

**Bangor University**

## **PROFESSIONAL DOCTORATES**

### **The role of self-efficacy in multiple sclerosis**

Spencer, Laura

*Award date:*  
2017

*Awarding institution:*  
Bangor University

[Link to publication](#)

#### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

#### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Download date: 07. May. 2024



# THE ROLE OF SELF-EFFICACY IN MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

Laura Spencer

The North Wales Clinical Psychology Programme, Bangor University

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the degree of Doctor of Clinical Psychology

June 2017

## **Declarations**

This work has not been previously accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree.

Signed: .....

Date: .....

### **Statement 1**

This thesis is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. Other sources are acknowledged by footnotes giving explicit references. A list of references is appended.

Signed: .....

Date: .....

### **Statement 2**

I agree to deposit an electronic copy of my thesis (the Work) in the Bangor University (BU) Institutional Digital Repository, the British Library ETHOS system, and /or in any other repository authorized for use by Bangor University and where necessary have gained the required permissions for the use of third party material.

Signed: .....

Date: .....

## **Acknowledgements**

Conducting this research project would not have been possible without the incredible support I have received along the way.

Firstly, I would like to thank each and every research participant for voluntarily giving up their time and for welcoming me into their lives. I would also like to thank the committee members of the North Wales Multiple Sclerosis Society branches who kindly invited me to attend their business and social events, enabling me to speak to a wider audience of people with Multiple Sclerosis. You selflessly all hoped that by supporting the project, you would help other people with Multiple Sclerosis. I share this aspiration with you all.

I would like to thank my research supervisor, Dr. Craig Roberts, for your continued support throughout the entire project. I have particularly appreciated your help in deciphering neuropsychological assessments; you have helped me to develop skills which I have no doubt will help me in my future career. Thank you to Mrs. Yvonne Copeland, Multiple Sclerosis Specialist Nurse, for your support with recruitment and for your generosity with your time.

I would also like to thank the staff and my fellow trainees at the North Wales Clinical Psychology Programme. A special thank you to Dr. Chris Saville for your expert guidance on quantitative data analysis. I would have been lost without your help. Last but not least, I would like to thank my family and friends. Not only have you supported me throughout this research project, you have consistently supported me throughout the entirety of my career to date. A sincere thank you, to you all.



## Table of Contents

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| Thesis abstract .....  | V          |
| <b>Chapter 1 – Literature Review .....</b>                             | <b>1</b>   |
| Journal guidelines .....   | 3          |
| List of abbreviations .....  | 8          |
| Abstract .....   | 10         |
| Introduction .....   | 12         |
| Method .....   | 16         |
| Results .....  | 19         |
| Discussion .....   | 27         |
| Conclusions .....  | 30         |
| References .....   | 31         |
| <b>Chapter 2 – Empirical Paper .....</b>                               | <b>38</b>  |
| Journal Guidelines .....   | 40         |
| List of abbreviations .....  | 46         |
| Abstract .....   | 47         |
| Introduction .....   | 49         |
| Method .....   | 51         |
| Results .....  | 57         |
| Discussion .....   | 61         |
| Conclusions .....  | 63         |
| References .....   | 64         |
| <b>Chapter 3 – Contributions to Theory and Clinical Practice .....</b> | <b>69</b>  |
| Contributions to theory and clinical practice .....                    | 70         |
| Research implications .....  | 75         |
| Reflective commentary .....  | 80         |
| References .....   | 83         |
| <b>Appendices .....</b>  | <b>86</b>  |
| <b>Word Counts .....</b>   | <b>144</b> |

## **Thesis Abstract**

### *The role of self-efficacy in Multiple Sclerosis*

This thesis aimed to explore the role of self-efficacy in Multiple Sclerosis. The thesis begins with a systematic literature review and meta-analysis to examine whether fatigue management interventions, based upon energy conservation strategies, increase self-efficacy in people with Multiple Sclerosis experiencing fatigue. Three databases were searched, and a total of nine articles were identified as meeting the inclusion criteria. Meta-analysis revealed a medium effect of energy conservation interventions in reducing fatigue, and a large effect of energy conservation interventions in increasing self-efficacy. The findings from this systematic review suggest that energy conservation interventions are effective at increasing self-efficacy in people with Multiple Sclerosis, as well as reducing the impact of fatigue.

The literature review is followed by an empirical paper, which aimed to investigate whether self-efficacy remains predictive of perceived cognitive impairment after controlling for objective cognitive functioning. This empirical paper also aimed to further explore the relationship between self-efficacy and cognitive domains (i.e., attention, processing speed, memory, and executive functioning), as measured objectively. A convenience sample of 25 adults with Multiple Sclerosis was recruited from a semi-rural part of North Wales. All participants completed a series of questionnaires and undertook a battery of neuropsychological assessments. Using hierarchical regression analyses, self-efficacy was found to significantly predict perceived cognitive impairment, even after controlling for objective cognitive functioning. Correlational analyses also revealed a significant relationship between self-efficacy and processing speed, and self-efficacy and

executive function. The paper concludes that self-efficacy is associated with perceived cognitive impairment in people with Multiple Sclerosis, and therefore may be an important aspect of self-management programmes.

The third chapter of this thesis addresses the implications for theory development and clinical practice, and future research. A reflective commentary is also enclosed.

## **Chapter 1 – Literature Review**

**Do energy conservation interventions increase self-efficacy in people with Multiple Sclerosis experiencing fatigue? A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.**

Laura Spencer, MSc<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Craig Roberts, DClinPsy<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Chris Saville, PhD<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> North Wales Clinical Psychology Programme, School of Psychology, Bangor University, U.K

<sup>2</sup> North Wales Brain Injury Service, Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board, U.K

**Address for correspondence:** Laura Spencer, North Wales Clinical Psychology Programme, School of Psychology, Brigantia Building, Bangor University, Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57 2DG. E-mail: Laura.Spencer@wales.nhs.uk

**Disclosures:** None

**Acknowledgements:** This paper is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for Doctorate in Clinical Psychology

**Word Count:** 3040

---

This paper will be submitted to *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, and has therefore being formatted in accordance with this journal's guidelines. The submission guidelines are listed at the beginning of this chapter.

#### Types of papers

**Original Research:** Present new and important basic and clinical information, extend existing studies, or provide a new approach to a traditional subject. Manuscripts should be limited to 3000 words of text (Introduction through Conclusions). Figures, tables, and references should be limited to the number needed to clarify, amplify, or document the text.

**Review Articles (Meta-Analyses):** The Editorial Board welcomes state-of-the-art review articles. Manuscripts should be limited to 5000 words of text (Introduction through Conclusions), exclusive of references. The *Archives* strongly prefers systematic reviews of the literature.

#### NEW - Reporting Guidelines and Checklists

To ensure a high and consistent quality of research reporting, original research articles, including brief reports, must contain sufficient information to allow readers to understand how a study was designed and conducted. For review articles, systematic or narrative, readers should be informed of the rationale and details behind the literature search strategy.

To achieve this goal, *Archives* requires that authors upload a completed checklist for the appropriate reporting guideline during original submission. Taking the time to ensure your manuscript addresses basic reporting prerequisites will greatly improve your manuscript, and enhance the likelihood of publication. These checklists serve as a guide for the editors and reviewers as they evaluate your paper.

The EQUATOR Network (<http://www.equator-network.org>) is an excellent resource for key reporting guidelines, checklists, and flow diagrams. These guidelines should be especially useful for *Archives*' authors.

Click on the checklist that applies to your manuscript, download it to your computer, fill it out electronically, "save as," and upload it with your manuscript when you submit. Links to mandatory flow diagrams also are provided. Below are the most commonly used checklists but please note that the Equator Network provides many others (e.g. TRIPOD, SRQR, etc.) and it is up to the authors to select the one most appropriate for their study.

- Randomized Controlled Trials — [CONSORT](#) — Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials
- Observational Studies — [STROBE](#) — Strengthening the Reporting of Observational studies in Epidemiology
- Systematic Review of Controlled Trials — [PRISMA](#) — Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses
- Study of Diagnostic accuracy/assessment scale — [STARD](#) — Standards for the Reporting of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies
- For psychometric studies the editors recommend either the [COSMIN](#) or [GRRAS](#) guideline, though the final choice is up to the author.



#### Preparation

Authors should prepare manuscripts according to the "Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals" <sup>1</sup> as developed by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. The Requirements are available at <http://www.icmje.org>.

#### Document Formatting

Manuscripts must be double-spaced throughout, including the title page, abstract, text, acknowledgments, references, individual tables, and legends. Use only standard 12-point type and spacing. Use unjustified, flush-left margins. Number the pages of the text consecutively. Put the page number in the upper or lower right-hand corner of each page. Number each line on each page of the text to facilitate peer review.

Authors should format manuscripts for specific attributes such as italics, superscripts/subscripts, and Greek letters. **The coding scheme for each such element must be consistent throughout the file.**

**Text Style:** Enter only 1 space between words and sentences. Leave 1 blank line between paragraphs. Leave 2 blank lines between headings and text.

#### Your Paper Your Way

As part of the Your Paper Your Way service, at initial submission you may choose to submit your new manuscript as a single file to be used in the refereeing process. This can be a PDF file or a Word document, in any format or lay-out that can be used by referees to evaluate your manuscript. It should contain high enough quality figures for refereeing. If you prefer to do so, you may still provide all or some of the source files at the initial submission. Please note that individual figure files larger than 10 MB must be uploaded separately. **If your paper is accepted, you will be requested, at the revision stage, to put your paper in the correct format by supplying individual files for the manuscript, tables, figures, etc. and any other items required for the publication of your article. To find out more, please read the rest of the Preparation section.**

#### NEW SUBMISSIONS

Submission to this journal proceeds totally online and you will be guided stepwise through the creation and uploading of your files. The system automatically converts your files to a single PDF file, which is used in the peer-review process.

#### References

There are no strict requirements on reference formatting at submission. References can be in any style or format as long as the style is consistent. Where applicable, author(s) name(s), journal title/book title, chapter title/article title, year of publication, volume number/book chapter and the pagination must be present. Use of DOI is highly encouraged. The reference style used by the journal will be applied to the accepted article by Elsevier at the proof stage. Note that missing data will be highlighted at proof stage for the author to correct.

## Formatting requirements

There are no strict formatting requirements for articles at initial submission (for requirements for revised submissions, please see REVISED SUBMISSIONS section below) but all manuscripts must contain the essential elements needed to convey your manuscript, for example Abstract, Keywords, Introduction, Methods, Results, Conclusions, Artwork and Tables with Captions. If your article includes any Videos and/or other Supplementary material, this should be included in your initial submission for peer review purposes. Divide the article into clearly defined sections.

Please ensure the text of your paper is double-spaced — this is an essential peer review requirement.

*Figures and tables embedded in text - Your Paper Your Way*

If you choose the Your Paper Your Way option when submitting your manuscript for the first time, please ensure the figures and the tables included in the single file are placed next to the relevant text in the manuscript, rather than at the bottom or the top of the file.

## Subdivision

Manuscript files should be structured as follows: (1) Title page, including Disclosure of Interest and Acknowledgments, etc.; (2) Manuscript file including Abstract, Keywords, Abbreviations, Main text, References, Legends of figures and tables; (3) Table files; (4) Figure files; (5) Supplementary files; (6) ICMJE forms.

## Manuscript Headings

Original Article level 1 headings are: Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusions. Articles should include the level 2 subsection heading Study Limitations at the end of the Discussion section. Longer articles may need other level 2 and/or level 3 subsection headings to clarify their content, especially the Results and Discussion sections. Other types of articles such as Commentaries and Special Communications do not require this format.

## Title Page

Include these elements in the title page in the following sequence, double-spaced: (1) Running head of no more than 40 character spaces (no abbreviations); (2) Title (no abbreviations); (3) Author(s) full name(s) and highest academic degree(s); (4) The name(s) of the institution(s), section(s), division(s), and department(s) where the study was performed and the institutional affiliation(s) of the author(s) at the time of the study. An asterisk after an author's name and a footnote may indicate a change in affiliation; (5) Acknowledgment of any presentation of this material, to whom, when, and where; (6) Acknowledgment of financial support, including grant numbers and any other needed acknowledgments. Explanations of any conflicts of interest; (7) Name, address, business telephone number, and e-mail address of corresponding author; and (8) Clinical trial registration number, if applicable. Please note that clinical trial registration will now be required as of January 1, 2016. The grace period will end January 1, 2017 when registration will be mandatory.

## Abstract

For articles reporting original data (Original Articles, Brief Reports) and Review Articles (including Meta-Analyses), a structured abstract is required (see the [Instructions for Structured Abstracts](#)). Authors should make sure the key elements from the Reporting Guideline (eg. CONSORT, PRISMA, etc.) they followed for their manuscript are included in the abstract as well as the body of the paper. For other manuscripts (e.g., Commentaries, Editorials and Special Communications), include a conventional, unstructured abstract of no more than 250 words.

## Keywords

All abstracts must include provide 3 to 5 Keywords identified by the author. Keywords must be selected from the US National Library of Medicine's (NLM) *Medical Subject Headings*, which is available at <http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MBrowser.html>.

## Abbreviations

*Archives'* editorial policy is to **minimize the use of abbreviations**. Fewer abbreviations make it easier for the multidisciplinary readership to follow the text. Authors should include a list of abbreviations in their manuscript file directly following the keywords (just above the introduction). *Archives* uses only standard abbreviations with Davis's and Dorland's as our guides. Abbreviations that are used only in tables, appendices, or figures are not included in the list and should be defined in the table, appendix, or figure legend. However, abbreviations that are in the list need not be re-defined in a table footnote or figure legend. All abbreviation lists **must** be alphabetized. All abbreviations must be defined upon first mention in the body of the manuscript. The abbreviations SD (standard deviation) and SE (standard error) require no definition in *Archives*.

## Results

When data are summarized in the Results section, specify the statistical methods used to analyze them. Describe the success of any blinding of observations. Report treatment complications. Give numbers of observations. Report losses to observation (ie, dropouts from a clinical trial). Present results in logical sequence in the text, tables, and illustrations. *Archives* aims to publish no more than 5 figures per manuscript so restrict tables and figures to those needed to explain arguments and to assess their support. Use graphs as an alternative to tables with many entries; do not duplicate data in graphs and tables. Do not repeat in the text all the data in the tables, illustrations, or both; emphasize or summarize only important observations.

While there may be occasional exceptions, *Archives* is committed to the need for clinical trial reports to be accompanied by adequate periods of follow-up. A lack of sufficient follow-up may be detrimental to a paper's acceptance.

## Discussion

Emphasize the new and important aspects of the study and the conclusions that follow from them. Do not repeat in detail data or other material given in the introduction or the Results section. Include in the Discussion section the implications of the findings and their limitations, including implications for future research. Authors should address the issue of effect magnitude, in terms of both the statistics reported and the implications of the research. Relate the observations to other relevant studies.

