

***Coronary heart disease patients' compliance with
dietary recommendations: Does trust matter?***

*Samantha Meyer
BA (Honours)*

August 2010

Discipline of Public Health
School of Medicine
Flinders University
Adelaide, South Australia

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.0 Investigating trust in healthcare as a means of theoretical development ...	2
1.1 Investigating coronary heart disease (CHD) patients' trust as a means of theoretical investigation	4
1.2 Importance of trust research in public health.....	5
1.3 Outline of thesis.....	6
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	8
2.0 Introduction.....	8
2.1 Systematic search	8
2.2 Background to doctor–patient interactions	10
2.21 Background.....	10
2.22 Monopoly phase.....	12
2.23 Conflict phase	13
2.24 Concentration phase.....	15
2.3 Conceptualisations of trust	19
2.31 The evolution of trust as a theoretical concept	19
2.32 Giddens' and Luhmann's theories of trust: An overview.....	20
2.33 Ideas on social change	21
2.34 The impact of modernity on trust	25
2.35 Conceptualisations of trust.....	32
2.36 Trust as a function in (and for) society.....	40
2.4 Conclusion	48
2.41 Theoretical gaps	48
2.42 Empirical gaps	49
2.43 Conclusion	51
2.5 Objectives.....	52
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY.....	55
3.0 Introduction.....	55
3.1 Methodology	55
3.11 Induction	57
3.12 Deduction.....	58
3.13 Abduction	59
3.14 Retroduction.....	61
3.2 The research design.....	64

CHAPTER 4: METHODS AND ANALYSIS	67
4.0 Introduction.....	67
4.1 The qualitative study	67
4.11 Sampling strategy	67
4.12 Qualitative sample	68
4.13 Qualitative recruitment	70
4.14 Qualitative data collection	72
4.15 Method	75
4.16 Designing the interview guide	76
4.17 Qualitative data analysis	79
4.18 Qualitative research ethics.....	83
4.2 The quantitative study.....	83
4.21 Quantitative research design	83
4.22 Pilot	83
4.23 The postal survey.....	92
4.24 Quantitative sampling frame	92
4.25 Quantitative sampling strategy.....	93
4.26 Quantitative data collection.....	93
4.27 Quantitative data analysis.....	94
4.28 Quantitative research ethics	97
4.3 Ensuring quality in research	97
4.31 Ensuring quality in qualitative research.....	97
4.32 Ensuring quality in quantitative research	100
CHAPTER 5: QUALITATIVE RESULTS.....	103
5.0 Introduction.....	103
5.1 Results.....	105
5.2 Interpersonal trust.....	106
5.3 Institutional trust	116
5.4 The role of risk and reflexivity in compliance.....	125
5.5 Summary of qualitative findings	135
CHAPTER 6: QUANTITATIVE RESULTS	137
6.0 Overview.....	137
6.1 Univariate analysis	137
6.11 Participant demographics	137
6.2 Bivariate and multivariate analyses.....	140
6.21 Generalised trust.....	141

6.22 Trust in medical professionals	144
6.23 Reflexivity.....	150
6.24 Interpersonal and institutional trust	165
6.25 Operationalisation of trust	187
6.3 Summary of the quantitative results.....	192
CHAPTER 7: DISCUSSION	194
7.0 Discussing the research process	194
7.01 The reflexive sociologist.....	194
7.02 Limitations.....	196
7.03 Strengths.....	197
7.1 Introduction to the discussion	198
7.2 The extent of trust in Australia.....	203
7.21 Australians' trust in groups of individuals.....	204
7.22 Australians' trust in organisations/institutions	205
7.3 Lay conceptualisations of trust.....	206
7.31 Distinction between interpersonal and institutional trust.....	209
7.32 Dependence.....	211
7.4 The role of power in patient trust and/or dependence.....	214
7.41 Medicine as a form of social control.....	216
7.5 The role of risk and reflexivity in patient compliance	217
7.6 The impact of social change on patient trust	222
7.7 Declining trust in healthcare and health professionals	224
7.71 Trust in healthcare professionals	224
7.72 Trust in the healthcare system.....	228
7.8 Trustworthy characteristics.....	230
7.9 The operationalisation of trust.....	233
7.91 Link between interpersonal trust and institutional trust.....	234
7.92 Link between institutional trust and institutional trust.....	236
7.93 Link between interpersonal trust and interpersonal trust	237
7.94 Conclusion regarding the operationalisation of trust.....	239
CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSION	240
8.0 Summary of findings	240
8.01 The conceptualisation of trust	240
8.02 Social factors affecting trust and compliance.....	241
8.03 The extent of trust in Australia	242
8.04 The operationalisation of trust.....	243

