langlois, J.A. Thomas, K.E. et al. (2006), Incidence of traumatic
19
20 brain injury in the United States, 2003. *Journal of Head Trauma*
21
22 *Rehabilitation*, 21, 544-548.
23
24
- 25 Simpson, G. and Tate, R. (2002), Suicidality after traumatic brain injury:
26
27 demographic, injury and clinical correlates. *Psychological Medicine*, 32, 687-
28
29 697.
30
31
- 32 Tesch, R. (1990), *Qualitative Research: Analysis Types and Software Tools*. Falmer:
33
34 Bristol, UK.
35
36
- 37 Thornton, T. (2011), Capacity, Mental Mechanisms, and Unwise Decisions.
38
39 *Philosophy, Psychiatry, & Psychology*, 18(2), 127-132
40
41
- 42 Topolovec-Vradnic, J. Ennis, N. Colantonio, A. et al. (2012), Traumatic brain injury
43
44 among people who are homeless: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health*, 12,
45
46 1059.
47
48
- 49 UKABIF (2019). Letter: Mental Capacity Act Code of Practice: Call for evidence.
50
51 Retrieved 08/05/19: [https://www.ukabif.org.uk/wp-](https://www.ukabif.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Acquired-Brain-Injury-Collaboration-MCA-CoP-Submission-6-March-2019.pdf)
52
53 [content/uploads/2019/03/Acquired-Brain-Injury-Collaboration-MCA-CoP-](https://www.ukabif.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Acquired-Brain-Injury-Collaboration-MCA-CoP-Submission-6-March-2019.pdf)
54
55 [Submission-6-March-2019.pdf](https://www.ukabif.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Acquired-Brain-Injury-Collaboration-MCA-CoP-Submission-6-March-2019.pdf)
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Weil, Z.M. Corrigan, J.D, and Karelina, K. (2016), Alcohol abuse after traumatic brain
4 injury: Experimental and clinical evidence. *Neuroscience and Behavioural*
5 *Reviews*, 62, 89-99
6
7
8
9

10 Williams, V. Boyle, G. Jepson, M. et al. (2012), *Making Best Interest Decisions:*
11 *People and Processes Policy Research Programme*. Department of Health:
12 London, UK.
13
14
15
16

17 Wood, R.L. and Worthington, A. (2017). Neurobehavioral abnormalities associated
18 with executive dysfunction after traumatic brain injury. *Frontiers in Behavioural*
19 *Neuroscience*, 11, 195.
20
21
22
23
24

25 Yates, P.J. Williams, W.H. Harris, A. et al. (2006), An epidemiological study of head
26 injuries in a UK population attending an emergency department. *Journal of*
27 *Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*, 77, 699-701.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Number of clients managed in the last five years

268x197mm (150 x 150 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Thematic Map

270x170mm (150 x 150 DPI)