## Study Limitations

Include the subsection (Level 2 heading), "Study Limitations" to discuss the limitations of the study.

## Conclusions

Link the conclusions with the study's goals but avoid unqualified statements not supported by the data. Avoid claiming priority and alluding to work that is incomplete. State new hypotheses when warranted, but clearly label them as such. Recommendations, when appropriate, may be included.

## Graphical abstract

Although a graphical abstract is optional, its use is encouraged as it draws more attention to the online article. The graphical abstract should summarize the contents of the article in a concise, pictorial form designed to capture the attention of a wide readership. Graphical abstracts should be submitted as a separate file in the online submission system. Image size: Please provide an image with a minimum of 531 × 1328 pixels (h × w) or proportionally more. The image should be readable at a size of 5 × 13 cm using a regular screen resolution of 96 dpi. Preferred file types: TIFF, EPS, PDF or MS Office files. You can view [Example Graphical Abstracts](#) on our information site.

Authors can make use of Elsevier's Illustration and Enhancement service to ensure the best presentation of their images and in accordance with all technical requirements: [Illustration Service](#).

## Highlights

Highlights are a short collection of bullet points that convey the core findings of the article. Highlights are optional and should be submitted in a separate editable file in the online submission system. Please use 'Highlights' in the file name and include 3 to 5 bullet points (maximum 85 characters, including spaces, per bullet point). You can view [example Highlights](#) on our information site.

## Main Manuscript

### Introduction

State the purpose of the article. Summarize the rationale for the study or observation. Give only pertinent references, and do not review the subject extensively. Do not include data or conclusions from the work being reported. Do not include a heading for this section.

### Methods

Describe the selection of the observational or experimental subjects (patients or experimental animals, including controls) clearly. Discuss eligibility of experimental subjects. Give details about randomization. Describe the methods for any blinding of observations. Identify the methods, equipment and materials, and procedures in sufficient detail to allow others to reproduce the results. Reference established methods, including statistical methods (see below); provide very brief descriptions for methods that have been published but are not well known; describe new or substantially modified methods, give reasons for using them, and evaluate their limitations. Identify precisely all drugs and chemicals used, including generic name(s), dose(s), and route(s) of administration.

While there may be occasional exceptions, *Archives* is committed to the need for clinical trial reports to be accompanied by adequate periods of follow-up. A lack of sufficient follow-up may be detrimental to a paper's acceptance.

When reporting work with human subjects, indicate whether the procedures followed protocol and accord with the ethical standards of the responsible institutional review board, ethics committee or with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2013, as appropriate for the country where the research took place.<sup>2</sup>

Do not use patients' names, initials, or hospital numbers, especially in any illustrative material. When reporting experiments on animals, indicate whether the procedures followed accord with the institution's committee on animal experimentation or with the National Research Council's guide on the care and use of laboratory animals. *Archives* may require authors to verify the above procedures.

Describe statistical methods in enough detail to enable knowledgeable readers with access to the original data to verify the reported results. When possible, quantify findings and present them with appropriate indicators of measurement error or uncertainty (eg, confidence intervals [CIs]). Avoid sole reliance on statistical hypothesis testing, such as *P* values, which fails to convey important quantitative information.

Researchers should report and identify the specific statistical test used and the obtained statistical value. Researchers should supplement the results of any statistical value. Researchers should supplement the results of any statistical significance test with the use of effect size values or CIs. Measures of effect size or CIs should be routinely included in quantitative clinical trials reported in rehabilitation research. The statistical power values and the corresponding type II error probability should always be reported for statistically nonsignificant results.

The investigator should ensure that there is sufficient power to detect, as statistically significant, a clinically meaningful treatment effect of an *a priori* specified size<sup>4</sup>. References for study design and statistical methods should be to standard works (with pages stated) rather than to papers in which designs or methods were originally reported.

Specify any general use computer programs used. Avoid nontechnical uses of technical terms in statistics, such as "random" (which implies a randomizing device), "normal," "significant," "correlation," or "sample." Define statistical terms, abbreviations, and symbols.

When submitting manuscripts on randomized controlled trials (RCTs), authors must include the CONSORT (Consolidated Standards for Reporting Trials) flow diagram. See the [Reporting Guidelines](#).



#### Figure legends

A list of figure legends should be provided after the reference list, listing each figure in order by number. Legends/captions should not be embedded in the figure files themselves.

#### Figure captions

Ensure that each illustration has a caption. A caption should comprise a brief title (**not** on the figure itself) and a description of the illustration. Keep text in the illustrations themselves to a minimum but explain all symbols and abbreviations used.

#### Tables

Submit each table as a separate file. Accepted file formats are PDF and Word (Please do not upload Excel files). If needed, Excel files will be requested from the authors upon a final editorial decision of accept. Number tables consecutively in the order of their first citation in the text. Include a brief title for each table, include a short or abbreviated heading for each column. Place explanatory matter in footnotes, not in the title or column headings. Explain in footnotes all nonstandard abbreviations that are used in each table. For footnotes, use the following symbols, in this sequence: \*, †, ‡, §, ||, ¶, #, \*\*, ††, ‡‡

Identify statistical measures of variations such as standard deviation and standard error of the mean. Do not use internal horizontal and vertical rules. Be sure that each table is cited in the text in order. Using too many tables in relation to the length of the text may produce typesetting difficulties.

Data from another published or unpublished source may only be used with permission and must be acknowledged fully. It is the author's responsibility to obtain such permission.

#### Supplementary data

*Archives* accepts electronic supplementary material to support and enhance your scientific research. Supplementary files offer the author additional possibilities to publish supporting applications, high-resolution images, background datasets, sound clips, and more. Supplementary files supplied will be published online alongside the electronic version of your article in Elsevier Web products, including ScienceDirect: ☐ <http://www.sciencedirect.com>.

#### Suppliers

Before the References section, provide a Suppliers list with contact information (names and complete mailing addresses) for manufacturers of devices and other non-drug products used directly in a study (ie, do not provide such information for products not directly used in your research but mentioned in studies you cite). Identify equipment and/or materials in text, tables, and legends by superscript lower case letters. List suppliers consecutively in the order they are mentioned in the text.

Manufacturer names and locations should **not** be listed in the text where the product is introduced. Do not list Suppliers in the References list. Do not list drug manufacturers in the Suppliers list.

#### References

References in manuscripts accepted by *Archives* shall include only material that is retrievable through standard literature searches. Number references consecutively in the order in which they first appear in the text. Identify references in text, tables, and legends by superscript Arabic numerals. References cited only in tables or in legends to figures should be numbered in accordance with a sequence established by the first identification in the text of the particular table or figure.

Try to avoid using abstracts as references; "unpublished observations" and "personal communications" may not be used as references, although references to written, not oral, communications may be inserted (in parentheses) in the text. Avoid "personal communication" unless it provides essential information not available from a public source. In this case, cite the name of the person and date of communication in parentheses in the text. For scientific articles, authors should obtain written permission and confirmation of accuracy from the source of personal communication.

Include among the references those papers **accepted** but not yet published; designate the journal and add "In press." Authors must obtain written permission to cite such papers as well as verification that they have been accepted for publication. Editors will request from the author(s) a copy of the letter from the journal accepting the "in press" article if the manuscript in which it is cited is accepted by *Archives*. Information from manuscripts **submitted** but not yet accepted should be cited in the text as "(unpublished observations)" with written permission from the source.

The references must be verified by the author(s) against the original documents. List all authors and/or editors for each reference, up to 6 authors. If there are 7 or more authors, truncate the list to the first 3 names and add "et al."

#### Citations in the running text

Number references consecutively in the order in which they first appear in the text. Identify references in text, tables, and legends by superscript Arabic numerals. References cited only in tables or in legends to figures should be numbered in accordance with a sequence established by the first identification in the text of the particular table or figure.

#### Data references

This journal encourages you to cite underlying or relevant datasets in your manuscript by citing them in your text and including a data reference in your Reference List. Data references should include the following elements: author name(s), dataset title, data repository, version (where available), year, and global persistent identifier. Add [dataset] immediately before the reference so we can properly identify it as a data reference. The [dataset] identifier will not appear in your published article.

#### Reference management software

Most Elsevier journals have a standard template available in key reference management packages. This covers packages using the Citation Style Language, such as Mendeley (☐ <http://www.mendeley.com/features/reference-manager>) and also others like EndNote (☐ <http://www.endnote.com/support/enstyles.asp>) and Reference Manager (☐ <http://refman.com/downloads/styles>). Using plug-ins to word processing packages which are available from the above sites, authors only need to select the appropriate journal template when preparing their article and the list of references and citations to these will be formatted according to the journal style as described in this Guide. The process of including templates in these packages is constantly ongoing. If the journal you are looking for does not have a template available yet, please see the list of sample references and citations provided in this Guide to help you format these according to the journal style.

#### Reference formatting

There are no strict requirements on reference formatting at submission. References can be in any style or format as long as the style is consistent. Where applicable, author(s) name(s), journal title/book title, chapter title/article title, year of publication, volume number/book chapter and the pagination must be present. Use of DOI is highly encouraged. The reference style used by the journal will be applied to the accepted article by Elsevier at the proof stage. Note that missing data will be highlighted at proof stage for the author to correct. If you do wish to format the references yourself they should be arranged according to the following examples:

#### Reference style

**Text:** Indicate references by (consecutive) superscript Arabic numerals in the order in which they appear in the text. The numerals are to be used *outside* periods and commas, *inside* colons and semicolons. For further detail and examples you are referred to the AMA Manual of Style, A Guide for Authors and Editors, Tenth Edition, ISBN 0-978-0-19-517633-9 (see <http://www.amanualofstyle.com>).  
**List:** Number the references in the list in the order in which they appear in the text. Click [here](#) for examples of correct reference formats.

#### Journal abbreviations in references

The titles of journals should be abbreviated according to the style used in *MEDLINE*. Consult *List of Serials Indexed for Online Users*, which is available from the NLM at <http://www.nlm.nih.gov/tsd/serials/tsiou.html>.

#### AudioSlides

The journal encourages authors to create an AudioSlides presentation with their published article. AudioSlides are brief, webinar-style presentations that are shown next to the online article on ScienceDirect. This gives authors the opportunity to summarize their research in their own words and to help readers understand what the paper is about. [More information and examples are available](#). Authors of this journal will automatically receive an invitation e-mail to create an AudioSlides presentation after acceptance of their paper.

#### Submission checklist

*Archives* requires the completion and upload of a checklist with each manuscript. Please follow the instructions on the checklist, which can be downloaded [here](#), to ensure all required manuscript elements are included with your submission. Please note that this submission checklist is NOT the same as a reporting guideline checklist or form noted above. This is a separate item specific to the *Archives*.

For any further information please visit our customer support site at <http://support.elsevier.com>.

## **List of Abbreviations**

**A:** Adequate

**C:** Control group

**CI:** Confidence interval

**E:** Experimental group

**f:** female

**FACETS:** Fatigue: Applying Cognitive behavioural and Energy effectiveness  
Techniques to Lifestyle

**FIS:** Fatigue Impact Scale

**GFS:** Global fatigue severity

**ITT:** Intention-to-treat

**LOCF:** Last-observation-carried-forward

**m:** male

**M:** Mean

**MFIS:** Modified Fatigue Impact Scale

**MS:** Multiple Sclerosis

**MSFSES:** Multiple Sclerosis Fatigue Self-Efficacy Scale

**MSSS:** Multiple Sclerosis Self-efficacy Scale

**n:** Number of participants

**RCT:** Randomised controlled trial

**S:** Strong

**SD:** Standard deviation

**SE:** Standard error

**SEG:** Self-Efficacy Gauge

**SEQ:** Self-Efficacy Questionnaire

**SEPECS:** Self-Efficacy for Performing Energy Conservation Strategies Assessment

**W:** Weak

## Abstract

**Objective:** To investigate whether fatigue management interventions, based upon energy conservation strategies, increase self-efficacy in people with Multiple Sclerosis experiencing fatigue.

**Data Sources:** The Web of Science, PubMed, and PsycInfo databases were searched to identify relevant randomised controlled trials and single group design studies. The search was filtered to include English language articles only, and restricted to publications post-1950. An ancestral search was also conducted. The search identified a total of 75 articles.

**Study Selection:** Inclusion criteria included quantitative experimental designs assessing both fatigue and self-efficacy pre- and post- a non-pharmacological intervention based upon energy conservation strategies. The first author reviewed the article's title and abstract to determine whether the criteria for inclusion were met.

**Data Extraction:** The first author extracted the relevant data and assessed the methodological quality of the studies, included in the meta-analysis, using the Evaluative method.

**Data Synthesis:** Of the initial 75 studies, 9 were included in the review ( $n = 587$ ). Two studies were assessed to have weak quality, five studies demonstrated adequate quality, and two studies were of strong quality. Meta-analyses revealed a medium effect of energy conservation interventions in reducing fatigue; pooled effect size of  $-0.39$  (95% CI,  $-0.54$  to  $-0.25$ ,  $p = .001$ ), and a large effect of energy conservation interventions in enhancing self-efficacy; with a pooled effect size of  $0.53$  (95% CI,

0.15 to 0.9,  $p = .01$ ).

**Conclusions:** The findings from this systematic review suggest that energy conservation interventions are effective at increasing self-efficacy in people with Multiple Sclerosis, as well as reducing the impact of fatigue. Future research may wish to examine whether increased self-efficacy is maintained at follow-up.

**Key Words:** Meta-analysis, self-efficacy, fatigue, Multiple Sclerosis.

Multiple Sclerosis (MS) is a disease of the central nervous system causing inflammation, demyelination and destruction of axons within the brain and spinal cord. It is the most common neurological condition affecting young adults, with a typical onset between 20-40 years of age<sup>1</sup>. The disease presents as either relapsing-remitting or progressive in nature; however often involves an accumulation of neurological deficits over time, resulting in cognitive and behavioural difficulties<sup>2</sup>. Symptomology varies depending upon the lesion site affected; yet common symptoms include weakness, stiffness, alterations in sensation(s), visual problems, difficulties with co-ordination, bladder and bowel difficulties, sexual dysfunction, and cognitive changes<sup>2</sup>. One of the most common complaints is fatigue, with studies indicating that fatigue is experienced by 75-95% of people with Multiple Sclerosis<sup>3</sup>. The Multiple Sclerosis Council Clinical Practice Guidelines<sup>3</sup> (1998) defines fatigue as:

*‘A subjective lack of physical and/or mental energy that is perceived by the individual or caregiver to interfere with usual and desired activities’.*

The cause of fatigue in Multiple Sclerosis is often characterised into primary and secondary disease processes. Primary fatigue refers to changes in the brain which are hypothesised to directly cause fatigue such as demyelination and axonal loss, functional changes, and immunological factors during an ‘attack’ or relapse<sup>4</sup>. Secondary fatigue however, refers to non-direct processes. For example, fatigue due to sleep disturbance, reduced physical activity, depression, pain, medication side effects, and psychological processes such as self-efficacy<sup>4</sup>.