8.1 Areas for future investigation.....	243
--	------------

REFERENCES	246
-------------------------	------------

TABLES

Table 1: Areas of recruitment for higher risk participants	71
Table 2: Areas of recruitment for lower risk participants	71
Table 3: Number of participants in each of the four groups.....	72
Table 4: Interview questions and rationale	76
Table 5: Example of first order analysis.....	80
Table 6: Example of second order analysis.....	81
Table 7: Trust survey: questions divided into areas of theoretical inquiry	89
Table 8: Summary of results for reliability of the survey	90
Table 9: Number of surveys distributed nationally according to State/Territory	93
Table 10: Qualitative participant profiles with regard to age, sex, CHD risk, and SES	103
Table 11: Age frequencies	138
Table 12: Sex frequencies	138
Table 13: Income frequencies.....	138
Table 14: IRSD frequencies.....	139
Table 15: Overall health frequencies	139
Table 16: Frequencies for presence of a chronic health condition	140
Table 17: Length of time seeing current GP	140
Table 18: Reference categories.....	141
Table 19: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with generalised trust in most people	142
Table 20: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with individuals who think most people would take advantage of them if given the chance.....	144
Table 21: Association between level of trust in doctors in general and age.....	146
Table 22: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with trust in doctors in general....	146
Table 23: Association between level of trust in a doctor being seen for the first time and age	147
Table 24: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with trust in a doctor who the respondents are seeing for the first time	148
Table 25: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with generalised trust in doctors..	149
Table 26: Association between requesting a second opinion from a doctor and IRSD quintile	150
Table 27: Association between requesting a second opinion from a doctor and age	151
Table 28: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with requesting a second opinion from a doctor	152
Table 29: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with doubting information from their family doctor.....	153

Table 30: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with doubting information from doctors in general	155
Table 31: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with doubting information from doctors	157
Table 32: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with doubting information from groups of individuals	158
Table 33: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with doubting information from individuals	160
Table 34: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with doubting information from institutions/organisations.....	161
Table 35: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with doubting information from organisations/institutions (all variables).....	163
Table 36: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with reflexivity with regard to trust in organisations/institutions.....	165
Table 37: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with trust in groups of individuals (all variables).....	166
Table 38: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with trust in groups of individuals	167
Table 39: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with trust in organisations/institutions (all variables).....	169
Table 40: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with trust in organisations/institutions	170
Table 41: Association between IRSD quintile and the level of influence the way a doctor dresses has on trust.....	172
Table 42: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with the extent to which the way a doctor is dressed influences trust	172
Table 43: Association between IRSD quintile and the level of influence of the doctor seeming to be caring on trust	174
Table 44: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with the extent to which the way a doctor seems to be caring influences trust	175
Table 45: Association between length of time seeing current GP and the level of influence the doctor appearing to be competent has on trust	177
Table 46: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with the extent to which the doctor appearing to be competent influences respondents' trust	178
Table 47: Association between age and the level of influence the doctor appearing to be older than 40 has on trust	179
Table 48: Association between length of time with current GP and the level of influence the doctor appearing to be older than 40 has on trust.....	179
Table 49: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with the extent to which the doctor appearing to be older than 40 influences trust.....	180
Table 50: Association between age and the level of influence the doctor appearing to be younger than 40 has on trust	181
Table 51: Association between income and the level of influence the doctor appearing to be younger than 40 has on trust	181
Table 52: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with the extent to which the doctor appearing to be younger than 40 influences trust.....	181
Table 53: Association between IRSD quintile and the level of influence the doctor being female has on trust	183
Table 54: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with the extent to which the doctor	

being female influences trust	184
Table 55: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with the extent to which the doctor being male influences trust	185
Table 56: Association between IRSD quintile and the level of influence certain GP characteristics have on respondent trust	186
Table 57: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with regard to the extent to which certain GP characteristics influence trust	187
Table 58: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with trust in doctors in general after controlling for trust in all groups or individuals and demographic variables	188
Table 59: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with trust in a doctor the respondent is seeing for the first time after controlling for trust in all groups or individuals and demographic variables	189
Table 60: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with trust in doctors in general after controlling for trust in all organisations/institutions and demographic variables	190
Table 61: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with trust in a doctor the respondent is seeing for the first time after controlling for trust in all groups and individuals and demographic variables	191
Table 62: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with trust in a doctor the respondent is seeing for the first time after controlling for trust in all groups or individuals, all organisations/institutions and demographic variables	191
Table 63: Multivariate odds ratios of factors associated with trust in doctors in general after controlling for trust in all groups of individuals, all organisations/institutions and demographic variables	192

FIGURES

Figure 1: Giddens—An individual's trust in the system's representative is imperative before the individual can trust the social system	41
Figure 2: Luhmann—An individual must have trust in the system, and all other systems that influence it, before they can place trust in system's representative	43
Figure 3: Depicting the application of the four lines of inquiry; induction, deduction, abduction, retroduction	64
Figure 4: Redeveloping the social theory of trust based on empirical results	202
Figure 5: A model of dependence	203

