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.

THE IMPACT OF LOCUS OF CONTROL AND CONTROL ON PERFORMANCE DURING PAINFUL STIMULATION: AN EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION

A dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Arts in Psychology at Massey University

Matthew David Manderson
1999

ABSTRACT

Pain interrupts cognitive processing, is hard to ignore and demands priority attention (Crombez, Baeyens & Eelen, 1994). Focusing on the effect of pain on attention, the primary task paradigm was used to investigate the effect pain had on the task performance of 59 psychology undergraduate students assessed for their locus of control (LOC) beliefs using Rotters (1964) LOC Scale. In a mixed experimental design, participants were required to discrimination between 250 and 750 MHz tones while being exposed to the experimental pain stimulus potassium iontophoresis, a control stimulus of an old man's face and tone only baseline trials. A control manipulation gave all participants both control and no control over the presentation of three levels of pain; high, medium and low pain. The results show that pain interfered with the accuracy of tone discriminations but not reaction times (RT). Additionally, the interference effect from painful stimulation was greater at 250 ms after the onset of the tone compared to the 750 ms onset. A signalling/warning effect is discussed as an explanation for this finding. The external LOC group performed worse when they had control over pain compared to no control. The internal LOC group showed less task degradation overall during the pain condition compared to the external group. These results are discussed in relation with current theories of attention, the effects of control and LOC beliefs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my thanks and appreciation to my supervisor Malcolm Johnson for his time that he put into the supervision of this thesis. I also appreciated his remarkable patience when explaining statistics to me and for the months spent adapting the primary task used in this study.

Thanks must also go to Steve Humphries who did all of the computer programming for this experimental research and who always came to this project with the best attitude possible. Thanks Steve for your time and patience when dealing with someone that could use Windows and not DOS.

Additionally I must extend a huge thank you to Mike Hughes and Malcolm Loudon of the School of Psychology workshop for the time that they spent fixing things when they broke, showing me "how to", and being a huge source of entertainment during this thesis. Their workmanship is second to none and could not have done this without their help.

I have to thank my experimental guinea pig Duncan Babbage from the School of Psychology at Massey University for the number of times that he gave me his arm to test my pain machine and also to Angela McNaught for her precious time reviewing this work. Thanks to my friends and family who supported me throughout this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF APPENDICES	vi
LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES	
FiguresTables	
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION PAIN The Classification of Pain Theories of Pain Summary	3 5
CHAPTER TWO	8
FACTORS EFFECTING PAIN Physiological Factors Affecting Pain Psychological Factors Affecting Pain Summary	8 9
CHAPTER THREE	13
STRATEGIES TO INFLUENCE THE EXPERIENCE OF PAIN Relaxation Cognitive Behavioural Strategies for Alleviating Pain Imagery Distraction THE PRIMARY TASK PARADIGM AND DISTRACTION Summary	13 14 15 16
CHAPTER FOUR	21
CONTROL AND PAIN CONTROL OF PAIN LOCUS OF CONTROL Summary	21 23
CHAPTER FIVE	26
THE PROPOSED RESEARCH THE CURRENT STUDY The Specific Hypothesis To Be Tested	27
CHAPTER SIX	29
METHOD Participants Setting Apparatus Pain Stimulus Iontophoretic Pain Generator	30 31
ioniophorelic Pain Generalor	31

Response Device	32
Emergency Cut-off Switch	
Primary Task	
DESIGN	
Design of experiment	
ASSESSMENT	
Pain Tolerance	
Control Manipulation	
Locus of Control	
Task Performance	
PROCEDURE	
Welcome and Questions	
Introduction to the Pain Apparatus	38
Task Practice and Iontopheretic Preparation	
Pain Tolerance Procedure	
Experimental Session	
Debriefing and Payment	41
CHAPTER SEVEN	42
RESULTS	
Analysis	42
Hypothesis One: Pain	
Hypothesis Two: Control	
Hypothesis Three: LOC and Performance	
Hypothesis Four: LOC and Control	
Hypothesis Five: Condition	
Hypothesis Six: Gender	
Post Hoc Analyses	48
CHAPTER EIGHT	51
DISCUSSION	51
Review of the Hypotheses and Findings	
Review of Post-Hoc Analyses	
Methological Issues	
Pain Report and Gender	
Slow Finger Responding	
Control	
Further Research	
Research Summary	
REFERENCES	01
APPENDICES	79
Appendix A. Information Sheet	70
Appendix B. Locus of Control Scale	
Appendix C. Consent Form	
Appendix D. Medical Checklist	
Appendix E Control visual distracter stimulus of an old man's face	
Appendix F. Results of Study Sent to Participants	
Appendix G. Format for the six experimental sessions	

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A.	Information Sheet	. 79
Appendix B.	Locus of Control Scale	. 82
Appendix C.	Consent Form	. 86
Appendix D.	Medical Checklist	. 87
Appendix E.	Control Visual Distracter Stimulus of an Old Man's Face	. 89
Appendix F.	Results of the Study Sent to Participants	. 90
Appendix G.	Format for the Six Experimental Session	. 92

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Figures		
Figure 1	Iontophoretic Pain Generator Apparatus	. 32
Figure 2	Schematic Representation of the Experimental Design	. 34
<u>Tables</u>		
Table 1	Age Distribution for Participants	. 30
Table 2	Mean RT and Standard Deviations for Pain and Baseline	
	Trials	. 43
Table 3	Overall Means and Standard Deviations for Control and No	
	Control Over Pain	. 44
Table 4	Mean RT and Standard Deviations for LOC Group With and	
	Without Control	. 45
Table 5	Percentage of Errors Made for LOC Group With and Without	
	Control of Pain	. 45
Table 6	Overall Means and Standard Deviations for Baseline, Visual	
	and Pain Conditions	. 47
Table 7	Overall Means and Standard Deviations for Tolerance Levels	
	for Males and Females	. 48
Table 8	Mean RT and Standard Deviations for High, Medium and	
	Low Pain	. 49
Table 9	Mean RT and Standard Deviations for Time One and Time	
	Two	50