Fatigue in Multiple Sclerosis, 1) inhibits sustained physical functioning, 2) is exacerbated by heat, 3) impacts upon physical functioning, 4) 'comes on easily', 5) impacts upon the individuals ability to meet their everyday responsibilities, and 6) results in 'problems' for the individual on a regular basis<sup>5</sup>. Research has demonstrated that fatigue in Multiple Sclerosis is associated with quality of life; Individuals who experience fatigue are more likely to experience depression and to report a lower quality of life<sup>6</sup>, even when levels of depression and disability are controlled for<sup>7</sup>.

Clinical guidelines for the management of fatigue in adults with Multiple Sclerosis include both pharmacological and non-pharmacological intervention<sup>8</sup>. With regard to pharmacological treatment, the National Institute for Clinical Excellence<sup>8</sup> (2014) recommends the use of Amantadine. A recent meta-analysis included seven pharmacological trials (including the use of Amantadine and Modafinil), and reported a pooled effect size in treating fatigue to be 0.07 (95% CI, -0.22 - 0.37,  $p = .63$ )<sup>9</sup>. Non-pharmacological interventions are also recommended within clinical practice guidelines, and include mindfulness based training, Cognitive-Behavioural Therapy, and fatigue management<sup>8</sup>. Aerobic, balance, and stretching exercises may also be advised<sup>8</sup>. Comparable with pharmacological treatments, research reports non-pharmacological treatments (i.e., exercise and educational interventions) to be more effective at treating fatigue<sup>9</sup>.

Fatigue management interventions have been delivered via individual telephone sessions<sup>10</sup>, group based teleconference<sup>11,12</sup>, group-format community settings<sup>1,13-19</sup>, and via online groups<sup>20</sup>.



One of the most common non-pharmacological fatigue management treatments includes energy effectiveness or energy conservation strategies, defined as: ‘the identification and development of activity modifications to reduce fatigue through a systematic analysis of daily work, home, and leisure activities in all relevant environments’<sup>3</sup>. Energy conservation strategies may include reorganising the individual’s environment, using aids and assistive technologies, revisiting and re-prioritising activities, asserting one’s own needs with others and re-distributing activities and tasks accordingly, altering activities to reduce energy consumption, and ensuring adequate rest<sup>21</sup>.

A meta-analysis published in 2013 found energy conservation treatments were more effective than no treatment (i.e., waiting list controls) in reducing the impact of fatigue (as assessed via self-report), and in improving quality of life for people with Multiple Sclerosis<sup>21</sup>. Furthermore, immediate benefits of participation in energy conservation treatments, including reduced impact of fatigue and an improved quality of life, are maintained at 12 months post intervention<sup>22</sup>.

Engaging in any new behaviours, including energy conservation behaviours, is related to cognitive and psychological processes. One of the processes theorised to be involved in the initiation and maintenance of new behaviours is self-efficacy. Grounded in social-cognitive theory, self-efficacy refers to the degree to which an individual believes that they are able to perform a task in order to produce a desired outcome<sup>23</sup>. It determines whether an individual engages in coping behaviours, the amount of effort that they will apply, and the length of time that the individual will continue to apply this effort when they experience difficulties or problems<sup>23</sup>. The

stronger the individual's self-efficacy expectation, the more active are their coping efforts<sup>24</sup>.

Self-efficacy has been associated with other treatments in Multiple Sclerosis. For example, previous research found that pre-treatment self-efficacy was associated with adherence to self-administered intramuscular injections at six-month follow up<sup>25</sup>, and adherence to an exercise programme<sup>26</sup>. Further research has also found that self-efficacy is associated with physical activity, i.e., individuals with high self-efficacy for exercise are more likely to engage in physical activity<sup>27</sup>.

Self-efficacy is also an important concept in fatigue management treatments such as energy conservation, as an individual can be 'taught' self-management strategies, but if the individual is unsure about whether they have the ability to perform such strategies, then they are unlikely to apply the strategies that they have learnt<sup>23</sup>.

Increased self-efficacy following energy conservations treatments therefore may account for changes in energy conservation behaviours post intervention<sup>18</sup>. However, no studies to date have systematically reviewed the current evidence base to determine whether non-pharmacological interventions based on energy conservation strategies increase self-efficacy in people with Multiple Sclerosis.

The aims of this study are two-fold: Firstly, to re-examine the current evidence base to determine whether energy conservation strategies reduce negative fatigue outcomes (i.e., fatigue impact or severity) in people with Multiple Sclerosis. Secondly, to investigate whether interventions, based upon energy conservation principles, increase self-efficacy for individuals with Multiple Sclerosis experiencing fatigue. Both aims

will be addressed by using meta-analyses to produce an overall effect size for both fatigue and self-efficacy following energy conservation treatments.

## **Methods**

### **Search Strategy**

A systematic search of the literature was conducted in April 2017. The Web of Science, PubMed, and PsycInfo databases were searched using the following search terms: (“energy manag\*” OR “energy conserv\*” OR “energy sav\*” OR “fatigue manag\*” OR “managing fatigue”) AND “multiple sclerosis” AND (“self efficacy” OR “self-efficacy”). The search was filtered to include English language articles only, and restricted to publications post-1950. An ancestral search was also conducted.

### **Inclusion and eligibility criteria**

The criteria for inclusion in the meta-analysis included:

*Study design:* Experimental, quantitative designs. Qualitative designed studies were excluded.

*Participants:* Adults (aged  $\geq 18$  years) with a diagnosis of Multiple Sclerosis, with no restrictions as to gender, diagnostic subtype, or duration of the disease. Studies that included other neurological conditions met inclusion criteria if they reported separate data for the Multiple Sclerosis sample.

*Intervention:* Studies must have included a non-pharmacological intervention based upon energy conservation principles. Studies were required to meet the following definition of energy conservation strategies as described by the Multiple Sclerosis Clinical Council: ‘the identification and development of activity modifications to

reduce fatigue through a systematic analysis of daily work, home, and leisure activities in all relevant environments<sup>3</sup>. Fatigue management interventions based upon cognitive behavioural therapy were excluded. Studies including pharmacological treatments only were excluded.

*Outcome measures:* Studies were required to have used pre- and post- intervention measures to assess both fatigue, such as the Fatigue Impact Scale<sup>28</sup>, and self-efficacy, such as the Multiple Sclerosis Self-Efficacy Scale<sup>29</sup>.

### **Study selection**

The first author initially screened article abstracts, and articles were excluded if the topic was not relevant to the meta-analysis. Full text articles were then assessed for eligibility.

### **Data extraction**

Information detailing the demographics of the sample, the intervention, the control condition (if present), and outcome measures were obtained from each of the studies. As the length of follow-up varied greatly between studies, we used the data for the time period immediately post intervention. To ensure consistency, where data from both intention-to-treat (ITT) and compliers analyses were reported, data from the ITT analyses were used. Where articles did not report the mean and standard deviation for the total Fatigue Impact Scale<sup>28</sup>, an average score was taken from the three subscales and incorporated into the analysis. In instances where the published article did not report raw data, the first author was contacted via e-mail to request this information.

## **Measurement of research quality**

The methodological quality of the studies included in the meta-analysis was assessed using the Evaluative method for evaluating and determining evidence-based practices<sup>30, 31</sup>. This method has demonstrated good psychometric properties<sup>31</sup> and has been deemed a suitable instrument for the appraisal of experimental research designs<sup>32</sup>.

Each study was initially reviewed and evaluated against a set of primary quality indicators, e.g., description of the independent variable (intervention) provided with ‘replicable precision’. Studies were awarded a quality rating of high (H), acceptable (A), or unacceptable (U). Secondly, each study was reviewed against a set of secondary quality indicators, e.g., treatment fidelity and attrition. These secondary quality indicators were rated dichotomously as either the study demonstrated or did not demonstrate evidence of each of the indicators. Finally, the overall strength of the research article was determined by synthesising the ratings from the appraisal of both the primary and secondary quality indicators. Each study was awarded an overall strength of strong (S), adequate (A), or weak (W).

## **Data analysis**

The Metafor package<sup>33</sup> for R<sup>34</sup> was used to conduct all statistical analyses. Initially, the effect size for each study was calculated using the mean and standard deviation. For studies that reported the mean and standard error only, the standard error was transformed into the standard deviation using the equation:  $SD = SE \times (\sqrt{n})$ , allowing

for an effect size to be calculated. Where no raw data was available, the effect size stated in the article was added to the model in Metafor.

Once an effect size had been calculated for each study, an overall effect size was calculated using a random-effects model. Using Cohen's (1988)<sup>35</sup> guidelines, effect sizes were interpreted as either small ( $r = 0.10$ ), medium ( $r = 0.30$ ), or large ( $r = 0.50$ ).

## **Results**

### **Included studies**

Of the initial 75 articles identified, the first author reviewed the article's title and abstract to determine whether the criteria for inclusion were met. Ten articles were removed at this stage, as the topic was not relevant to the meta-analysis. Sixty-five full text-articles were then reviewed, and 10 were assessed as meeting the criteria for inclusion in the meta-analysis. One article did not provide either the raw data or effect sizes, and these were unable to be obtained from the corresponding author of the study. This article was therefore excluded. Figure 1. provides a diagrammatic summary of the study selection process.




Figure 1. PRISMA (2009) flow diagram of the literature search process

A total of nine studies ( $n = 587$ ) published between 2001 and 2016 were identified as meeting the criteria for inclusion in the meta-analysis. Three studies employed a single group design<sup>11,17,18</sup>, and five studies were randomised controlled trials (RCT)<sup>13-16,19,36</sup>. One article, Lamb et al. (2007)<sup>36</sup>, was a secondary data analysis from a previous RCT. Six studies included a comparison condition, these ranged from

waiting list control<sup>14</sup> and delayed treatment control<sup>15</sup>, to peer support groups<sup>13,18</sup>, current local practice<sup>19</sup>, and a placebo intervention which included the provision of general information such as car adaptations<sup>16</sup>. For five studies<sup>11,13,15,18,36</sup>, the original or a modified version of the “Managing Fatigue” energy conservation course developed by Packer et al. (1995)<sup>37</sup> was administered during the intervention phase. This was the most common treatment approach.

*Outcome measures.* The most commonly used measure of fatigue was the Fatigue Impact Scale<sup>28</sup> ( $n = 6/9$  studies, 67%), followed by the Modified Fatigue Impact Scale<sup>3</sup> ( $n = 2/9$ , 22%), and the Global Fatigue Severity subscale of the Fatigue Assessment Instrument<sup>38</sup> ( $n = 1/9$ , 11%). Where both the impact and severity of fatigue were measured, data from the Fatigue Impact Scale<sup>28</sup> or the Modified Fatigue Impact Scale<sup>3</sup> were used in an attempt to maintain consistency across studies.

Self-efficacy was assessed using four different measures. The Multiple Sclerosis Self-Efficacy Scale<sup>29</sup> ( $n = 4/9$  studies, 45%) and the Self-Efficacy for Performing Energy Conservation Strategies Scale<sup>39</sup> ( $n=3/9$ , 33%) were the most commonly used. Other measures included the Self-efficacy Gauge<sup>40</sup> ( $n = 1/9$ , 11%) and the Multiple Sclerosis Fatigue Self Efficacy Scale<sup>41</sup> ( $n = 1/9$ , 11%).

Table 1. provides a summary description of the studies included in the meta-analysis.



Table 1. *Summary descriptions of the studies included in the meta-analysis*

| <b>First Author (Year)</b>        | <b>Design</b> | <b><i>n</i></b> | <b>Follow-up</b> | <b>Age</b>                     | <b>Gender</b>            | <b>Intervention</b>  | <b>Control</b>       | <b>Outcomes (Pre-Post)</b>  | <b>Research Report Strength</b> |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| Finlayson (2005) <sup>11</sup>    | Single group  | 29              | 0                | 47 (9.6)                       | 5m, 24f                  | Modified “Managing Fatigue” by Packer (delivered via teleconference) | -                    | SEQ: 7.46(1.11) – 7.81 (1.37)<br>FIS Total: 124.83 (27.1) – 112.1 (29.78)   | W                               |
| García Jalón (2012) <sup>13</sup> | RCT           | E: 13<br>C: 10  | 3m               | E: 45.9 (9.9)<br>C: 52 (7)     | E: 3m, 10f<br>C: 4m, 6f  | Energy conservation programme by Packer                              | Peer support group   | Energy conservation group:<br>MSSS: 46(8.5) - 43.31(8.74)<br>FIS: 83.31(16.26) - 59.62(23.14)<br>Support Group:<br>MSSS: 49.9(7.5) - 43.5(8.44)<br>FIS: 80.9(21.73) - 63.3(26.03)   | A                               |
| Hugos (2010) <sup>14</sup>        | RCT           | E: 15<br>C: 15  | 13w              | E: 58.4 (7.7)<br>C: 55.4 (9.1) | E: 4m, 11f<br>C: 2m, 13f | “Take control” programme   | Wait-list control    | Week 1 to Week 5 <sup>+</sup><br>‘Take control’ group:<br>MSSS:1362.67(61.3) - 1391(61.3)<br>MFIS: 44(3.46) - 39.79(6.44)<br>Wait-list control group:<br>MSSS:1284.67(61.3)- 1318.57(63.45)<br>MFIS: 44.4(3.35) - 40.43(3.46) | A                               |
| Kos (2007) <sup>16</sup>          | RCT           | E: 28<br>C: 23  | 6m               | E: 42.9 (9.1)<br>C: 44.5 (9.9) | E: 8m, 20f<br>C: 8m, 15f | Multi-disciplinary fatigue management programme                      | Placebo intervention | Baseline to Week 35 (ITT group)<br>Fatigue management:<br>MFIS: 46.69(10.80) - 42.03(11.96)<br>MSSS (function subscale):  | A                               |

|                                    |                 |                |    |                                 |                            |  |                                       |   |   |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|----|---------------------------------|----------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|
|                                    |                 |                |    |                                 |                            |  |                                       | 694.31(155.37) - 689.4(135.95)<br>MSSS (control subscale):<br>516.08(185.18) - 577.57(165.98)   |   |
| Lamb<br>(2005) <sup>36</sup>       | RCT             | 43             | 0  | 48.4 (10)                       | 7m, 36f                    | “Managing fatigue”<br>programme by<br>Packer   | -                                     | FIS: 115.2(28.4) - 102.86(30.06)<br>SEPECSA: 7(2.06) - 8.11(1.27)   | A |
| Mathiowetz<br>(2005) <sup>15</sup> | RCT             | 169            | 6w | 48.34 (8.44)                    | 29m, 140f                  | Energy conservation<br>course by Packer  | Delayed<br>treatment<br>control       | (ITT LOCF Effect size)<br>FIS Cognitive subscale: 0.52<br>FIS Physical subscale: 0.74<br>FIS Social subscale: 0.69<br>SEPECSA: 1.82   | S |
| Mathiowetz<br>(2001) <sup>18</sup> | Single<br>group | 54             | 6w | 50 (31-74 <sup>#</sup> )        | 18m, 36f                   | Energy conservation<br>course by Packer  | Support<br>group                      | Energy conservation (week 7-13):<br>FIS: 66.4(26.5) - 55.8(29.7)<br>SEG: 206.1(40.4) - 214(35.8)<br>Support group (week 1-7):<br>FIS: 68.9(26.2) - 66.4(26.5)<br>SEG: 201.5(36.3) - 206.1(40.4) | A |
| Mulligan<br>(2016) <sup>17</sup>   | Single<br>group | 24             | 0  | 49.29 (8.12)                    | 0m, 24f                    | “Minimise Fatigue,<br>Maximise Life:<br>Creating balance<br>with Multiple<br>Sclerosis” (MFML)                     | -                                     | Time 2 - Time 3:<br>MFIS: 11.25(4.12) - 9.17(3.57)<br>MSSS: 34.75(12.79) - 43.3(11.85)  | W |
| Thomas<br>(2013) <sup>19</sup>     | RCT             | E: 84<br>C: 80 | 4m | E: 48.0 (10.2)<br>C: 50.1 (9.1) | E: 23m, 61f<br>C: 22m, 58f | “Fatigue: Applying<br>cognitive<br>behavioural and<br>energy effectiveness<br>techniques to<br>lifestyle (FACETS)” | Current<br>local<br>practice<br>(CLP) | FACETS group:<br>GFS: 5.6(.98) - 5.48(.92)<br>MSFSE: 45(17) - 57(17)<br>CLP group:<br>GFS: 5.61(1.09) - 5.55(1.17)<br>MSFSE: 49(16) - 50(17)  | S |

