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Abstract

This study evaluated the mediating role of self-efficacy, coping, depression and anxiety on the relationship between illness perceptions and quality of life in stroke survivors (n=72; 32 females; mean [SD] age 65.09 [14.14] years; male mean [SD] age 69.83[11.81]). Illness perceptions (Brief Illness Perceptions Questionnaire; BIPQ), coping styles (Carver Brief COPE scale; B-COPE), depression/anxiety (Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale; HADS), self-efficacy (General Self-Efficacy Scale; GSE) and quality of life (Assessment of quality of life; AQOL-6D) were analysed. Correlation analyses showed illness perception, maladaptive coping, self-efficacy, depression and anxiety to have a significant negative relationship with quality of life. Mediation analyses showed that while maladaptive coping and self-efficacy did not mediate the relationship between illness perception and quality of life, depression and anxiety did. The final model explained 76.74% of the variance in quality of life. Although based on a relatively small sample size, these results provide evidence for the important role of psychosocial factors in quality of life in post-stroke cohorts.
The Common Sense Model (CSM) developed by Leventhal and colleagues (1980) can be used to understand the psychosocial health of important chronic diseases, such as stroke, by establishing the relationship between illness symptoms and individual outcomes (e.g., quality of life [QoL]) which are mediated by illness perceptions and coping style. In the past, the CSM has been applied to numerous chronic illnesses including gastrointestinal disorders (Knowles, Wilson, Connell, & Kamm, 2011), diabetes (Breland, McAndrew, Burns, Leventhal, & Leventhal, 2013) and arthritis (Knowles et al., 2016). However, the CSM has been applied to stroke survivors in only few studies (Hagger & Orbell, 2003; Klinedinst, Dunbar & Clark, 2012; Phillips, Diefenbach, Abrams & Horowitz, 2015).

The CSM proposes that disease activity shares an integral link with the individual’s perception of their illness, referred to as ‘illness perceptions’ (Leventhal, Phillips & Burns, 2016). In CSM, illness perceptions refer to the cognitive and emotional perceptions that individuals develop in response to becoming aware of a threat to their health (Leventhal et al., 2016). Concisely described by Broadbent et al. (2006), illness perceptions are comprised of five dimensions: chronicity (is the illness chronic, acute or cyclical?); consequence (how much does the illness impact on my physical and psychosocial well-being?); causes (what factors caused or influenced the illness?); identity (how is one impacted by having an illness?); and cure/control (can the illness be cured or controlled?).

The concept of ‘coping’ is also central to the CSM. According to Lazarus and Folkman (1984), individuals mediate stress through behaviour and cognition. In CSM, ‘adaptive coping’ strategies seek to change the situation (e.g., planning, problem solving), while
‘maladaptive coping’ strategies seek to regulate emotional distress (e.g., praying, avoiding) (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

Considering this literature, the CSM may be able to provide new insights into the relationship between illness parameters and psychosocial outcomes in stroke survivors. Stroke is the second highest cause of mortality and the third leading cause of disability worldwide (Feigin, Norrving & Mensah, 2017). Stroke is a neurological condition that occurs when a blockage or bleed in the brain results in oxygen deprivation and associated cell death (Sacco et al., 2013). Stroke can produce myriad symptoms including cognitive, motor/sensory and language impairments (Sacco et al., 2013). In addition, the detrimental impact of stroke on survivor’s psychosocial health is widely noted (Frincu, Lupsa, & Stefanescu, 2016; Wang & Wang, 2013). Globally, the economic cost of stroke between 2014 and 2015 exceeded $34 billion in the US (Centres for Disease Control and Prevention, 2019) and €45 billion in the European Union (Stroke Alliance for Europe, 2016). With stroke healthcare costs exceeding $606 million in Australia in 2008-2009 (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2013) the physical, emotional and fiduciary costs of stroke are deeply concerning.