Abstract

Recent theoretical and applied International literature has suggested that trust in healthcare is declining. This thesis investigates the apparent decline by researching the role of trust in coronary heart disease (CHD) patients' compliance with dietary recommendations. This thesis also investigates the practical application of social theories of trust. At present, social theories of trust do not provide a practical framework for applied investigation. This thesis is a means of theoretical development with regard to social theories of trust. A total of 37 qualitative interviews in South Australia and 1044 quantitative surveys were collected from a national sample as a means of investigating social theories of trust. The qualitative findings indicate that people with CHD trust healthcare professionals and the healthcare system. It was also found that in situations of risk, individuals are dependent on the healthcare system and healthcare professionals; they do not reflexively 'trust'. In addition, the findings suggest that trust may play a role in compliance but that risk and reflexivity are central to understanding the concept of compliance. Quantitative results indicate that Australians have high levels of trust in organisations/individuals but that specific demographic factors can be used to predict levels of trust. Respondents who are females, have a chronic health condition, a high annual household income, living in advantaged areas are the most likely to distrust doctors, among other groups of individuals and organisations/institutions. The findings suggest that current social theories of trust do not provide a practical framework for investigating trust in social health research. Findings have led to the development of a more comprehensive model of trust that may be used for future research on trust in healthcare.

I certify that this thesis does not incorporate without acknowledgment any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any university; and that to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the text.

Samantha B. Meyer

Acknowledgements

Thank you to my supervisors Paul Ward, John Coveney, Wendy Rogers and John McMillan for their time and support in the construction and completion of this thesis. A special thanks to Paul Ward for the ongoing opportunities and for challenging me. Thank you also to John Coveney for your genuine care and compassion.

Thank you to the Food and Trust team Julie Henderson, Trish Clark, Paul Ward, John Coveney, Ann Taylor and Jemal Nath. Trish, my saviour, the process of printing, stamping and mailing might have killed me without your guidance. Julie, thank you for your support but also your 'revenge' email – made my day.

Thank you to the staff at the Discipline of Public Health, Flinders University for the support and guidance with administration and advice. A special thanks to Katy Osborne who met with me before my enrolment and is a big part of the reason I ended up studying at Flinders.

Thank you to George Tsourtos for the advice and for making me take a few extra steps to strengthen my work. Thank you to Mariastella Pulvirenti for giving me the opportunity to strengthen my academic skills

Thank you to the staff at Flinders Social Health Sciences, Eileen Willis, Louise Reynolds, Tanya Tamm, Julia McKesser, and Carol Grbich without whom I would have never been able to fund this PhD.

In addition to the wonderful academics who helped me find my way, I would like to thank a number of people who contribute to my life on a daily basis in so many ways.

I would like to thank my biggest fan Philip Deacon for his ongoing support and constant 'bigging me up' to all friends and family. You are perfect.

Thank you to my parents John and Trudy Meyer for proving support from overseas and for coming to Australia during my last months of writing. I do not know how I got so lucky to have people who love me like you do.

Thank you to Trudy and Alan Deacon for all of their love and support. I am not sure where I would have ended up without you. Also, I would like to thank Kaitlynn and William Deacon for being incredible supports.

Thank you to Jill Mailing and the late Bruce Keepes for your academic wisdom and friendship.

Thank you to Louise Holmberg for spending time in the dungeon with me and teaching me how to paddle board. Thank you to Tini Luong who spend three nights printing and stuffing envelopes. Thank you also to her partner and brother for lasting the long haul with us.

Thank you to Belinda Lunnay and Chelsea Todd for our weekly coffee sessions which made the 'bads' seem normal. Thank you to fellow PhD students Ruth Campbell, Kathryn Brown-Yeung and Louise Townend.

Thank you to my incredible support system of friends in Canada, Matt Meyer, Casey Pratt, Caitlin Campbell, Lindsey Lukings, Tara McLaughlin, Lauren Hughes, Jocelyn Bain, Laura Fraser, Nicole Kotyk, Malorie Knoester, Morgan Walsh, Laurie Woodley, David Green, Ryan Farkas, Adam Bereza, Jeremy Bonk, David Dean, Nick Hendry, Mike Bartholomew, Aran Pope, and Neil McCabe. You are all AMAZING.

Thank you to my supports in Australia, Jillian Deacon, Dylan Jones, Carrie Duffield, Jaime Duffield, Lia Hardy, Sarah Lacanilao, Steve Morgan, Naomi Farrell, Danielle Farrow, Bridgid Brown, Lorna Richardson, Dan Henderson, Sarah Sheppard, Rudyard Wake, Dave McFarlane, Jim London, Helen Uppington, and Carol and Lawrie Roberts. A special thanks to Dylan Jones for telling me I could do a PhD before I had the confidence in myself