Note. All values are  $M$  ( $SD$ ) unless otherwise stated, <sup>+</sup> = Values in brackets are standard error, <sup>#</sup> = range.

Abbreviations: A, adequate; C, control group; E, experimental group; f, female; FIS, Fatigue Impact Scale; GFS, Global Fatigue Severity subscale of the Fatigue Assessment Inventory; m, male; MFIS, Modified Fatigue Impact Scale; MSFSES, MS Fatigue Self-efficacy Scale; MSSS, MS Self-efficacy Scale; RCT, Randomised Controlled Trial; S, Strong; SEG, Self-efficacy gauge; SEPECSA, Self-efficacy for performing energy conservation strategies assessment; SEQ, Self-efficacy Questionnaire; W, Weak.

### **Data extraction**

One study, by Mathiowetz et al. (2005)<sup>15</sup> reported ITT data using both the method of last-observation-carried-forward (LOCF) and using the maximum likelihood method. In this case, data from the LOCF method was used.

### **Measurement of research quality**

Using the Evaluative method<sup>30,31</sup>, two studies were assessed to be of weak quality, five were of adequate quality, and two studies were of strong quality. The research report strength for each study is detailed in Table 1.

### **Publication bias**

Although it was not possible to thoroughly assess for publication bias due to the limited number of studies included in the analysis, a visual review of the funnel plots did not reveal any obvious positive bias (see appendix).

### **Effectiveness of energy conservation treatments**

Effect sizes for fatigue outcomes post-intervention ranged from -0.01 to -0.65. The pooled effect size was -0.39 (95% CI, -0.54 to -0.25,  $p = .001$ ), which equates to a medium effect size. The test for heterogeneity was significant ( $Q = 24.09$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $I^2 = 62.25\%$ ). Figure 2. demonstrates the effect size for each individual study and the overall effect size for fatigue.




Figure 2. Forest plot for fatigue outcomes.

### Self-efficacy

Effect sizes for self-efficacy outcomes post-intervention ranged from -0.02 to 1.82.

The pooled effect size was 0.53 (95% CI, 0.15 to 0.9,  $p = .01$ ), equating to a large

effect size. The test for heterogeneity was significant ( $Q = 347.61$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $I^2 =$

95.41%). Figure 3. details the effect size for each study and the overall effect size for self-efficacy.




Figure 3. Forest plot for self-efficacy outcomes.

## Discussion

The aim of this study was to systematically review the effectiveness of energy conservation interventions in reducing fatigue and increasing self-efficacy in people with Multiple Sclerosis, and to use meta-analysis to produce an overall effect size for both fatigue and self-efficacy.

### *Effectiveness on fatigue*

With regard to fatigue, the meta-analysis revealed that fatigue management interventions which incorporate energy conservation strategies, are moderately effective at reducing the impact or severity of fatigue when compared to no treatment

(i.e., wait-list control), a placebo intervention, or alternative support. These findings support previous research that also reported energy conservation strategies to be effective at reducing fatigue <sup>21</sup>.

### *Effectiveness on Self-Efficacy*

The main aim of this study however was to determine whether energy conservation strategies are effective at enhancing self-efficacy in people with Multiple Sclerosis experiencing fatigue. Results from the meta-analysis showed that energy conservation interventions do increase self-efficacy, with a large effect.

The current literature base suggests that self-efficacy is an important psychological construct in Multiple Sclerosis. Although self-efficacy is unlikely to be the sole determinant of engagement in energy conservation strategies, it is highly likely to influence the initiation of such behaviours, and the quantity of both time and effort an individual will expend in these behaviours<sup>23</sup>. Interventions that increase self-efficacy may therefore increase the likelihood than an individual will utilise energy conservation strategies. Furthermore, an increased self-efficacy for fatigue management may generalise to other behaviours that were previously limited due to the individual's lack of efficacy expectations<sup>23</sup>. Fatigue management strategies that increase self-efficacy may therefore have positive consequences on other health outcomes in addition to reducing the impact of fatigue.

### *Study limitations*

This meta-analysis included a relatively small sample of 9 studies, including 587 people with Multiple Sclerosis, and therefore the findings should be interpreted with

some caution. There was also some variation in the methodological quality of the studies included in this meta-analysis. Whilst, the majority of studies were assessed as being of adequate or strong quality, some studies were of weak methodological quality. This was typically due to the lack of an appropriate control condition. Some caution may be required in interpreting the findings of this study due to the overall quality of the studies included in the meta-analysis. The literature base would therefore also benefit from future high quality randomised controlled clinical trials.

In this study, the effectiveness of energy conservation strategies in reducing fatigue and increasing self-efficacy was assessed using data collected immediately post-intervention. The findings from this paper therefore are limited to the short-term effects of energy conservation interventions, and it is not possible to conclude whether these findings would be maintained over time. Although, previous studies have found a reduction in fatigue, following participation in energy conservation treatments, to be maintained one year post-intervention<sup>22</sup>. It is possible that reductions in fatigue impact may be due to a sustained increase in self-efficacy for performing energy conservation strategies; however further research is required to investigate this hypothesis.

#### *Future research*

This study found energy conservation interventions reduce fatigue impact and increase self-efficacy. However, it is not clear as to the relationship between these two variables. Future research may wish to incorporate a mediational analysis to determine whether the increase in self-efficacy indirectly accounts for the reduction in fatigue impact, by increasing the uptake of energy conservation strategies.



This meta-analysis incorporated studies in which energy conservation interventions were delivered via a number of different modalities including community groups and teleconference. In addition, there was some variation in the fatigue management approaches used, including programmes based on Packer<sup>37</sup> and the group-based fatigue management programme (FACETS). In this study, the test for heterogeneity was significant for fatigue and self-efficacy outcomes, indicating varying effectiveness across studies. This may be due to differences in treatment modality, treatment approaches, or other variables. Therefore an interesting focus of future research may be in examining what variables account for differences in effectiveness. This may guide future service development and clinical work to ensure people with Multiple Sclerosis experiencing fatigue are offered the most effective treatment.

Finally, the number of studies included in the meta-analysis was limited, as some studies examining the effectiveness of energy conservation treatments did not include a measure of self-efficacy. Future research studies should therefore incorporate a measure of self-efficacy.

### **Conclusions**

This study is the first to systematically review the literature and to use meta-analysis to determine whether energy conservations interventions increase self-efficacy in people with Multiple Sclerosis. The results suggest that energy conservations interventions may be more effective than either no treatment or general support in increasing self-efficacy in the short-term. Future research may wish to consider whether the increase in self-efficacy is maintained over time.

## References

1. Barlow, J., Turner, A., Edwards, R., & Gilchrist, M. (2009). A randomised controlled trial of lay-led self-management for people with Multiple Sclerosis. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 77(1), 81-89. doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2009.02.009
2. Lezak, M.D., Howieson, D.B., Bigler, E.R., & Tranel, D. (2012). *Neuropsychological assessment*. New York: Oxford University Press.
3. Multiple Sclerosis Council for Clinical Practice Guidelines. (1998). *Fatigue and Multiple Sclerosis: Evidence-Based Management Strategies for Fatigue in Multiple Sclerosis*. Paralyzed Veterans of America on-line publication. Retrieved from <http://www.kintera.org/AccountTempFiles/Account403152/ECSofMS-FatigueCPG.pdf>
4. Kos, D., Kerckhofs, E., Nagels, G., D'hooghe, M. B., & Ilsbrouckx, S. (2008). Origin of fatigue in Multiple Sclerosis: Review of the literature. *Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair*, 22(1), 91-100. doi: 10.1177/1545968306298934
5. Krupp, L. B., Alvarez, L. A., LaRocca, N. G., & Scheinberg, L. C. (1988). Fatigue in Multiple Sclerosis. *Archives of Neurology*, 45(4), 435-437.
6. Pittion-Vouyovitch, S., Debouverie, M., Guillemin, F., Vandenberghe, N., Anxionnat, R., & Vespignani, H. (2006). Fatigue in Multiple Sclerosis is related to disability, depression and quality of life. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences*, 243(1), 39-45. doi:10.1016/j.jns.2005.11.025

7. Janardhan, V., & Bakshi, R. (2002). Quality of life in patients with Multiple Sclerosis: The impact of fatigue and depression. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences*, 205(1), 51-58. doi: 10.1016/S0022-510X(02)00312-X
8. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. (2014). *Multiple Sclerosis in adults: Management*. Retrieved from <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg186/resources/multiple-sclerosis-in-adults-management-pdf-35109816059077>
9. Asano, M., & Finlayson, M. L. (2014). Meta-analysis of three different types of fatigue management interventions for people with Multiple Sclerosis: Exercise, education, and medication. *Multiple Sclerosis International* (Article ID 798285). doi: 10.1155/2014/798285
10. Ehde, D. M., Elzea, J. L., Verrall, A. M., Gibbons, L. E., Smith, A. E., & Amtmann, D. (2015). Efficacy of a telephone-delivered self-management intervention for persons with Multiple Sclerosis: A randomized controlled trial with a one-year follow-up. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 96(11), 1945-1958. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2015.07.015
11. Finlayson, M. (2005). Pilot study of an energy conservation education program delivered by telephone conference call to people with Multiple Sclerosis. *NeuroRehabilitation*, 20(4), 267-277.
12. Finlayson, M., Preissner, K., Cho, C., & Plow, M. (2011). Randomized trial of a teleconference-delivered fatigue management program for people with Multiple Sclerosis. *Multiple Sclerosis Journal*, 17(9), 1130-1140. doi: 10.1177/1352458511404272
13. García Jalón, E. G., Lennon, S., Peoples, L., Murphy, S., & Lowe-Strong, A. (2013). Energy conservation for fatigue management in Multiple Sclerosis: A

- pilot randomized controlled trial. *Clinical rehabilitation*, 27(1), 63-74. doi: 10.1177/0269215512446495
14. Hugos, C. L., Copperman, L. F., Fuller, B. E., Yadav, V., Lovera, J., & Bourdette, D. N. (2010). Clinical trial of a formal group fatigue program in Multiple Sclerosis. *Multiple Sclerosis*. doi: 10.1177/1352458510364536
  15. Mathiowetz, V. G., Finlayson, M. L., Matuska, K. M., Chen, H. Y., & Luo, P. (2005). Randomized controlled trial of an energy conservation course for persons with Multiple Sclerosis. *Multiple Sclerosis*, 11(5), 592-601. doi: 10.1191/1352458505ms1198oa
  16. Kos, D., Duportail, M., D'hooghe, M. B., Nagels, G., & Kerckhofs, E. (2007). Multidisciplinary fatigue management programme in Multiple Sclerosis: A randomized clinical trial. *Multiple Sclerosis Journal*, 13(8), 996-1003. doi: 10.1177/1352458507078392
  17. Mulligan, H., Wilkinson, A., Barclay, A., Whiting, H., Heynike, C., & Snowdon, J. (2016). Evaluation of a Fatigue Self-Management Program for People with Multiple Sclerosis. *International Journal of MS Care*, 18(3), 116-121. doi: 10.7224/1537-2073.2015-019
  18. Mathiowetz, V., Matuska, K. M., & Murphy, M. E. (2001). Efficacy of an energy conservation course for persons with Multiple Sclerosis. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 82(4), 449-456. doi: 10.1053/apmr.2001.22192
  19. Thomas, S., Thomas, P. W., Kersten, P., Jones, R., Green, C., Nock, A., ... & Hillier, C. (2013). A pragmatic parallel arm multi-centre randomised controlled trial to assess the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of a group-based fatigue management programme (FACETS) for people with Multiple

- Sclerosis. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*, 84, 1092-1099.  
doi: 10.1136/jnnp-2012-303816
20. Ghahari, S., Leigh Packer, T., & Passmore, A. E. (2010). Effectiveness of an online fatigue self-management programme for people with chronic neurological conditions: A randomized controlled trial. *Clinical Rehabilitation*, 24(8), 727-744. doi: 10.1177/0269215509360648
  21. Blikman, L. J., Huisstede, B. M., Kooijmans, H., Stam, H. J., Bussmann, J. B., & van Meeteren, J. (2013). Effectiveness of energy conservation treatment in reducing fatigue in Multiple Sclerosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 94(7), 1360-1376. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2013.01.025
  22. Mathiowetz, V. G., Matuska, K. M., Finlayson, M. L., Luo, P., & Chen, H. Y. (2007). One-year follow-up to a randomized controlled trial of an energy conservation course for persons with Multiple Sclerosis. *International Journal of Rehabilitation Research*, 30(4), 305-313.
  23. Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
  24. Bandura, A., & Adams, N. E. (1977). Analysis of self-efficacy theory of behavioral change. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 1(4), 287-310.
  25. Mohr, D. C., Boudewyn, A. C., Likosky, W., Levine, E., & Goodkin, D. E. (2001). Injectable medication for the treatment of Multiple Sclerosis: The influence of self-efficacy expectations and infection anxiety on adherence and ability to self-inject. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 23(2), 125-132.
  26. McAuley, E., Motl, R. W., Morris, K. S., Hu, L., Doerksen, S. E., Elavsky, S., & Konopack, J. F. (2007). Enhancing physical activity adherence and well-

- being in Multiple Sclerosis: A randomised controlled trial. *Multiple Sclerosis*, 13, 652-659. doi: 10.1177/1352458506072188
27. Snook, E. M., & Motl, R. W. (2008). Physical activity behaviors in individuals with Multiple Sclerosis: Roles of overall and specific symptoms, and self-efficacy. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*, 36(1), 46-53. doi: 10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2007.09.007
  28. Fisk, J. D., Ritvo, P. G., Ross, L., Haase, D. A., Marrie, T. J., & Schlech, W. F. (1994). Measuring the functional impact of fatigue: Initial validation of the Fatigue Impact Scale. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 18 (Supplement 1), S79-S83.
  29. Schwartz, C. E., Coulthard-Morris, L., Zeng, Q., & Retzlaff, P. (1996). Measuring self-efficacy in people with Multiple Sclerosis: A validation study. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 77(4), 394-398.
  30. Reichow, B. (2011). Development, Procedures, and Application of the Evaluative Method for Determining Evidence-Based Practices in Autism. In Reichow, B., Doehring, P., Cicchetti, D.V., & Volkmar, F.R. (Eds.), *Evidence-Based Practices and Treatments for Children with Autism* (pp.25-40). New York: Springer.
  31. Reichow, B., Volkmar, F. R., & Cicchetti, D. V. (2008). Development of the evaluative method for evaluating and determining evidence-based practices in autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 38(7), 1311-1319. doi: 10.1007/s10803-007-0517-7
  32. Wendt, O., & Miller, B. (2012). Quality appraisal of single-subject experimental designs: An overview and comparison of different appraisal tools. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 35(2), 235-268.