Depression, anxiety and reduced QoL as well as other psychosocial maladies are common following a stroke (Ayerbe, Ayis, Wolfe & Rudd, 2013). In fact, recent systematic reviews (Mitchell et al., 2017; Schöttke & Giabbiconi, 2015) estimate that one-third of stroke survivors experience depression, whilst a further 25% experience clinical anxiety (Chun, Whiteley, Dennis, Mead & Carson, 2018). Evidence suggests that psychosocial outcomes such as depression, anxiety and QoL affect each other (Tang, Lau, Mok, Ungvari & Wong, 2013; van Mierlo et al.; 2014 Volz, Möbus, Letsch & Werheid, 2016). Although these
relationships are not well understood, evidence suggests that depression is linked to poor QoL (Zhang et al., 2017). Meanwhile, self-efficacy has been shown to affect QoL and depression (Robinson-Smith, Johnston & Allen, 2000; Volz, Möbus, Letsch & Werheid, 2016).

Given the effectiveness of implementing the CSM in other chronic health conditions and the importance of psychosocial mediators in health, this study sought to explore the CSM in stroke survivors. It was hypothesized that, aligned with CSM, self-efficacy, coping styles, depression and anxiety would act as mediators between illness perceptions and QoL.

**Methods**

Participants were recruited as part of the Stroke and Carer Optimal Health Program (SCOHP) trial, the details of which have been reported elsewhere (Braiser et al. 2016). An a priori power analysis using GPower (version 3.1) with an effect size 0.15, error probability alpha 0.05 and power of 0.80 indicated a minimum of 68 individuals to predict QoL with seven predictor variables. The sample of 72 participants surpassed this requirement.

**Compliance with ethical standards**

This trial was approved by a Melbourne Metropolitan Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC-A 031/12). Written informed consent was obtained from all participants. The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, the authorship, and/or publication of this article.

**Materials**

**Brief Illness Perceptions Questionnaire (BIPQ)** (Broadbent, Petrie, Main & Weinman, 2006).
The BIPQ is a 9-item questionnaire evaluating emotional/cognitive representations of illness across eight dimensions: emotional response, consequences, timeline, personal control, treatment control, identity, concern and understanding (Broadbent, 2006). Items were assessed according to a 11-point rating scale. For example, “How much does your illness affect your life: 0 [not at all] – 10 [severely affects my life]” (Broadbent et al., 2006).

Reliability analysis was conducted with if the item deleted until the Cronbach’s alpha above 0.7. After removing 2 items (control over illness and helpfulness of treatment), remaining items demonstrated good internal consistency (0.71). The illness perception scale score was created by attaining the average of the subscales, with higher scores reflecting more negative emotional and cognitive representations of illness. Meta-analysis of the BIPQ has demonstrated construct validity in other chronic diseases such as diabetes (Broadbent, et al., 2015).

**Carver Brief Coping Questionnaire (Brief-COPE) (Carver, 1997).**

The Brief-COPE is comprised of 14-subscale questionnaires, with two items per subscale. A 4-point rating scale is used, for example: “1 [I haven’t been doing this at all] to 3 [I’ve been doing this a lot]” (Carver et al., 1997). Due to sample size constraints, the coping subscales could not be derived by factor analysis. Instead, subscales were based on those reported by Carver et al. (1989). Maladaptive coping was based on 12 items (self-distraction, denial, substance use, behavioural disengagement, venting, self-blame) and had good internal consistency (0.71). Emotion-focused coping was based on 10 items (emotional support, positive reframing, humor, acceptance, religion) and had a good internal consistency (0.74).

Finally, problem-focused coping was based on 6 items (active coping, instrumental support,
planning) and demonstrated good internal consistency of (0.85). All three subscales were created as the average of the respective items.

**General Self-efficacy Scale (GES) (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995)**

The General Self-Efficacy Scale is a 10-item measure which assesses an individual’s belief that they can overcome challenges and situations in their own life, utilising a 4-point scale: “1 [Not at all true]” to “4 [Exactly true]” (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995, p.38). Items are summed giving a score range of 10 to 40; higher scores signify greater levels of self-efficacy (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995). The self-efficacy scale had good internal consistency (0.89).

**Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) (Snaith, 2003)**

The HADS is a 14-item self-report questionnaire that assesses depression (7 items) and anxiety (7 items) rated over the previous seven days. Questions are assessed via a 4-point Likert scale. For example, “I feel tense or ‘wound up’” 0 = [not at all] to 3 = [most of the time] (Snaith, 2003, p. 2). Scores between 16 and 21 indicate the presence of a mood disorder (Snaith, 2003). The anxiety and depression subscales had good internal consistency (0.84 and 0.83 respectively). The HADS has been validated for use in stroke survivors, reporting 60% specificity and 80% sensitivity (Burton & Tyson, 2015).

