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.

ILLNESS COGNITIONS AND HEALTH BEHAVIOURS IN ADULT ASTHMATICS

121

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Psychology at Massey University

RICHARD JOHN LAIRD

B.Sc., Dip.Soc.Sc., Dip.Sc., M.Phil.

ABSTRACT

A study in the area of health psychology, focusing on illness cognitions and health behaviours and employing a cognitive approach, was conducted. The aim of the study was to test two theoretical models of the determinants and consequences of perceived seriousness of illness using adult asthmatics and, supplementary to this, to generate some information of practical value in self-managing this illness. It was hypothesized that perceived prevalence, perceived treatability, and asthma history (duration, average intensity over entire history, average intensity over the last six months, and frequency of attacks) would correlate with perceived seriousness (self-rated seriousness and number and frequency of symptoms), and that these relationships would be moderated by repressive defence style. It was further hypothesized that seriousness would influence asthma health behaviour (competencies and adherence), and that response and personal efficacies would moderate these relationships. These hypotheses were tested using data from two mail surveys of members of New Zealand regional Asthma Societies, conducted six months apart (N=412 and 389 respectively).

The results revealed limited support for the model examining determinants. Only average intensity over entire history, average intensity over the last six months, and frequency of attacks were positively related to self-rated seriousness, whilst average intensity over entire history was positively related to number and frequency of symptoms. There was no evidence that repressive defence style moderated any of the seriousness relationships. However, repressive defence style related to number and frequency of symptoms, but not to self-rated seriousness. The findings provide some support for the notion that rational information processing dominates the seriousness relationships in persons with chronic asthma. The desensitizing influence of asthmatics' experiences with, and knowledge of, asthma was offered as an explanation

for the null relationships between duration and seriousness, prevalence and seriousness, and treatability and seriousness.

The findings also revealed limited support for the consequences model. Only one seriousness-health behaviour relationship emerged, such that number of symptoms positively related to health competencies. This finding is consistent with a number of studies reporting that the experience of symptoms motivates health behaviour. The competing influences of seriousness as a motivator of health behaviour versus the tendency for seriousness to be negatively related to adherence to complex regimens was offered as a possible explanation for the null relationship between seriousness and adherence. Self-efficacy was not a moderator of the seriousness-health behaviour relationships. It was concluded that methodological inadequacies may have contributed to this result. Despite the general lack of support for the models, the study led to some interesting discussion on a range of largely theoretical issues. For example, it was concluded that an assertion made early in the study that seriousness is a salient illness cognition may not be justified.

Additionally, the study findings have three potential applications in the area of asthma self-management. First, the percentage of asthmatics using each of the health competencies provides information of use to asthma educators and clinicians in targeting asthmatics weak in particular areas of self-management. Second, variations identified in the adherence practices and use of health competencies by age, gender, educational level, and number of symptoms should also be useful to asthma professionals, for the same reason. Third, of all the study variables, response efficacy was identified as being most important in determining asthma health behaviour. It is suggested that developers of asthma self-management programmes should incorporate this variable in programmes aimed at promoting health behaviours.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my father

James Gordon Laird

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my wife, Joyce, for her unconditional support and encouragement throughout this project. She was instrumental in my efforts to complete this degree. It will be my task to provide her with the same level of support and encouragement for the remainder of her PhD, and beyond.

Most sincere thanks go to my supervisors, Kerry Chamberlain and John Spicer, for their very certain abilities to teach research skills. Their dedication to encouraging mastery of these skills and to carrying out quality research provided a true education. My sincere thanks to you Kerry and John.

A number of other people contributed directly to the project. These included Dr. William Morris (Physician-in-charge, Student Health Centre, Massey University), Bob Lambourne (Computer consultant), Glenys Wallbutton (Dataprep operator), Joan Judd and colleagues (Departmental secretaries), and Dr. Ross Flett (Temporary second supervisor). Also, I am indebted to Brenda Wilson, Executive Director, The Asthma Foundation of New Zealand for her assistance in obtaining a suitable sample. Thanks also go to Kate Hyde-Smith of the Auckland Asthma Society and Sandra Yates of the Canterbury Asthma Society. Also, thanks to the 412 persons who participated in the study.

Finally, there are those who provided support in other ways. I would like to thank Dr. Bill Zika for his help during my years at Massey University. Thanks also go to Dr. Sidney Pugmire, Dr. Maureen Bell, Professor Mason Durie, Dr. Roy Simons, Dr. Yogesh Rathod, Dr Stuart Roberts and, in particular, Dr. John Elliott. In addition, the friendship and guidance of a number of staff members in the Department of

Psychology was appreciated. These included Dr. John Podd, Dr. Robert Gregory, Dr. Alan Winton and, in particular, Mrs Shannon Roache. Thanks to all these people.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for their support. I would like to thank my brother, Trevor, and sister-in-law, Julie, and Steven and Frazer. Also thanks to my brothers-in-law, Terry and Mel, and also Stephanie. Thanks go to my friends Trish and Trevor, Marilyn and Podge, Heather and Ross, Leanne and John, and Yvonne and Mike. To the numerous words of encouragement I received from other friends, thanks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