33. Viechtbauer, W. (2010). Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 36(3), 1-48. Retrieved from <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v36/i03/>
34. R Core Team. (2016). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. *R Foundation for Statistical Computing*. Retrieved from <https://www.R-project.org/>.
35. Cohen, J. (1988) *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences*. New York: Academic Press.
36. Lamb, A. L., Finlayson, M., Mathiowetz, V., & Chen, H. Y. (2005). The outcomes of using self-study modules in energy conservation education for people with Multiple Sclerosis. *Clinical Rehabilitation*, 19(5), 475-481. doi: 10.1191/0269215505cr851oa
37. Packer TL, Brink N, Sauriol A. (1995). Managing fatigue: A six-week course for energy conservation. Tucson: Therapy Skill Builders.
38. Schwartz, J. E., Jandorf, L., & Krupp, L. B. (1993). The measurement of fatigue: A new instrument. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 37(7), 753-762.
39. Liepold, A., & Mathiowetz, V. (2005). Reliability and validity of the Self-Efficacy for Performing Energy Conservation Strategies Assessment for persons with Multiple Sclerosis. *Occupational Therapy International*, 12(4), 234-249. doi: 10.1002/oti.5
40. Gage, M., Noh, S., Polatajko, H. J., & Kaspar, V. (1994). Measuring perceived self-efficacy in occupational therapy. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 48(9), 783-790.

41. Thomas, S., Kersten, P., & Thomas, P. W. (2015). The Multiple Sclerosis-Fatigue Self-Efficacy (MS-FSE) scale: Initial validation. *Clinical Rehabilitation*, 29(4), 376-387. doi: 10.1177/0269215514543702



## **Chapter 2 – Empirical Paper**

**Investigating the role of objective cognitive functioning in the relationship between self-efficacy and perceived cognitive impairment in people with Multiple Sclerosis**

Laura Spencer, MSc<sup>1</sup>, Yvonne Copeland, BSc<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Craig Roberts, DClinPsy<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> North Wales Clinical Psychology Programme, School of Psychology, Bangor University, U.K

<sup>2</sup> Walton Centre, NHS Foundation Trust, Liverpool, U.K

<sup>3</sup> North Wales Brain Injury Service, Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board, U.K

**Address for correspondence:** Laura Spencer, North Wales Clinical Psychology Programme, School of Psychology, Brigantia Building, Bangor University, Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57 2DG. E-mail: Laura.Spencer@wales.nhs.uk

**Disclosures:** None

**Acknowledgements:** This paper is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for Doctorate in Clinical Psychology.

**Word Count:** 2974

---

This paper will be submitted to *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, and has therefore being formatted in accordance with this journal's guidelines. The submission guidelines are listed at the beginning of this chapter.

#### Types of papers

**Original Research:** Present new and important basic and clinical information, extend existing studies, or provide a new approach to a traditional subject. Manuscripts should be limited to 3000 words of text (Introduction through Conclusions). Figures, tables, and references should be limited to the number needed to clarify, amplify, or document the text.

**Review Articles (Meta-Analyses):** The Editorial Board welcomes state-of-the-art review articles. Manuscripts should be limited to 5000 words of text (Introduction through Conclusions), exclusive of references. The *Archives* strongly prefers systematic reviews of the literature.

#### NEW - Reporting Guidelines and Checklists

To ensure a high and consistent quality of research reporting, original research articles, including brief reports, must contain sufficient information to allow readers to understand how a study was designed and conducted. For review articles, systematic or narrative, readers should be informed of the rationale and details behind the literature search strategy.

To achieve this goal, *Archives* requires that authors upload a completed checklist for the appropriate reporting guideline during original submission. Taking the time to ensure your manuscript addresses basic reporting prerequisites will greatly improve your manuscript, and enhance the likelihood of publication. These checklists serve as a guide for the editors and reviewers as they evaluate your paper.

The EQUATOR Network (<http://www.equator-network.org>) is an excellent resource for key reporting guidelines, checklists, and flow diagrams. These guidelines should be especially useful for *Archives'* authors.

Click on the checklist that applies to your manuscript, download it to your computer, fill it out electronically, "save as," and upload it with your manuscript when you submit. Links to mandatory flow diagrams also are provided. Below are the most commonly used checklists but please note that the Equator Network provides many others (e.g. TRIPOD, SRQR, etc.) and it is up to the authors to select the one most appropriate for their study.

- Randomized Controlled Trials — [CONSORT](#) — Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials
- Observational Studies — [STROBE](#) — Strengthening the Reporting of Observational studies in Epidemiology
- Systematic Review of Controlled Trials — [PRISMA](#) — Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses
- Study of Diagnostic accuracy/assessment scale — [STARD](#) — Standards for the Reporting of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies
- For psychometric studies the editors recommend either the [COSMIN](#) or [GRRAS](#) guideline, though the final choice is up to the author.



## Preparation

Authors should prepare manuscripts according to the "Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals" <sup>1</sup> as developed by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. The Requirements are available at <http://www.icmje.org>.

### Document Formatting

Manuscripts must be double-spaced throughout, including the title page, abstract, text, acknowledgments, references, individual tables, and legends. Use only standard 12-point type and spacing. Use unjustified, flush-left margins. Number the pages of the text consecutively. Put the page number in the upper or lower right-hand corner of each page. Number each line on each page of the text to facilitate peer review.

Authors should format manuscripts for specific attributes such as italics, superscripts/subscripts, and Greek letters. **The coding scheme for each such element must be consistent throughout the file.**

**Text Style:** Enter only 1 space between words and sentences. Leave 1 blank line between paragraphs. Leave 2 blank lines between headings and text.

### Your Paper Your Way

As part of the Your Paper Your Way service, at initial submission you may choose to submit your new manuscript as a single file to be used in the refereeing process. This can be a PDF file or a Word document, in any format or lay-out that can be used by referees to evaluate your manuscript. It should contain high enough quality figures for refereeing. If you prefer to do so, you may still provide all or some of the source files at the initial submission. Please note that individual figure files larger than 10 MB must be uploaded separately. **If your paper is accepted, you will you be requested, at the revision stage, to put your paper in the correct format by supplying individual files for the manuscript, tables, figures, etc. and any other items required for the publication of your article. To find out more, please read the rest of the Preparation section.**

### NEW SUBMISSIONS

Submission to this journal proceeds totally online and you will be guided stepwise through the creation and uploading of your files. The system automatically converts your files to a single PDF file, which is used in the peer-review process.

### References

There are no strict requirements on reference formatting at submission. References can be in any style or format as long as the style is consistent. Where applicable, author(s) name(s), journal title/book title, chapter title/article title, year of publication, volume number/book chapter and the pagination must be present. Use of DOI is highly encouraged. The reference style used by the journal will be applied to the accepted article by Elsevier at the proof stage. Note that missing data will be highlighted at proof stage for the author to correct.

### Formatting requirements

There are no strict formatting requirements for articles at initial submission (for requirements for revised submissions, please see REVISED SUBMISSIONS section below) but all manuscripts must contain the essential elements needed to convey your manuscript, for example Abstract, Keywords, Introduction, Methods, Results, Conclusions, Artwork and Tables with Captions.

If your article includes any Videos and/or other Supplementary material, this should be included in your initial submission for peer review purposes.

Divide the article into clearly defined sections.

Please ensure the text of your paper is double-spaced — this is an essential peer review requirement.

### Figures and tables embedded in text - Your Paper Your Way

If you choose the Your Paper Your Way option when submitting your manuscript for the first time, please ensure the figures and the tables included in the single file are placed next to the relevant text in the manuscript, rather than at the bottom or the top of the file.

## Subdivision

Manuscript files should be structured as follows: (1) Title page, including Disclosure of interest and Acknowledgments, etc.; (2) Manuscript file including Abstract, Keywords, Abbreviations, Main text, References, Legends of figures and tables; (3) Table files; (4) Figure files; (5) Supplementary files; (6) ICMJE forms.

## Manuscript Headings

Original Article level 1 headings are: Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusions. Articles should include the level 2 subsection heading Study Limitations at the end of the Discussion section. Longer articles may need other level 2 and/or level 3 subsection headings to clarify their content, especially the Results and Discussion sections.

Other types of articles such as Commentaries and Special Communications do not require this format.

## Title Page

Include these elements in the title page in the following sequence, double-spaced: (1) Running head of no more than 40 character spaces (no abbreviations); (2) Title (no abbreviations); (3) Author(s) full name(s) and highest academic degree(s); (4) The name(s) of the institution(s), section(s), division(s), and department(s) where the study was performed and the institutional affiliation(s) of the author(s) at the time of the study. An asterisk after an author's name and a footnote may indicate a change in affiliation; (5) Acknowledgment of any presentation of this material, to whom, when, and where; (6) Acknowledgment of financial support, including grant numbers and any other needed acknowledgments. Explanations of any conflicts of interest; (7) Name, address, business telephone number, and e-mail address of corresponding author; and (8) Clinical trial registration number, if applicable. Please note that clinical trial registration will now be required as of January 1, 2016. The grace period will end January 1, 2017 when registration will be mandatory.

## Abstract

For articles reporting original data (Original Articles, Brief Reports) and Review Articles (including Meta-Analyses), a structured abstract is required (see the [Instructions for Structured Abstracts](#)). Authors should make sure the key elements from the Reporting Guideline (eg, CONSORT, PRISMA, etc.) they followed for their manuscript are included in the abstract as well as the body of the paper. For other manuscripts (e.g., Commentaries, Editorials and Special Communications), include a conventional, unstructured abstract of no more than 250 words.

## Keywords

All abstracts must include provide 3 to 5 Keywords identified by the author. Keywords must be selected from the US National Library of Medicine's (NLM) *Medical Subject Headings*, which is available at <http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MBrowser.html>.

## Abbreviations

*Archives'* editorial policy is to **minimize the use of abbreviations**. Fewer abbreviations make it easier for the multidisciplinary readership to follow the text. Authors should include a list of abbreviations in their manuscript file directly following the keywords (just above the introduction). *Archives* uses only standard abbreviations with Davis's and Dorland's as our guides. Abbreviations that are used only in tables, appendices, or figures are not included in the list and should be defined in the table, appendix, or figure legend. However, abbreviations that are in the list need not be re-defined in a table footnote or figure legend. All abbreviation lists **must** be alphabetized. All abbreviations must be defined upon first mention in the body of the manuscript. The abbreviations SD (standard deviation) and SE (standard error) require no definition in *Archives*.

## Results

When data are summarized in the Results section, specify the statistical methods used to analyze them. Describe the success of any blinding of observations. Report treatment complications. Give numbers of observations. Report losses to observation (ie, dropouts from a clinical trial). Present results in logical sequence in the text, tables, and illustrations. *Archives* aims to publish no more than 5 figures per manuscript so restrict tables and figures to those needed to explain arguments and to assess their support. Use graphs as an alternative to tables with many entries; do not duplicate data in graphs and tables. Do not repeat in the text all the data in the tables, illustrations, or both; emphasize or summarize only important observations.

While there may be occasional exceptions, *Archives* is committed to the need for clinical trial reports to be accompanied by adequate periods of follow-up. A lack of sufficient follow-up may be detrimental to a paper's acceptance.

## Discussion

Emphasize the new and important aspects of the study and the conclusions that follow from them. Do not repeat in detail data or other material given in the introduction or the Results section. Include in the Discussion section the implications of the findings and their limitations, including implications for future research. Authors should address the issue of effect magnitude, in terms of both the statistics reported and the implications of the research. Relate the observations to other relevant studies.

## Study Limitations

Include the subsection (Level 2 heading), "Study Limitations" to discuss the limitations of the study.

## Conclusions

Link the conclusions with the study's goals but avoid unqualified statements not supported by the data. Avoid claiming priority and alluding to work that is incomplete. State new hypotheses when warranted, but clearly label them as such. Recommendations, when appropriate, may be included.

## Graphical abstract

Although a graphical abstract is optional, its use is encouraged as it draws more attention to the online article. The graphical abstract should summarize the contents of the article in a concise, pictorial form designed to capture the attention of a wide readership. Graphical abstracts should be submitted as a separate file in the online submission system. Image size: Please provide an image with a minimum of 531 × 1328 pixels (h × w) or proportionally more. The image should be readable at a size of 5 × 13 cm using a regular screen resolution of 96 dpi. Preferred file types: TIFF, EPS, PDF or MS Office files. You can view [Example Graphical Abstracts](#) on our information site.

Authors can make use of Elsevier's Illustration and Enhancement service to ensure the best presentation of their images and in accordance with all technical requirements: [Illustration Service](#).

