LOSS-RELATED VARIABLES AS RISK FACTORS FOR COMPLICATED GRIEF: A PERSON-CENTERED APPROACH

Selva Ülbe*, Özge Yüksel**, Samet Baş*, Duygu Güngör*
*Dokuz Eylul University (Turkey)
**Izmir University of Economics (Turkey)

BACKGROUND

Although the death of a loved one has traumatic effects on the course of life, many bereaved people can succeed to adapt their changing lives after the natural process of mourning. However, sometimes some bereaved people might continue to experience considerable mourning and suffer from “complicated grief” even after the long period of time[1] When the destructive impact of complicated grief on human functionality and psychological well-being is considered, it becomes crucial to figure out the underlying mechanisms explaining why some people are more prone to experience complicated grief. In the light of literature, the loss-related factors including age of the deceased, cause of death, time since loss, and subjective closeness with deceased could be risk factors for the development of complicated grief.

METHOD

N = 384
(Female= 293;
Male=91
Age = 30.40(SD=11.85)

People with loss of a significant person within five years.

Measures

- 1.Demographic Information Form
2. Traumatic Grief Inventory-Self Report Version (TGI)[2]
3. Impact of Event Scale-Revised (IES)[3]
4. Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scale (DASS)[4]

What are the implications of the study?

DISCUSSION

- All subgroups differed in almost all lost-related variables (i.e., the age of deceased, the quality of relationship, subjective closeness, and frequency of contact) except time since loss, and in the level of depression, anxiety, stress, and the impact of event.
- The person-centered analysis of responses to the loss experience is thought to offer deep insight into the distinguishing features of the subgroups of bereaved people.
- The findings provided crucial information about the risk factors in terms of loss-related variables.

What was the aim of the study?

The main aim of the present study is to identify subgroups among the bereaved people via person-centered approach and to compare these groups according to the loss-related variables and psychological outcomes

RESULTS

Using 18 items of TGI, three latent classes were found according to BIC (Bayesian Information Criteria). BIC from 1-class to 9-class respectively. (8878.5585,7335.1306, 6986.8065, 7009.2256, 7048.8293, 7112.9870, 7173.7887, 7245.7287, 7342.5067)

Figure 1.Estimated symptom probabilities for the three-class solution

How do the sub-groups differ from each other?

Table 1. Difference between subgroups according to loss-related and psychological variables						
Variables	Mean (SD)			P-value	F	Post-hoc
	RG (1) (N=172)	TGG(2) (N=120)	NTGG(3) (N=92)			
Quality of relationship	5.72 (1.53)	6.53(.99)	5.24(1.63)	.00	23.16	3<1<2
Subjective closeness	5.73(1.51)	6.56(.84)	5.05(1.77)	.00	30.59	3<1<2
Frequency of contact	5.26 (1.52)	6.35(1.20)	4.72(1.71)	.00	35.82	3<1<2
Age of the deceased	59.08(22.50)	53.96(21.91)	66.60(19.24)	.00	8.83	1=2<3
Time since loss	25.66(17.50)	30.58(20.07)	30.22(18.44)	.05	3.08	1=2=3
Depression	13.80(5.31)	18.16(5.59)	10.54(3.92)	.00	59.83	3<1<2
Anxiety	11.87(4.49)	15.98(5.39)	9.84(3.87)	.00	49.72	3<1<2
Stress	14.59(5.05)	18.15(4.99)	11.71(4.34)	.00	46.62	3<1<2
Impact of Events	48.82(13.44)	67.43(14.87)	32.45(9.13)	.00	190.76	3<1<2
Intrusion	18.93 (6.14)	27.27(6.57)	11.39(3.61)	.00	198.79	3<1<2
Avoidance	19.09(6.08)	22.98(6.17)	13.43(5.26)	.00	67.67	3<1<2
Hyperarousal	10.80(4.67)	17.19(5.82)	7.62(2.81)	.00	117.79	3<1<2

Note. RG(1)=Resilient Group, TGG(2)= Traumatic Grief Group, NTGG(3)=Non-Traumatic Grief

References
[1]Prigerson, H. G., Vanderwerker, L. C., & Maciejewski, P. K. (2008). A case for inclusion of prolonged grief disorder in DSM-V.
[2] Boelen, P. A., Djelantik, A. M. J., de Keijser, J., Lenferink, L. I., & Smid, G. E. (2018). Further validation of the Traumatic Grief Inventory-Self Report (TGI-SR): A measure of persistent complex bereavement disorder and prolonged grief disorder. *Death studies*, 43(6), 351-364.
[3] Weiss D, Marmar C (1997) The impact of Event Scale - Revised.Wilson J, Keane T, editors. Assessing psychological trauma and PTSD. New York: Guilford.
[4]Henry, J. D., & Crawford, J. R. (2005). The short-form version of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS-21): Construct validity and normative data in a large non-clinical sample. *British journal of clinical psychology*, 44(2), 227-239.