

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

# **Coping in the chair: A validation study of the Monitoring Blunting Dental Scale**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Psychology

at Massey University, Wellington

New Zealand.

Matthew Neil Williams

2010

## Abstract

The monitoring-blunting theory of coping in threatening situations (Miller, 1981, 1987) suggests that when faced with a threatening situation, individuals can respond either by attending to threatening information (“monitoring”) or by avoiding threatening information (“blunting”). A valid and reliable measure of children’s preferred coping styles in dental situations may assist dental staff in providing efficacious anxiety-reducing interventions to diverse groups of children. The current study sought to validate a scale of children’s preference for monitoring or blunting in dental situations (the Monitoring Blunting Dental Scale or MBDS). The psychometric characteristics of the scale were assessed in a group of 240 eleven to thirteen year old New Zealand children. Internal consistency reliability was adequate for both the monitoring ( $\alpha = .743$ ) and blunting ( $\alpha = .762$ ) subscales. Convergent validity was indicated by strong correlations ( $> .6$ ) between the MBDS monitoring and blunting subscales and those of an adapted version of the Child Behavioural Style Scale (CBSS-M). Discriminant validity with respect to dental anxiety was strong for the monitoring subscale,  $r = .079$ ,  $p = .221$ , but not the blunting subscale,  $r = .478$ ,  $p < .001$ . Confirmatory factor analysis of the MBDS indicated adequate fit for a two factor monitoring-blunting model (RMSEA = .079), but unacceptable fit for a one factor model (RMSEA = .095). A similar finding was observed when confirmatory factor analysis of the CBSS-M was conducted. These confirmatory factor analyses suggested that the monitoring and blunting theoretical constructs cannot be justifiably regarded as representing poles of a single underlying dimension, but are better regarded as distinct, related constructs. A content analysis of children’s comments about the coping strategies they might adopt in several dental scenarios indicated that these strategies were largely classifiable within monitoring-blunting theory, with blunting-type strategies much more commonly mentioned. Given further validity evidence, the MBDS could be a useful measure when attempting to tailor anxiety-reducing interventions in dental settings to children with diverse coping preferences.

## **Acknowledgements**

I would firstly like to thank my supervisor Linda Jones for her support, guidance and pragmatic advice. My thanks also to John Spicer, whose assistance with statistical issues was invaluable.

The support provided to me by Massey University in the form of a Masterate scholarship was very much appreciated, as was a grant to travel to the New Zealand Postgraduate Conference to present preliminary results of my study.

The friendliness and patience of the staff and students at the participating school made the data collection period a pleasure; without them, this project could not have happened. The generosity of Colgate-Palmolive in providing toothbrushes and pastes for study participants was also greatly appreciated.

My girlfriend Jessica has been a steady source of gentle encouragement and patience throughout this intense year. Thanks also to my brother Martin and sister Amy for being there to help when needed.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents, Anneke and David Williams. Your support and constant belief in me mean the world.

Approval was obtained for this study from the Massey Human Ethics Committee (MUHEC Southern A 09/37).

## Table of Contents

List of Tables and Figures.....	v
Abbreviations .....	vii
Introduction .....	1
Dental Anxiety: Definition.....	1
Prevalence of Dental Anxiety.....	3
Correlates of Dental Anxiety.....	6
Aetiology and Age of Onset.....	9
Coping Styles and Dental Anxiety .....	12
The Measurement of Coping: Scales Measuring Monitoring and Blunting. ....	17
The Study Scale: The Monitoring Blunting Dental Scale .....	24
Aim and Objectives of the Current Study .....	25
Method .....	28
Participants .....	28
Measures.....	31
Procedure.....	37
Data Analysis .....	39
Results.....	48
Single-Scale Analyses for the MBDS .....	48
Single-Scale Analyses for the CBSS-M.....	72
Single-Scale Analyses for the SFPS.....	77
Multi-Scale Analyses: Convergent and Discriminant Validity of the MBDS .....	80
Ancillary Qualitative Analysis: Content Analysis .....	83
Discussion .....	88
Findings With Relation to Study Objectives .....	88
Factorial Validity of the MBDS .....	91
Invariance of the MBDS Across Level of Dental Anxiety .....	94
Reliability of the MBDS.....	95
Possibilities for Revision of MBDS Items .....	97
Interpretation of Individual MBDS Scores .....	99

Factorial Validity and Reliability of the CBSS-M .....	100
Factorial Validity and Reliability of the SFPS .....	102
Convergent and Discriminant Validity of the MBDS .....	103
The Broader Range of Coping: Conclusions from Content Analysis .....	107
General Limitations of the Study and Directions for Future Research .....	109
Conclusions and Implications .....	112
References .....	115
Appendix 1: Participant Information and Consent Documents .....	131
Appendix 2: Study Questionnaire .....	135
Appendix 3: CBSS-M and MBDS Sample Correlation Matrices .....	141
Appendix 4: Abstract for Poster Presented at the New Zealand Postgraduate Conference, Wellington, 20–21 November 2009 .....	143