## Highlights

Highlights are a short collection of bullet points that convey the core findings of the article. Highlights are optional and should be submitted in a separate editable file in the online submission system. Please use 'Highlights' in the file name and include 3 to 5 bullet points (maximum 85 characters, including spaces, per bullet point). You can view [example Highlights](#) on our information site.

## Main Manuscript

### Introduction

State the purpose of the article. Summarize the rationale for the study or observation. Give only pertinent references, and do not review the subject extensively. Do not include data or conclusions from the work being reported. Do not include a heading for this section.

### Methods

Describe the selection of the observational or experimental subjects (patients or experimental animals, including controls) clearly. Discuss eligibility of experimental subjects. Give details about randomization. Describe the methods for any blinding of observations. Identify the methods, equipment and materials, and procedures in sufficient detail to allow others to reproduce the results. Reference established methods, including statistical methods (see below); provide very brief descriptions for methods that have been published but are not well known; describe new or substantially modified methods, give reasons for using them, and evaluate their limitations. Identify precisely all drugs and chemicals used, including generic name(s), dose(s), and route(s) of administration.

While there may be occasional exceptions, *Archives* is committed to the need for clinical trial reports to be accompanied by adequate periods of follow-up. A lack of sufficient follow-up may be detrimental to a paper's acceptance.

When reporting work with human subjects, indicate whether the procedures followed protocol and accord with the ethical standards of the responsible institutional review board, ethics committee or with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2013, as appropriate for the country where the research took place.<sup>2</sup>

Do not use patients' names, initials, or hospital numbers, especially in any illustrative material. When reporting experiments on animals, indicate whether the procedures followed accord with the institution's committee on animal experimentation or with the National Research Council's guide on the care and use of laboratory animals. *Archives* may require authors to verify the above procedures.

Describe statistical methods in enough detail to enable knowledgeable readers with access to the original data to verify the reported results. When possible, quantify findings and present them with appropriate indicators of measurement error or uncertainty (eg, confidence intervals [CIs]). Avoid sole reliance on statistical hypothesis testing, such as *P* values, which fails to convey important quantitative information.

Researchers should report and identify the specific statistical test used and the obtained statistical value. Researchers should supplement the results of any statistical value. Researchers should supplement the results of any statistical significance test with the use of effect size values or CIs. Measures of effect size or CIs should be routinely included in quantitative clinical trials reported in rehabilitation research. The statistical power values and the corresponding type II error probability should always be reported for statistically nonsignificant results.

The investigator should ensure that there is sufficient power to detect, as statistically significant, a clinically meaningful treatment effect of an *a priori* specified size<sup>4</sup>. References for study design and statistical methods should be to standard works (with pages stated) rather than to papers in which designs or methods were originally reported.

Specify any general use computer programs used. Avoid nontechnical uses of technical terms in statistics, such as "random" (which implies a randomizing device), "normal," "significant," "correlation," or "sample." Define statistical terms, abbreviations, and symbols.

When submitting manuscripts on randomized controlled trials (RCTs), authors must include the CONSORT (Consolidated Standards for Reporting Trials) flow diagram. See the [Reporting Guidelines](#).

### Figure legends

A list of figure legends should be provided after the reference list, listing each figure in order by number. Legends/captions should not be embedded in the figure files themselves.

### Figure captions

Ensure that each illustration has a caption. A caption should comprise a brief title (**not** on the figure itself) and a description of the illustration. Keep text in the illustrations themselves to a minimum but explain all symbols and abbreviations used.

### Tables

Submit each table as a separate file. Accepted file formats are PDF and Word (Please do not upload Excel files). If needed, Excel files will be requested from the authors upon a final editorial decision of accept. Number tables consecutively in the order of their first citation in the text. Include a brief title for each table, include a short or abbreviated heading for each column. Place explanatory matter in footnotes, not in the title or column headings. Explain in footnotes all nonstandard abbreviations that are used in each table. For footnotes, use the following symbols, in this sequence: \*, †, ‡, §, ||, ¶, #, \*\*, ††, ‡‡

Identify statistical measures of variations such as standard deviation and standard error of the mean. Do not use internal horizontal and vertical rules. Be sure that each table is cited in the text in order. Using too many tables in relation to the length of the text may produce typesetting difficulties.

Data from another published or unpublished source may only be used with permission and must be acknowledged fully. It is the author's responsibility to obtain such permission.

### Supplementary data

*Archives* accepts electronic supplementary material to support and enhance your scientific research. Supplementary files offer the author additional possibilities to publish supporting applications, high-resolution images, background datasets, sound clips, and more. Supplementary files supplied will be published online alongside the electronic version of your article in Elsevier Web products, including ScienceDirect: ☐ <http://www.sciencedirect.com>.

### Suppliers

Before the References section, provide a Suppliers list with contact information (names and complete mailing addresses) for manufacturers of devices and other non-drug products used directly in a study (ie, do not provide such information for products not directly used in your research but mentioned in studies you cite). Identify equipment and/or materials in text, tables, and legends by superscript lower case letters. List suppliers consecutively in the order they are mentioned in the text.

Manufacturer names and locations should **not** be listed in the text where the product is introduced. Do not list Suppliers in the References list. Do not list drug manufacturers in the Suppliers list.

### References

References in manuscripts accepted by *Archives* shall include only material that is retrievable through standard literature searches. Number references consecutively in the order in which they first appear in the text. Identify references in text, tables, and legends by superscript Arabic numerals. References cited only in tables or in legends to figures should be numbered in accordance with a sequence established by the first identification in the text of the particular table or figure.

Try to avoid using abstracts as references; "unpublished observations" and "personal communications" may not be used as references, although references to written, not oral, communications may be inserted (in parentheses) in the text. Avoid "personal communication" unless it provides essential information not available from a public source. In this case, cite the name of the person and date of communication in parentheses in the text. For scientific articles, authors should obtain written permission and confirmation of accuracy from the source of personal communication.

Include among the references those papers **accepted** but not yet published; designate the journal and add "In press." Authors must obtain written permission to cite such papers as well as verification that they have been accepted for publication. Editors will request from the author(s) a copy of the letter from the journal accepting the "in press" article if the manuscript in which it is cited is accepted by *Archives*. Information from manuscripts **submitted** but not yet accepted should be cited in the text as "(unpublished observations)" with written permission from the source.

The references must be verified by the author(s) against the original documents. List all authors and/or editors for each reference, up to 6 authors. If there are 7 or more authors, truncate the list to the first 3 names and add "et al."

### Citations in the running text

Number references consecutively in the order in which they first appear in the text. Identify references in text, tables, and legends by superscript Arabic numerals. References cited only in tables or in legends to figures should be numbered in accordance with a sequence established by the first identification in the text of the particular table or figure.

### Data references

This journal encourages you to cite underlying or relevant datasets in your manuscript by citing them in your text and including a data reference in your Reference List. Data references should include the following elements: author name(s), dataset title, data repository, version (where available), year, and global persistent identifier. Add [dataset] immediately before the reference so we can properly identify it as a data reference. The [dataset] identifier will not appear in your published article.

### Reference management software

Most Elsevier journals have a standard template available in key reference management packages. This covers packages using the Citation Style Language, such as Mendeley (☐ <http://www.mendeley.com/features/reference-manager>) and also others like EndNote (☐ <http://www.endnote.com/support/enstyles.asp>) and Reference Manager (☐ <http://refman.com/downloads/styles>). Using plug-ins to word processing packages which are available from the above sites, authors only need to select the appropriate journal template when preparing their article and the list of references and citations to these will be formatted according to the journal style as described in this Guide. The process of including templates in these packages is constantly ongoing. If the journal you are looking for does not have a template available yet, please see the list of sample references and citations provided in this Guide to help you format these according to the journal style.



#### Reference formatting

There are no strict requirements on reference formatting at submission. References can be in any style or format as long as the style is consistent. Where applicable, author(s) name(s), journal title/book title, chapter title/article title, year of publication, volume number/book chapter and the pagination must be present. Use of DOI is highly encouraged. The reference style used by the journal will be applied to the accepted article by Elsevier at the proof stage. Note that missing data will be highlighted at proof stage for the author to correct. If you do wish to format the references yourself they should be arranged according to the following examples:

#### Reference style

**Text:** Indicate references by (consecutive) superscript Arabic numerals in the order in which they appear in the text. The numerals are to be used *outside* periods and commas, *inside* colons and semicolons. For further detail and examples you are referred to the AMA Manual of Style, A Guide for Authors and Editors, Tenth Edition, ISBN 0-978-0-19-517633-9 (see <http://www.amanualofstyle.com>).  
**List:** Number the references in the list in the order in which they appear in the text. Click [here](#) for examples of correct reference formats.

#### Journal abbreviations in references

The titles of journals should be abbreviated according to the style used in *MEDLINE*. Consult *List of Serials Indexed for Online Users*, which is available from the NLM at <http://www.nlm.nih.gov/tsd/serials/tsiou.html>.

#### AudioSlides

The journal encourages authors to create an AudioSlides presentation with their published article. AudioSlides are brief, webinar-style presentations that are shown next to the online article on ScienceDirect. This gives authors the opportunity to summarize their research in their own words and to help readers understand what the paper is about. [More information and examples are available](#). Authors of this journal will automatically receive an invitation e-mail to create an AudioSlides presentation after acceptance of their paper.

#### Submission checklist

*Archives* requires the completion and upload of a checklist with each manuscript. Please follow the instructions on the checklist, which can be downloaded [here](#), to ensure all required manuscript elements are included with your submission. Please note that this submission checklist is NOT the same as a reporting guideline checklist or form noted above. This is a separate item specific to the *Archives*.

For any further information please visit our customer support site at <http://support.elsevier.com>.



## **List of Abbreviations**

**BADS:** Behavioural Assessment of the Dysexecutive Syndrome

***M:*** Mean

**MS:** Multiple Sclerosis

***n:*** Number of participants

**NeuroQol:** Quality of Life in Neurological Disorders Measure

**NHS:** National Health Service

**OCF:** Objective cognitive functioning

**PASAT:** Paced Auditory Serial Additions Test

**PHQ-9:** Patient Health Questionnaire - 9

**PROMIS:** Patient Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System

***SD:*** Standard Deviation

**WAIS:** Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale

**WMS:** Wechsler Memory Scale

## Abstract

**Objective:** To investigate whether self-efficacy remains predictive of perceived cognitive impairment after controlling for objective cognitive functioning, and to further examine the relationship between self-efficacy and cognitive domains, as measured objectively.

**Design:** A cross-sectional design was employed.

**Setting:** General community setting within a semi-rural part of the United Kingdom.

**Participants:** A convenience sample of twenty-five participants with a diagnosis of Multiple Sclerosis. Participants were recruited via National Health Service clinics and the Multiple Sclerosis Society. Eligible participants were those with a diagnosis of Multiple Sclerosis (any subtype), aged  $\geq 18$  years, of fluent English language, and with sufficient cognitive and motor ability to complete neuropsychological assessment.

**Intervention(s):** Not applicable.

**Main Outcome Measure(s):** The main outcome measures included the Liverpool Self-efficacy Scale<sup>1</sup> as a measure of self-efficacy, and the Cognitive Function (v.2) questionnaire of the Quality of Life in Neurological Disorders (Neuro-QOL) Measures<sup>2</sup> to assess perceived cognitive impairment. Objective cognitive functioning, i.e., attention, processing speed, memory, and executive functioning, was assessed using a variety of neuropsychological measures.

**Results:** Using regression analyses, self-efficacy was found to significantly predict perceived cognitive impairment, even after controlling for objective cognitive functioning. Self-efficacy accounted for 45% of the variance in perceived cognitive impairment ( $F_{(1,22)} = 8.92, p = .001$ ). Correlational analyses revealed a significant

relationship between self-efficacy and processing speed, and self-efficacy and executive function.

**Conclusion(s):** Self-efficacy is associated with the perception of cognitive impairment in people with Multiple Sclerosis, and therefore may be an important aspect of self-management programmes.

**Key words:** Self-efficacy, cognition, Multiple Sclerosis.

Multiple Sclerosis (MS) is an autoimmune disease of the central nervous system causing inflammation, demyelination and axonal loss within the brain and spinal cord<sup>3</sup>. A review of the General Practice Research Database estimated the prevalence of MS in the U.K to be 203.4 per 100,000 population in 2010, with women accounting for 72% of the prevalence rates<sup>4</sup>. Clinical symptoms vary dependent upon the lesion site affected, and the subsequent disease course of either relapsing-remitting or progressive MS. However, symptoms can include motor, cognitive, and behavioural deficits<sup>5</sup>, and neuropsychiatric complications such as depression and anxiety<sup>6</sup>.

The research literature refers to a number of different psychological processes that may impact upon an individual's ability to adjust to life with a physical health condition, such as MS<sup>7</sup>. One of these psychological processes, grounded in social-cognitive theory, is self-efficacy. Differentiated from outcome expectancies, i.e., the understanding that performing a behaviour will lead to a specific outcome<sup>8</sup>, self-efficacy expectations refers to the degree to which an individual believes that they are able to perform a task in order to produce a desired outcome<sup>9</sup>. Self-efficacy is one of the major determinants of peoples choice of activities, how much effort they expend in a task, and how long they persist in the face of difficulties<sup>9,10</sup>. Yet, possibly due to the unpredictable nature of the disease, people with MS experience lower levels of self-efficacy than people with other physical health conditions, including spinal cord injury<sup>11</sup>.

Research suggests that self-efficacy is associated with health-related quality of life, depression, and social functioning<sup>12</sup>, as well as physical activity in people with MS<sup>13</sup>.

However, only three studies to date have investigated the relationship between self-efficacy and cognition in people with MS. Initial research examined self-efficacy in the context of perceived cognitive impairment i.e., impairment as measured by patient self-report. Research by Schmitt and colleagues in 2014 found self-efficacy to be predictive of perceived cognitive impairment in a sample of individuals with a range diagnostic subtypes<sup>12</sup>. Expanding these initial findings, longitudinal research found self-efficacy to remain predictive of perceived cognitive impairment over a three-year period<sup>14</sup>. Although depression and fatigue are associated with perceived cognitive impairment in MS<sup>15</sup>, self-efficacy continues to be predictive of perceived cognitive impairment even when these variables are controlled for<sup>14</sup>.

More recent research has begun to consider the relationship between self-efficacy and objective cognitive functioning, i.e., cognitive ability as measured using computer or clinician administered neuropsychological assessments. Using a sample of participants with clinically isolated syndrome or early relapsing-remitting MS, Jongen and colleagues (2015) found self-efficacy to be associated with power of attention, reaction time variability, and speed of memory, using a computerised battery of cognitive tests<sup>16</sup>. The findings suggest that self-efficacy positively affects performance on cognitive tests, particularly in the cognitive domains most typically affected by MS<sup>16</sup>. The authors also hypothesised that cognitive ability may impact upon self-efficacy, in that individuals with greater cognitive capacity may feel better able to manage their symptoms as compared to individuals with impaired cognition<sup>16</sup>.