**Assessment of Quality of Life-6 Dimensions (AQoL-6D) (Allen, Inder, Lewin, Attia & Kelly, 2013).**

The AQoL-6D is a multi-attribute self-reported questionnaire that provides a multidimensional assessment of health-related quality (Allen, Inder, Lewin, Attia & Kelly, 2013). It comprises 20 items which assess 6 domains of QoL (relationships – 3 items, independent living – 4 items, coping – 3 items, mental health – 4 items, senses – 3 items and pain – 3 items). Items have between 4 to 6 response options which can be combined to
provide an overall score of QoL; higher scores suggest greater impairment in QoL. The QoL scale had good internal consistency (0.91).

**Statistical analysis**

Prior to conducting multiple regression modeling, the relevant assumptions of this statistical analysis strategy were tested. The assumption of singularity was met, as the independent variables were not a combination of other independent variables. An examination of correlations (see Table 1) revealed that no independent variables were highly correlated. The assumptions of multicollinearity, normality, linearity and homoscedasticity were all satisfied (Hair, Black, Babin & Anderson, 2018; Pallant, 2001). Mediation analyses were carried out using PROCESS macro (version 3.4) for SPSS (Preacher & Hayes, 2008).

**Results**

Participants were 72 stroke survivors (32 females; mean [SD] age 65.09 [14.14] years; male mean [SD] age 69.83[11.81]), of whom 61 percent were married, 7 percent were defacto, 8 percent were divorced, 2 percent were separated, 17 percent were single, 3 percent were widowed and 2 percent identified their relationship as ‘other’. Mean [SD] time since stroke was 33 months [28.2].

Table 1 shows the descriptive and correlational analyses of the study variables. Illness perceptions and maladaptive coping were significantly positively correlated, as well as both having significant positive correlations with anxiety and depression and significant negative correlations with QoL and self-efficacy. Emotion-focused coping had a positive correlation with problem-focused coping and a negative correlation with depression, both relationships were significant. Problem-focused coping had a significant positive correlation with self-efficacy. Maladaptive coping had a significant positive relationship with
depression/anxiety and the other two coping strategies, and a significant negative correlation with self-efficacy and QoL. In addition, QoL had a significant negative correlation with depression and anxiety, and a significant positive correlation with self-efficacy. As emotion and problem-focused coping did not have a significant correlation with QoL, they were not included in further analysis.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

To evaluate the study hypothesis that that self-efficacy, coping styles, depression and anxiety act as mediators between illness perceptions and QoL, separate regression analyses were performed to investigate whether each variable predict QoL. As shown in Table 2, illness perception, self-efficacy, maladaptive coping, depression and anxiety each had a unique effect on QoL.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

Mediation analyses with 5000 bootstrap samples were conducted to examine the potential roles of maladaptive coping, self-efficacy, depression and anxiety as mediators between illness perceptions and QoL. As shown in Figure 1, consistent with full mediation, illness perception was no longer a significant predictor of QoL after the mediator variables were included in the model. Maladaptive coping and self-efficacy did not mediate the relationship between illness perception and QoL. This suggests that depression and anxiety fully mediate the relationship between QoL and illness perception. The final model was found to account for 76.74% of the variance in QoL.

INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE
Discussion

Whilst the global prevalence of stroke is increasing (Gorelick, 2019), medical advances are leading to improved survival rates (Warner, Harrington, Sacco & Elkind, 2019; Seminog, Scarborough, Wright, Rayner & Goldacre, 2019). While higher survival rates are positive, it is also well-established that post-stroke cohorts report greater rates of depression and anxiety compared to healthy control groups (Campbell Burton et al., 2012; Cumming, Blomstrand, Skoog & Linden; Lincoln et al., 2013) as well as poorer QoL (Abubakar, & Isezuo., 2012; Franzen-Dahlin & Laska, 2012). Given this, the identification of psychosocial variables that can be utilised by psychological interventions to target and promote QoL in stroke survivors is essential. The evaluation of well established psychosocial models of health outcomes, such as the CSM, provide a strong theoretical and practical basis to identify and evaluate psychosocial variables.