### **List of Tables and Figures**

#### ***Tables***

Table 1 <i>Demographic information for study sample</i> .....	29
Table 2 <i>MBDS items and sub-categories</i> .....	33
Table 3 <i>Descriptive statistics for MBDS subscale scores</i> .....	49
Table 4 <i>MBDS pattern matrix displaying factor loadings for 2 factor EFA model</i> .....	52
Table 5 <i>Goodness of fit indices used for evaluating confirmatory analytic models</i> .....	54
Table 6 <i>Goodness of fit of competing MBDS factor models</i> .....	59
Table 7 <i>Parameter estimates for MBDS 2 factor model</i> .....	60
Table 8 <i>MBDS 2 factor model: Goodness of fit in lower and higher dental anxiety sub- samples</i> .....	62
Table 9 <i>Correlated error terms freed in model respecifications: item pairs</i> .....	64
Table 10 <i>Model fit for respecified model across dental anxiety groupings</i> .....	65
Table 11 <i>Estimated parameters for respecified MBDS 2 factor model across dental anxiety groups</i> .....	66
Table 12 <i>Raykov's composite reliability coefficients for MBDS 2 factor models</i> .....	68
Table 13 <i>MBDS items identified with poor psychometric properties</i> .....	69

Table 14 <i>Suggested interpretation scheme for MBDS monitoring and blunting average scores</i> .....	71
Table 15 <i>Classification of sample into scoring categories across monitoring and blunting scores</i> .....	71
Table 16 <i>Descriptive statistics for CBSS-M subscales</i> .....	72
Table 17 <i>CBSS-M: model fit for comparative confirmatory factor analyses</i> .....	74
Table 18 <i>CBSS-M 2 factor model: parameter estimates</i> .....	75
Table 19 <i>Reliability values for CBSS-M Monitoring and Blunting subscales</i> .....	76
Table 20 <i>Descriptive statistics for SFPS items and summated scale</i> .....	77
Table 21 <i>Intercorrelations between SFPS items</i> .....	78
Table 22 <i>Goodness of fit for the SFPS one factor model</i> .....	79
Table 23 <i>Parameter estimates for SFPS one factor model</i> .....	79
Table 24 <i>Convergent and discriminant validity coefficients</i> .....	81
Table 25 <i>Primary coding categories utilised for content analysis of children’s coping behaviours</i> .....	84
Table 26 <i>Frequency of responses falling into each coding category</i> .....	85
Table 27 <i>CBSS-M item intercorrelations (standard deviations on main diagonal)</i> .....	141
Table 28 <i>MBDS item intercorrelations (standard deviations on main diagonal)</i> .....	142

**Figures**

<i>Figure 1. Response scale for the SFPS.</i> .....	35
<i>Figure 2. Path diagrams for MBDS 1 factor model (left) and 2 factor model (right).</i> .....	57
<i>Figure 3. Path diagram for MBDS 4 factor model.</i> .....	58
<i>Figure 4. Path diagram for SFPS 1 factor model.</i> .....	78

## Abbreviations

ADF	Asymptotically Distribution-free Estimator; a model estimation method (and discrepancy function) for estimating structural equation models.
AMOS	A computer program used to evaluate structural equation models; short for Analysis of Moment Structures (Arbuckle, 2008).
CBSS	Child Behavioural Style Scale (Miller, Roussi, Caputo, & Kruus, 1995). An adapted version of the CBSS was used in the current study (CBSS-M).
CBSS-M	Child Behavioural Style Scale – Medical situations (an adaptation of the CBSS for the current study).
CFA	Confirmatory Factor Analysis.
CFI	Comparative Fit Index, a measure of the goodness of fit of a given SEM model in comparison to a null model for the same dataset (usually an independence model, with zero population correlations between variables).
CFSS-DS	Children’s Fear Survey Schedule – Dental Subscale (Cuthbert & Melamed, 1982).
DAS	Dental Anxiety Scale (Corah, 1969).
DMFS	Decayed/Missing/Filled Surfaces (a “global” measure of oral health; the sum of a subject’s decayed, missing and filled tooth surfaces).
DMFT	Decayed/Missing/Filled Teeth, a simpler and more commonly reported global oral health index; applies to whole tooth counts rather than tooth surfaces.
EFA	Exploratory Factor Analysis.
IRT	Item Response Theory, a paradigm for the design and analysis of psychometric tests.
KMO	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy, a measure of the appropriateness of a correlation matrix for factor analysis.

MAR	Missing At Random, an assumption with regard to the process underlying the missing data in a dataset; missingness on a variable is assumed to be unrelated to the level of that variable after controlling for all other variables in the analysis (Allison, 2001).
MBSC	Monitoring and Blunting Scale for Children (Kliewer, 1991; Lepore & Kliewer, 1989).
MBSS	Miller Behavioural Style Scale (Miller, 1987), a general measure of monitoring and blunting coping preferences.
MCAR	Missing Completely At Random, a missing data assumption: probability of missingness is assumed to be unrelated to any study variable.
MCDAS	Modified Child Dental Anxiety Scale (Wong, Humphris, & G. T. Lee, 1998).
MCI	Mainz Coping Inventory (Krohne et al., 2000).
MLE	MLE: Maximum Likelihood Estimation (used here with reference to the maximum likelihood estimator/discrepancy function for CFA/SEM models).
PCLOSE	The p value for the RMSEA test of close fit for a structural equation model (Browne & Cudeck, 1993).
RMSEA	Root Mean Square Error of Approximation, a measure of the goodness of fit of a structural equation model.
SEM	Structural Equation Modelling. CFA models are a subtype of SEM model.
SFPS	Smiley Faces Paper Scale, the dental anxiety measure utilised in the current study; adapted from the computerised Smiley Faces Program (Buchanan, 2005).
SRMR	Standardised Root Mean square Residual, a measure of the goodness of fit of an SEM model.
TMSI	Threatening Medical Situations Inventory, a scale measuring monitoring and blunting preferences in medical situations (van Zuuren, de Groot, Mulder, & Peter, 1996).