

17-10-2016

Does the CSM really provide a consistent framework for understanding self-management?

Frank Doyle

Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland, fdoyl4@rcsi.ie

Barbara Mullan

Curtin University

Citation

Doyle F, Mullan B. Does the CSM really provide a consistent framework for understanding self-management? *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*. 2016 Oct 17. [Epub ahead of print]

This Other is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Psychology at e-publications@RCSI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Psychology Articles by an authorized administrator of e-publications@RCSI. For more information, please contact epubs@rcsi.ie.

— Use Licence —



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

Journal of Behavioral Medicine

Does the CSM really provide a consistent framework for understanding self-management? --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	
Full Title:	Does the CSM really provide a consistent framework for understanding self-management?
Article Type:	Letter to Editor
Keywords:	Common Sense Model; Systematic Review; Meta-analysis; Illness perceptions; Replicability; Bias
Corresponding Author:	Frank Doyle Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland Dublin 2, IRELAND
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Frank Doyle
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	Frank Doyle Barbara Mullan
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Funding Information:	
Abstract:	See letter

Does the CSM really provide a consistent framework for understanding self-management?

Frank Doyle, Division of Population Health Sciences (Psychology), Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland

Barbara Mullan, Health Psychology & Behavioural Medicine Research Group, School of Psychology and Speech Pathology, Curtin University

Corresponding author:

Dr. Frank Doyle

Division of Population Health Sciences (Psychology)

Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland

123 St Stephen's Green

Dublin 2

Ireland

Email: fdoyle4@rcsi.ie

Tel: +353 1 4022718

Does the CSM really provide a consistent framework for understanding self-management?

Despite Leventhal, Phillips, and Burns (2016) providing a 50-year overview of their Common-Sense Model of Self-Regulation (CSM), they fail to cite the null findings in relation to the CSM and adherence, as found by at least two reviews (Brandes & Mullan, 2014; Law, Tolgyesi, & Howard, 2014).

Brandes and Mullan (2014) meta-analysed 23 datasets from 30 studies in chronically ill populations (26 studies concerned medication adherence) and assessed the CSM with adherence as the outcome. The results were stark, with effect sizes (r^+) ranging from -0.02 (causal [95% CI -0.17 to 0.16] and emotional [95% CI -0.07 to 0.03] representations) to only 0.12 (treatment control [95% CI 0.05 to 0.19] and personal control [95% CI 0.06 to 0.18]). Moderate to high heterogeneity was also evident for all dimensions apart from timeline, coherence and emotional representations, with funnel plots indicative of bias. These results are not supportive of the CSM for predicting adherence, in contrast to the conclusions of Leventhal et al., which cites other meta-analyses, but not this evidence or indeed that of Law et al. (2014).

Psychology has significant reproducibility issues (Open Science, 2015), with substantial evidence of biased literatures (e.g. Donnelly, Hickey, Burns, Murphy, & Doyle, 2015; Ferguson & Heene, 2012; Open Science, 2015). Ignoring the findings of well-conducted systematic reviews, in favour of selected, supportive studies, does not provide sufficient support for any theory (Ferguson & Heene, 2012; Ioannidis, 2005). It also reduces our credibility with other professions (Johnston, 2016; Open Science, 2015). The CSM should be robust to meta-analytic investigations.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Brandes, K., & Mullan, B. (2014). Can the common-sense model predict adherence in chronically ill
9
10 patients? A meta-analysis. *Health Psychol Rev*, 8(2), 129-153. doi:
11
12 10.1080/17437199.2013.820986
13
14
15 Donnelly, N. A., Hickey, A., Burns, A., Murphy, P., & Doyle, F. (2015). Systematic review and meta-
16
17 analysis of the impact of carer stress on subsequent institutionalisation of community dwelling
18
19 older people. *PLoS One*, 10(6), e0128213. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0128213
20
21
22 Ferguson, C. J., & Heene, M. (2012). A Vast Graveyard of Undead Theories: Publication Bias and
23
24 Psychological Science's Aversion to the Null. *Perspect Psychol Sci*, 7(6), 555-561. doi:
25
26 10.1177/1745691612459059
27
28
29 Ioannidis, J. P. (2005). Why most published research findings are false. *PLoS Med*, 2(8), e124. doi:
30
31 10.1371/journal.pmed.0020124
32
33
34 Johnston, M. (2016). A science for all reasons: A comment on Ogden (2016). *Health Psychol Rev*, 10(3),
35
36 256-259. doi: 10.1080/17437199.2016.1190292
37
38
39 Law, G. U., Tolgyesi, C. S., & Howard, R. A. (2014). Illness beliefs and self-management in children and
40
41 young people with chronic illness: a systematic review. *Health Psychol Rev*, 8(3), 362-380. doi:
42
43 10.1080/17437199.2012.747123
44
45
46 Leventhal, H., Phillips, L. A., & Burns, E. (2016). The Common-Sense Model of Self-Regulation (CSM): a
47
48 dynamic framework for understanding illness self-management. *J Behav Med*. doi:
49
50 10.1007/s10865-016-9782-2
51
52
53 Open Science, C. (2015). PSYCHOLOGY. Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science*,
54
55 349(6251), aac4716. doi: 10.1126/science.aac4716
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65