Based on the CSM our study found partial support for the hypothesis in that maladaptive anxiety and depression mediated the relationship between illness perceptions and QoL. This reflects the premise that mental health is a key marker of QoL (Lincoln et al., 2013; Northcott, Moss, Harrison, & Hilari, 2015). Although not found to act as a mediator, self-efficacy was found to be predicted by illness perceptions. Coping styles are complex and have been conceptualised in numerous ways to exemplify their diverse impact. In CSM, coping styles are essential to one’s welfare and are thought to determine key outcomes (Lazarus & Folkman., 1984.) In support of other CSM-based research, coping (specifically maladaptive coping), was predicted by illness perceptions (Knowles et al, 2019). The findings that maladaptive coping, and not other forms of coping (emotion- and problem-focused) was predicted by illness perceptions is consistent with past research (Knowles et al, 2017;
While the influence of QoL by maladaptive coping was not significant, these findings reflect the more influential role of maladaptive coping than adaptive coping styles. It should also be acknowledged that although not tested in this study, both self-efficacy and maladaptive coping may also have a direct impact on anxiety and depression.

While this is the first study to provide partial evidence for the CSM in a stroke cohort, it is not without limitations. The first limitation was that no measure of health status was collected, despite being a key predictor variable of illness perceptions in the CSM. The small number of participants and self-reported nature the questionnaires, may bias the results and only reflect the perceptions of participants and not the wider post-stroke population.

The study design was cross-sectional and therefore true causal (mediation) relationships could not be evaluated; nor could bi-directional pathways be evaluated. Future research should seek to replicate and extend the current findings by utilizing more advanced statistical approaches such as structural equation modeling (SEM), to better control for measurement error and inter-item correlations, and assess for multiple simultaneous mediational relationships. An extended CSM in a post-stroke cohort could also explore the potential mediating role of other psychosocial variables which have been found to be associated with post-stroke outcomes, like QoL, including optimism (Kim, Park & Peterson, 2011) and carer support (King, Hartke & Houle, 2010). While acknowledging these limitations, the study has identified several potential psychosocial variables, specifically illness perceptions, maladaptive coping, self-efficacy, and depression and anxiety which could be targeted through psychological interventions such as cognitive behaviour therapy (CBT) the promote QoL in a post-stroke cohort.
Conclusion

Along with higher rates of anxiety and depression, post stroke cohorts are also at risk of reduced QoL. Based on the CSM, this study explored the potential mediational role of self-efficacy, coping strategies, and anxiety and depression between illness perceptions and QoL in a post-stroke cohort. The findings suggest that illness perceptions, anxiety and depression should be targets for modification using well-established psychological interventions such as CBT to enhance QoL in post-stroke cohorts.
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### Table 1. Pearson’s correlation and descriptive statistics of the scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Illness perceptions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>6.49 (2.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Maladaptive coping</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.65 (1.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Emotion-focused coping</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>2.26 (0.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Problem-focused coping</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>2.58 (0.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Self-efficacy</td>
<td>-0.35*</td>
<td>-0.35**</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>30.04 (5.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Anxiety</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.42**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>7.16 (4.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Depression</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.46**</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>6.33 (4.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Quality of Life</td>
<td>-0.56**</td>
<td>-0.51**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>-0.69**</td>
<td>-0.77**</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.63 (0.21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *p < .05 and **p < .001.*
Table 2. Summary of the regression analysis between the five predictor variables on QoL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illness perception</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.56**</td>
<td>-5.22</td>
<td>[-0.09, -0.04]</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maladaptive Coping</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.51**</td>
<td>-6.20</td>
<td>[-0.37, -0.19]</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>[0.02, 0.03]</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.69**</td>
<td>-10.57</td>
<td>[-0.04, -0.03]</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.77**</td>
<td>-13.06</td>
<td>[-0.05, -0.03]</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **p < .001.
Figure 1. Multiple mediation between illness perception and QoL (*p < 0.05, **p < 0.001).