Cognitive impairments are reported to occur in approximately 45-65% of people with MS, and commonly include deficits in attention, memory, and executive functioning<sup>17</sup>. The impact of cognitive impairment is wide spread, and includes a greater risk of unemployment, reduced engagement in social activities, and increased difficulties undertaking activities of everyday living<sup>18</sup>. Therefore, understanding psychological variables associated with cognition is essential in order to continue to develop self-management interventions that are grounded in the evidence base.

The primary aim of this study was to address the current gaps in the research literature by investigating whether self-efficacy remains predictive of perceived cognitive impairment, even when objective cognitive functioning has been controlled for. Secondly, this study aimed to add to the currently limited literature base by examining the relationship between self-efficacy and objective cognitive functioning using ecologically valid measurement tools.

## **Methods**

### ***Participants***

The participant sample ( $n = 25$ ) was recruited from National Health Service clinics and from local branches of the MS Society, based within a semi-rural area in North Wales, United Kingdom. Eligible participants were those with a diagnosis of MS, aged  $\geq 18$  years, of fluent English language, and with sufficient cognitive and motor ability to complete neuropsychological assessment. Exclusion criteria included co-morbid

neurological diagnoses (including diagnosis of a dementia syndrome), current substance misuse, and significant current mental health difficulties that would impact upon capacity to provide informed consent.

## ***Measures***

***Clinical Measures.*** Participants completed five questionnaire measures.

*Self-efficacy.* Self-efficacy was measured using the Liverpool Self-efficacy Scale<sup>1</sup>. This is an 11-item Likert-type scale, consisting of two domains of control and personal agency. The scale has been validated using a sample of people with MS; the authors report good internal consistency ( $\alpha = 0.81$ ) and acceptable test-retest reliability (intraclass correlation coefficient of 0.79)<sup>1</sup>. Low scores on this scale are associated with low self-efficacy.

*Perceived cognitive impairment.* The Cognitive Function questionnaire of the Quality of Life in Neurological Disorders<sup>2</sup> (Neuro-QOL) short-form measure (version 2) assesses both executive function and general concerns (e.g., attention, memory, planning, and organising), and consists of 8 items scored on a 5-point Likert scale. This short-form measure allows for raw scores to be converted into standardised T scores ( $M = 50$ ,  $SD = 10$ ). Higher scores denote less perceived cognitive difficulty.

*Multiple Sclerosis subtype and neurological impairment.* MS subtype was assessed using self-report. Where participants were unsure as to their diagnosis, their MS specialist nurse was consulted (with written consent) to obtain this information. Neurological impairment was assessed using the Multiple Sclerosis Questionnaire<sup>19</sup>. This 17-item questionnaire has been demonstrated to be highly cross-correlated with other measures of impairment in MS and is therefore recommended as a valid and accurate measure<sup>19</sup>.

*Fatigue.* The Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System (PROMIS) Fatigue short form for MS was administered to assess fatigue<sup>20</sup>. This measure includes 8 items scored using a 5-point Likert scale. Raw scores are converted to standardised T scores ( $M = 50$ ,  $SD = 10$ ). The PROMIS measures have been shown to be valid for use with people with MS<sup>21</sup>. Higher scores on this measure are associated with greater levels of fatigue.

*Depression.* Symptoms associated with depression were assessed using the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9)<sup>22</sup>. This 9-item measure is scored using a 4-point Likert-type scale. The PHQ-9 has been validated for use in a MS sample<sup>23</sup>. Higher scores are associated with greater symptoms of depression.

***Neuropsychological measures.*** Participants completed a series of neuropsychological assessments, covering a breadth of cognitive domains.

*Attention.* The Paced Auditory Serial Additions Test (PASAT)<sup>24</sup> was initially developed as a measure of information processing speed and flexibility. It has since been adapted<sup>25</sup>, and subsequently has been extensively used within the MS population as a measure of attention. Participants are presented with a series of single-digit numbers using a pre-recorded tape, and are required to add the most recent number to the one presented immediately before it. Participants are not required to keep a running total, but to provide the sum of the last two numbers heard. There are two subtests, and the numbers are presented at a rate of every three seconds on the first subtest and every two seconds on the following subtest. On each subtest, participants are presented with a total of 60



numbers. The PASAT has demonstrated good internal consistency<sup>26</sup>. High scores represent greater attentional abilities.

*Processing Speed.* The symbol search and coding subtests of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale fourth edition (WAIS-IV)<sup>26</sup> were administered as a measure of speed of information processing. The symbol search subtest assesses both processing speed and visual perception. On the symbol search subtest, participants are required to scan a series of symbols presented sequentially in a row, and identify whether they match a target symbol. On the coding subtest, participants are required to translate symbols, each uniquely associated with a number, into boxes. Both the symbol search and coding subtests are timed tasks of two minutes each, and therefore participants are encouraged to work as quickly and accurately as possible. Scores on the symbol search and coding subtests are converted into a processing speed index score ( $M = 100$ ,  $SD = 15$ ). Higher scores reflect a quicker processing speed.

*Memory.* The Logical Memory subtests of the Wechsler Memory Scale fourth edition (WMS-IV)<sup>28</sup> were administered as a measure of immediate and delayed verbal memory. The researcher read two short stories, which participants were required to recall both immediately and after a 30-minute delay. There are two versions available, one for adults (16-69 years) and one for older adults (aged 65-90 years). These were administered accordingly given the participant's age. Higher scores indicate greater recall.

*Executive Function.* Executive functioning was measured using the 6 Elements Test of the Behavioural Assessment of the Dysexecutive Syndrome (BADS)<sup>29</sup>. This is a set task of ten minutes in which participants are instructed to undertake three different types of tasks, a dictation task, a picture-naming task, and an arithmetic task. Participants are

advised to adhere to specific rules throughout the task, with points deducted if the rules are not observed. Low scores represent executive dysfunction.

## **Procedure**

Ethical approval was obtained from the School of Psychology, Bangor University, and from the Research and Ethics Committee of local Health Board. Participants were recruited via three methods: Potential participants who met the eligibility criteria were approached during their routine National Health Service (NHS) MS nurse appointment, and the third author approached potential participants at their NHS clinical psychology appointment. The first author also contacted the local branches of the MS Society and presented details about the research study at Society meetings. Potential participants were provided with a bilingual (English and Welsh) information pack, containing an information sheet and an initial contact form. Interested participants were advised to return the initial contact form to the first author using a freepost envelope provided in the information pack. Upon receipt of the initial contact form, participants were contacted via telephone and a research appointment was arranged. Appointments took place within NHS premises or within the participants' own home. Written consent was obtained at the start of the appointment, and subsequently, the questionnaire and neuropsychological measures were administered. Measures were completed over 1-3 appointments as requested by the research participant to accommodate for participant fatigue. Recruitment and testing took place between September 2016 and March 2017.

## Data analyses

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23 was used to perform all analyses. In order to create a single measure of objective cognitive functioning, tests measuring the four individual cognitive domains (i.e., attention, processing speed, memory, executive function) were standardised and averaged, before the four cognitive domain scores were averaged to create a single measure. Specifically, the raw scores for each neuropsychological assessment were converted into standardised scores using normative data. The WMS-IV Logical Memory subtest raw scores were converted into scaled scores using normative data based upon age ( $M = 10$ ,  $SD = 3$ ). These two scaled scores were each transformed into z scores. An average of the two z scores was then calculated to produce an overall z score for verbal memory. For the WAIS-IV symbol search and coding subtests, again, each raw score was converted into a scaled score using normative data based upon age ( $M = 10$ ,  $SD = 3$ ). The sum of the two scaled scores were then transformed into a processing speed composite score ( $M = 100$ ,  $SD = 15$ ). A final z score for processing speed was then calculated from the composite score. Scores on the PASAT and the BADS 6 Elements Test were converted into z scores to generate a total score for attention and executive functioning respectively. Finally, the z scores for each cognitive domain were averaged, using the mean, to create a unified measure of objective cognitive functioning ( $M = 0$ ,  $SD = 1$ ).

The primary aim of this study was to determine whether self-efficacy remains predictive of perceived cognitive impairment, even when objective cognitive functioning has been controlled for. This aim was addressed using hierarchical regression analyses, with

perceived cognitive impairment as the outcome variable, and objective cognitive functioning and self-efficacy as the predictor variables. Objective cognitive functioning was entered into the regression model at stage 1 (Model 1), and self-efficacy was entered into the model at stage 2 (Model 2). This study also aimed to further examine the relationship between self-efficacy and objective cognitive functioning. Therefore correlational analyses were performed between self-efficacy and the cognitive domains of attention, processing speed, memory, and executive functioning. The data were initially examined to determine whether the assumptions for parametric analyses were met, and either Pearson's product or Spearman's rho analyses were performed, dependent upon whether the data were normally distributed.

## **Results**

### **Participants**

Descriptive statistics for demographic variables, self-efficacy, fatigue, perceived cognitive impairment, and depression are presented in Table 1. The majority of participants were female ( $n = 18$ ), and all participants were aged between 31 and 78 ( $M = 52.92$ ,  $SD = 12.96$ ). Ten participants had a diagnosis of relapsing-remitting MS (40%), nine participants had a diagnosis of secondary progressive MS (36%), and six participants had a diagnosis of primary progressive MS (24%). Participants had experienced symptoms of MS for between 33 and 480 months ( $M = 185.68$ ,  $SD = 111.28$ ), and had received a diagnosis of MS between 22 and 300 months prior to undertaking the research project ( $M = 132.16$ ,  $SD = 91.30$ ).

Table 1.

*Descriptive statistics for demographic and disease-related variables, fatigue, depression, self-efficacy, and perceived cognitive impairment*

|                                       | <u>Values (n = 25)</u>     |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <i>Education level</i>                |                            |
| School or less                        | 8 (32)                     |
| College course or equivalent          | 7 (28)                     |
| University degree or higher           | 10 (40)                    |
| <i>Employment Status</i>              |                            |
| Employed full time                    | 7 (28)                     |
| Unemployed                            | 3 (12)                     |
| Retired/retired on ill-health grounds | 15 (60)                    |
| <i>Ethnicity</i>                      |                            |
| White British                         | 21 (84)                    |
| Welsh                                 | 1 (4)                      |
| Other ethnicity                       | 3 (12)                     |
| <i>PROMIS-Fatigue</i>                 | 58.85 ± 10.52 (34.7, 81.3) |
| <i>PHQ-9</i>                          | 9.6 ± 7.14 (0, 26)         |
| <i>Liverpool Self-efficacy Scale</i>  |                            |
| Control subscale                      | 15.76 ± 4.42 (7, 24)       |
| Personal agency subscale              | 13 ± 3.01 (6, 20)          |
| Total score                           | 28.76 ± 6.95 (14, 44)      |
| <i>NeuroQOL-Cognitive Function</i>    | 42.72 ± 7.72 (25.9, 56.3)  |

Note. Values are mean ± SD (minimum, maximum) or n (%).

Details regarding neurological impairment for the sample are provided in Table 2. Based upon the mean score on the PHQ-9, the sample was experiencing a mild to moderate level of depression. Perceived cognitive impairment and fatigue fell within one standard deviation of the population mean. Group means and standard deviations for performance on neuropsychological assessments are displayed in the appendix.

Table 2.

*Neurological impairment (MS Questionnaire<sup>19</sup>)*

|   | (%) |
|---|-----|
| Require an aid to walk                        | 48  |
| Uses a wheelchair for almost all activities   | 16  |
| Mild weakness                                 | 12  |
| Moderate or severe weakness                   | 64  |
| Mildly impaired sensation                     | 28  |
| Moderately or severely impaired sensation     | 56  |
| Mildly impaired visual acuity                 | 4   |
| Moderately or severely impaired visual acuity | 12  |
| Mildly uncoordinated                          | 32  |
| Moderately or severely uncoordinated          | 24  |
| Mild difficulties with speech                 | 12  |
| Moderate or severe difficulties with speech   | 12  |
| Mild difficulty with balance                  | 16  |
| Moderate or severe difficulty with balance    | 68  |
| Mild spasticity and/or spasms                 | 40  |
| Moderate or severe spasticity and/or spasms   | 48  |
| Mild difficulty with swallowing               | 32  |
| Moderate or severe difficulty with swallowing | 4   |
| Difficulties with bowel or bladder function   | 76  |
| Mild dizziness or vertigo                     | 32  |
| Moderate to severe dizziness or vertigo       | 12  |

### **Regression analysis**

A hierarchical regression analysis revealed that objective cognitive functioning only explained 12% of the variance in perceived cognitive impairment, and this model (Model 1) was not significantly better than chance ( $F_{(1,23)} = 3.15, p = .089$ ). When both objective cognitive functioning and self-efficacy were entered at stage 2 (Model 2), they explained 45% of the variance and significantly contributed to the model ( $F_{(1,22)} = 8.92, p = .001$ ).

The regression analysis is detailed in Table 3.

Table 3.

*Regression analyses*

| Variable                | Model 1 |      |         | Model 2 |       |         |
|-------------------------|---------|------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
|                         | B       | SE B | $\beta$ | B       | SE B  | $\beta$ |
| Constant                | 44.46   | 1.78 | -       | 19.90   | 6.95  | -       |
| OCF                     | 2.67    | 1.50 | .35     | -0.48   | 1.49  | -.06    |
| Self-efficacy           | -       | -    | -       | 0.78    | 0.22  | .70**   |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> | -       | .08  | -       | -       | .40   | -       |
| R <sup>2</sup> Change   | -       | .12  | -       | -       | .33   | -       |
| F Change                | -       | 3.15 | -       | -       | 13.05 | -       |

Note. OCF, objective cognitive functioning; \*\* $p = .002$

**Correlational analyses***Correlational analysis between self-efficacy and cognitive domains*

A significant relationship between self-efficacy and processing speed was found on both the personal agency subscale and the total self-efficacy score. A significant relationship between executive function and both the control subscale and self-efficacy total score was also found. No other significant relationships were found between self-efficacy and cognitive domains. All correlational analyses are demonstrated in Table 4.

Table 4.