			Pa	age
Abstract				ii
Dedication	on		. j	iv
Acknowle	edgeme	ents		v
Table of	Conter	nts	. v	'ii
List of T	ables		. 2	хi
СНАРТІ	ER I	INTRODUCTION		1
1.1	Cogni	itive approaches in health psychology		1
1.1.1		ived seriousness		2
1.1.2		minants of seriousness		6
1.1.2	(i)			8
	()	Treatment information		11
	′		-	12
	(iii)	Personal experience	-	
1 1 2	` '	Denial	•	14
1.1.3		nary	-	18
1.1.4		equences of seriousness	-	19
	(i)	Definition of health behaviour		19
		Seriousness and health behaviour		20
		Self-efficacy and health behaviour		24
1.1.5		nary		29
1.2	Adult	asthma		29
1.2.1	Descr	iption		29
	(i)	Definitions		29
	(ii)	Symptomatology		31
	(iii)	Health behaviour	. :	32
1.2.2	Ration	nale for selecting asthma		35
	(i)	Reasons for selection		35
	(ii)	Contribution to asthma health behaviour research		36
1.2.3	` '	na research		37
	(i)	Demographic characteristics		37
	(ii)	Denial	-	38
	(iii)	Symptoms		40
	(iv)	Cognitions		41
	(v)	Summary		44
1.3	` '	resent study	-	45

(viii)

СНАРТ	TER II METHOD 5
2.1	Design
2.2	Sample
2.3	Demographic information
2.4	Procedure
2.5	Questionnaires
2.5	(i) Seriousness
	(,,,
	(,
	(-,
	(v) Self-efficacy
	(vi) Repressive defence style
	(vii) Miscellaneous
2.6	Statistical analysis
2.7	Ethics
СНАРТ	TER III RESULTS 6
3.1	Determinants of seriousness
3.1.1	Main analyses
3.1.1	(i) Univariate considerations
	(ii) Cross-sectional bivariate relationships
	(iii) Cross-sectional multivariate relationships
3.1.2	•
3.1.2	The symptom record to the system of the syst
3.2.1	
	(-)
	(ii) Cross-sectional bivariate relationships
2 2 2	(iii) Cross-sectional multivariate relationships
3.2.2	The symptom factors
3.2.3	The health competency factors
3.3	Seriousness as a mediator

CHAPTER IV	DISCUSSION	92
4.1 The	determinants of seriousness	92
(i)		93
(ii)		93
(iii)		96
(iv)	A	98
(v)		100
(vi)		101
(vii)		103
	consequences of seriousness	107
(i)		108
(ii)		111
(iii)	e	114
(iv) 4.3 Serio		115 116
	usness: A salient illness cognition?	110
	ications: Adult asthma self-management	117
(ii)		117
()	e directions	120
REFERENCES	S	123
APPENDIX A	Consent Form/Information Sheet - Auckland	142
APPENDIX B	Consent Form/Information Sheet - Christchurch	144
APPENDIX C	Accompanying letter - Questionnaire One	145
APPENDIX D	Questionnaire One	146
APPENDIX E	Accompanying letter - Questionnaire Two	161
APPENDIX F	Questionnaire Two	162
APPENDIX G	Multiple regression analyses for subcomponents of the determinants model	175

APPENDIX H	Multiple regression analyses for subcomponents of the consequences model	180
APPENDIX I	Percentage of asthmatics who use specific health competencies	184
APPENDIX J	Laird, R. J. (1993). Securing respondent cooperation by circulating consent forms in a society newsletter. Marketing Bulletin, 4, 58-60	190
APPENDIX K	Laird, R. J., Chamberlain, K., & Spicer, J. (1994). Self-management practices in adult asthmatics. <i>New</i> Zealand Medical Journal, 107, 73-75	196

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Gender, age group, ethnicity, educational level, occupational status and marital status for the sample at Time 1 $(N=412)$	53
Table 2	Test-retest (frequency and number of symptoms) and alpha (Round 1 data) reliabilities for the ASC factors	58
Table 3	Means and standard deviations of determinants and seriousness measures, assessed at both times $(N=302)$	69
Table 4	Intercorrelations among determinants, RDS, and control variables at Time 1 (N=330) and Time 2 (N=322)	71
Table 5	Intercorrelations among the seriousness measures at Time 1 $(N=367)$ and Time 2 $(N=374)$	72
Table 6	Correlations between determinants, control variables and seriousness measures at Time 1 ($N=303$) and Time 2 ($N=315$)	73
Table 7	Regression coefficients, adjusted R ² , and R ² change for regressions of seriousness on determinants and control variables at Time 1 and Time 2	76
Table 8	Means and standard deviations of seriousness measures, response and personal efficacies, and the health behaviour measures at both times (N=304)	80
Table 9	Intercorrelations among seriousness measures, response and personal efficacies, and control variables at Time 1 (N=327) and Time 2 (N=339)	81
Table 10	Intercorrelations among health behaviour measures at Time 1 $(N=397)$ and Time 2 $(N=374)$	83
Table 11	Correlations between seriousness, response and personal efficacies, control variables, and health behaviour measures at Time 1 (N=321) and Time 2 (N=328)	84

Table 12	Regression coefficients, adjusted R ² , and R ² change for regressions of health behaviour measures on seriousness measures, response and personal efficacies, and control variables at Time 1 and Time 2	86
Table 13	Standardized regression coefficients (betas) for analyses examining seriousness as a mediator between determinants and consequences	90
Table 14	Regression coefficients, adjusted R ² , and R ² change for regressions of ASC factors (frequency of symptoms) on determinants, and control variables at Time 1 and Time 2	176
Table 15	Regression coefficients, adjusted R ² , and R ² change for regressions of ASC factors (number of symptoms) on determinants, and control variables at Time 1 and Time 2	178
Table 16	Regression coefficients, adjusted R ² , and R ² change for regressions of health competencies on ASC factors (number of symptoms), response and personal efficacies, and control variables at Time 1 and Time 2	181
Table 17	Regression coefficients, adjusted R ² , and R ² change for regressions of health competency categories on seriousness corresponding personal and response efficacy items, and control variables at Time 1 and Time 2	182
Table 18	Percentage of asthmatics who use specific health competencies (N=412)	186