*Correlational analyses between self-efficacy and cognitive domains*

|                     | Cognitive Domain |                               |        |                    |
|---------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|--------|--------------------|
|                     | Attention        | Processing Speed <sup>a</sup> | Memory | Executive Function |
| Control             | .11              | .33                           | .31    | .49*               |
| Personal agency     | .31              | .51**                         | .34    | .26                |
| Total self-efficacy | .15              | .43*                          | .33    | .42*               |

Note. \*\*p&lt;. 01, \*p&lt;. 05 (2-tailed)

All values are Spearman's rho, unless otherwise stated

<sup>a</sup> = Pearson's r

## Discussion

Extending previous research <sup>12,14</sup>, this study found self-efficacy significantly predicts perceived cognitive impairment in individuals MS, even when controlling for objective cognitive functioning. In this sample, objective cognitive functioning was not a significant predictor of perceived cognitive impairment. This may be due to discrepancy between perceived and objective cognitive impairment found in individuals with MS<sup>30</sup>. The relationship between self-efficacy and specific cognitive domains was also investigated. Unlike previous research by Jongen and colleague (2015)<sup>16</sup>, there was not a significant relationship between attention and self-efficacy, although this may be due to differences in measurement. However, this study found a significant relationship between processing speed and self-efficacy, and executive functioning and self-efficacy. One of the strengths of this study was the use of ecologically valid measures of objective cognitive functioning. Furthermore, this study adds to the current literature on self-



efficacy and objective cognitive functioning by including people with a wider variety of diagnostic subtypes.

The findings from this study have both clinical and research implications. With regard to research implications, this study was the first to examine whether self-efficacy remains predictive of perceived cognitive impairment, whilst controlling for objective cognitive functioning. This study may therefore benefit from replication to ensure the findings are robust. With regard to clinical practice, clinicians may wish to consider whether self-management interventions, aimed at enhancing self-efficacy, reduce perceived cognitive impairment. Such studies would need to be carefully evaluated to determine their effectiveness. However, this is a meaningful area of rehabilitative work that has the potential to improve health outcomes for people with MS.

#### *Study limitations*

Previous research has found perceived cognitive impairment to be associated with depression and fatigue in individuals with MS<sup>15</sup>. However, due to the relatively small sample size and therefore limited statistical power of this study, depression and fatigue were not entered into the regression analysis. In addition, no demographic or disease-related variables were entered in to the regression model. However, previous research has not found a relationship between demographic variables (including age and diagnostic subtype) and self-efficacy in a sample of people with MS<sup>1</sup>. It is therefore possible that these variables would not have significantly contributed to the regression model.

Due to the cross-sectional design of this study, it is not possible to infer the direction of causality between self-efficacy and perceived cognitive impairment. Indeed, some authors have proposed that cognitive ability may affect self-efficacy, as opposed to self-efficacy affecting cognition<sup>16</sup>. Longitudinal research would be required to address this question. This study also assessed self-efficacy for MS in terms of sense of control and personal agency, as opposed to self-efficacy specifically in regard to cognition. However, participants were aware that they had consented to take part in a study on self-efficacy and cognition, and so it is reasonable to infer that they completed the self-efficacy measure with cognition in mind. Finally, due to the relatively small sample size included in this study, one should interpret the findings with some cautiousness.

### **Conclusion**

The present study was the first to examine the role of objective cognitive functioning in the relationship between self-efficacy and perceived cognitive impairment in people with MS. This study found that self-efficacy was predictive of perceived cognitive impairment, and remained so after controlling for objective cognitive functioning. There was a significant relationship between processing speed and self-efficacy, and executive functioning and self-efficacy; this study did not find a significant relationship between attention and self-efficacy, or verbal memory and self-efficacy.

## References

1. Airlie, J., Baker, G. A., Smith, S. J., & Young, C. A. (2001). Measuring the impact of Multiple Sclerosis on psychosocial functioning: The development of a new self-efficacy scale. *Clinical Rehabilitation*, 15(3), 259-265. doi: 10.1191/026921501668362643
2. Gershon, R.C., Lai, J.S., Bode, R., Choi, S., Moy, C., Bleck, T., Miller, D.,... Cella, D. (2012). Neuro-QOL: Quality of life item banks for adults with neurological disorders: Item development and calibrations based upon clinical and general population testing. *Quality of Life Research*, 21(3), 475-486. doi: 10.1007/s111136-011-9958-8
3. Kos, D., Kerckhofs, E., Nagels, G., D'hooghe, M. B., & Ilsbrouckx, S. (2008). Origin of fatigue in Multiple Sclerosis: Review of the literature. *Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair*, 22(1), 91-100. doi: 10.1177/1545968306298934
4. Mackenzie, I. S., Morant, S. V., Bloomfield, G. A., MacDonald, T. M., & O'Riordan, J. (2014). Incidence and prevalence of Multiple Sclerosis in the U.K. 1990–2010: A descriptive study in the General Practice Research Database. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*, 85(1), 76-84. doi: 10.1136/jnnp-2013-305450
5. Lezak, M.D., Howieson, D.B., Bigler, E.R., & Tranel, D. (2012). *Neuropsychological assessment*. New York: Oxford University Press.
6. Paparrigopoulos, T., Ferentinos, P., Kouzoupis, A., Koutsis, G., & Papadimitriou,

- G. N. (2010). The neuropsychiatry of Multiple Sclerosis: Focus on disorders of mood, affect and behaviour. *International Review of Psychiatry*, 22(1), 14-21. doi: 10.3109/09540261003589323.
7. Dennison, L., Moss-Morris, R., & Chalder, T. (2009). A review of psychological correlates of adjustment in patients with Multiple Sclerosis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 29(2), 141-153. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2008.12.001
  8. Bandura, A., Adams, N. E., & Beyer, J. (1977). Cognitive processes mediating behavioral change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35(3), 125.
  9. Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
  10. Rutter Goodworth, M. C., Stepleman, L., Hibbard, J., Johns, L., Wright, D., Hughes, M. D., & Williams, M. J. (2016). Variables Associated with Patient Activation in Persons with Multiple Sclerosis. Faculty Publications. *Grad School of Clinical Psychology* (Paper No. 250). Retrieved from [http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/gscp\\_fac/250](http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/gscp_fac/250)
  11. Shnek, Z. M., Foley, F. W., LaRocca, N. G., Gordon, W. A., DeLuca, J., Schwartzman, H. G., ... & Irvine, J. (1997). Helplessness, self-efficacy, cognitive distortions, and depression in Multiple Sclerosis and spinal cord injury. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 19(3), 287-294.
  12. Schmitt, M.M., Goverover, Y., DeLuca, J., Chiaravalloti, N. (2014). Self-efficacy as a predictor of self-reported physical, cognitive and social functioning in Multiple Sclerosis. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 59(1), 27-34. doi: 10.1037/a0035288.

13. Motl, R. W., Snook, E. M., McAuley, E., & Gliottoni, R. C. (2006). Symptoms, self- efficacy, and physical activity among individuals with Multiple Sclerosis. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 29(6), 597-606. doi: 10.1002/nur.20161
14. Hughes, A.J., Beier, M., Hartoonian, N., Turner, A.P., Amtmann, D., Ehde, D.M. (2015). Self-efficacy as a longitudinal predictor of perceived cognitive impairment in individuals with Multiple Sclerosis. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 96, 913-919. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2015.01.008
15. Kinsinger, S. W., Lattie, E., & Mohr, D. C. (2010). Relationship between depression, fatigue, subjective cognitive impairment, and objective neuropsychological functioning in patients with Multiple Sclerosis. *Neuropsychology*, 24(5), 573. doi: 10.1037/a0019222.
16. Jongen, P. J., Wesnes, K., van Geel, B., Pop, P., Schrijver, H., Visser, L. H., ... & Brands, A. M. (2015). Does self-efficacy affect cognitive performance in persons with clinically isolated syndrome and early relapsing remitting Multiple Sclerosis? *Multiple Sclerosis International* (Article ID: 960282). doi: 10.1155/2015/960282
17. DeSousa, E. A., Albert, R. H., & Kalman, B. (2002). Cognitive impairments in Multiple Sclerosis: A review. *American Journal of Alzheimer's disease and other Dementias*, 17(1), 23-29.
18. Kalmar, J. H., Gaudino, E. A., Moore, N. B., Halper, J., & DeLuca, J. (2008). The relationship between cognitive deficits and everyday functional activities in multiple sclerosis. *Neuropsychology*, 22(4), 442-449. doi: 10.1037/0894-4105.22.4.442

19. Goodin, D. S. (1998). A questionnaire to assess neurological impairment in Multiple Sclerosis. *Multiple Sclerosis Journal*, 4(5), 444-451.
20. Cook, K.F., Bamer, A.M., Roddey, T.S., Kraft, G.H., Kim, J., & Amtmann, D. (2012). A PROMIS fatigue short form for use by individuals who have Multiple Sclerosis. *Quality of Life Research*, 21(6), 1021-1030. doi: 10.1007/s11136-011-0011-8
21. Senders, A., Hanes, D., Bourdette, D., Whitham, R., & Shinto, L. (2014). Reducing survey burden: Feasibility and validity of PROMIS measures in Multiple Sclerosis. *Multiple Sclerosis Journal*, 20(8), 1102-1111. doi: 10.1177/1352458513517279
22. Spitzer, R. L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J. B., & Patient Health Questionnaire Primary Care Study Group. (1999). Validation and utility of a self-report version of PRIME-MD: The PHQ primary care study. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 282(18), 1737-1744. doi: 10.1001/jama.282.18.1737
23. Amtmann, D., Kim, J., Chung, H., Bamer, A. M., Askew, R. L., Wu, S., ... & Johnson, K. L. (2014). Comparing CESD-10, PHQ-9, and PROMIS depression instruments in individuals with Multiple Sclerosis. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 59(2), 220-229. doi: 10.1037/a0035919
24. Gronwall, D.M.A. (1977). Paced auditory serial-addition task: A measure of recovery from concussion. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 44, 367-373.
25. Rao, S. M., Leo, G. J., Haughton, V. M., ST. Aubin-Faubert, P., & Bernadin, L. (1989). Correlation of magnetic resonance imaging with neuropsychological testing in Multiple Sclerosis, *Neurology*, 39, 161-166

26. Tombaugh, T.N. (2006). A comprehensive review of the Paced Auditory Serial Additions Test (PASAT). *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*, 21, 53-76.  
doi:10.1016/j.acn.2005.07.006
27. Wechsler, D. (2008). *Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale Fourth Edition*. London: Pearson.
28. Wechsler, D. (2010). *Wechsler Memory Scale Fourth Edition*. London: Pearson.
29. Wilson, B.A., Alderman, N., Burgess, P.W., Emslie, H., & Evans, J.J. (1996). Behavioural Assessment of the Dysexecutive Syndrome Manual. Bury St Edmunds: Thames Valley Test Company.
30. Middleton, L.S., Denney, D.R., Lynch, S.G., & Parmenter, B. (2006). The relationship between perceived and objective cognitive functioning in Multiple Sclerosis. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*, 21(5), 487-494. doi: 10.1016/j.acn.2006.06.008

## **Chapter 2 – Empirical Paper**



**Investigating the role of objective cognitive functioning in the relationship between self-efficacy and perceived cognitive impairment in people with Multiple Sclerosis**

Laura Spencer, MSc<sup>1</sup>, Yvonne Copeland, BSc<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Craig Roberts, DClinPsy<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> North Wales Clinical Psychology Programme, School of Psychology, Bangor University, U.K

<sup>2</sup> Walton Centre, NHS Foundation Trust, Liverpool, U.K

<sup>3</sup> North Wales Brain Injury Service, Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board, U.K

**Address for correspondence:** Laura Spencer, North Wales Clinical Psychology Programme, School of Psychology, Brigantia Building, Bangor University, Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57 2DG. E-mail: Laura.Spencer@wales.nhs.uk

**Disclosures:** None

**Acknowledgements:** This paper is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for Doctorate in Clinical Psychology.

**Word Count:** 2974

---

This paper will be submitted to *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, and has therefore being formatted in accordance with this journal's guidelines. The submission guidelines are listed at the beginning of this chapter.

#### Types of papers

**Original Research:** Present new and important basic and clinical information, extend existing studies, or provide a new approach to a traditional subject. Manuscripts should be limited to 3000 words of text (Introduction through Conclusions). Figures, tables, and references should be limited to the number needed to clarify, amplify, or document the text.

**Review Articles (Meta-Analyses):** The Editorial Board welcomes state-of-the-art review articles. Manuscripts should be limited to 5000 words of text (Introduction through Conclusions), exclusive of references. The *Archives* strongly prefers systematic reviews of the literature.

#### NEW - Reporting Guidelines and Checklists

To ensure a high and consistent quality of research reporting, original research articles, including brief reports, must contain sufficient information to allow readers to understand how a study was designed and conducted. For review articles, systematic or narrative, readers should be informed of the rationale and details behind the literature search strategy.

To achieve this goal, *Archives* requires that authors upload a completed checklist for the appropriate reporting guideline during original submission. Taking the time to ensure your manuscript addresses basic reporting prerequisites will greatly improve your manuscript, and enhance the likelihood of publication. These checklists serve as a guide for the editors and reviewers as they evaluate your paper.

The EQUATOR Network (<http://www.equator-network.org>) is an excellent resource for key reporting guidelines, checklists, and flow diagrams. These guidelines should be especially useful for *Archives'* authors.

Click on the checklist that applies to your manuscript, download it to your computer, fill it out electronically, "save as," and upload it with your manuscript when you submit. Links to mandatory flow diagrams also are provided. Below are the most commonly used checklists but please note that the Equator Network provides many others (e.g. TRIPOD, SRQR, etc.) and it is up to the authors to select the one most appropriate for their study.

- Randomized Controlled Trials — [CONSORT](#) — Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials
- Observational Studies — [STROBE](#) — Strengthening the Reporting of Observational studies in Epidemiology
- Systematic Review of Controlled Trials — [PRISMA](#) — Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses
- Study of Diagnostic accuracy/assessment scale — [STARD](#) — Standards for the Reporting of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies
- For psychometric studies the editors recommend either the [COSMIN](#) or [GRRAS](#) guideline, though the final choice is up to the author.



## Preparation

Authors should prepare manuscripts according to the "Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals" <sup>1</sup> as developed by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. The Requirements are available at <http://www.icmje.org>.

### Document Formatting

Manuscripts must be double-spaced throughout, including the title page, abstract, text, acknowledgments, references, individual tables, and legends. Use only standard 12-point type and spacing. Use unjustified, flush-left margins. Number the pages of the text consecutively. Put the page number in the upper or lower right-hand corner of each page. Number each line on each page of the text to facilitate peer review.

Authors should format manuscripts for specific attributes such as italics, superscripts/subscripts, and Greek letters. **The coding scheme for each such element must be consistent throughout the file.**

**Text Style:** Enter only 1 space between words and sentences. Leave 1 blank line between paragraphs. Leave 2 blank lines between headings and text.

### Your Paper Your Way

As part of the Your Paper Your Way service, at initial submission you may choose to submit your new manuscript as a single file to be used in the refereeing process. This can be a PDF file or a Word document, in any format or lay-out that can be used by referees to evaluate your manuscript. It should contain high enough quality figures for refereeing. If you prefer to do so, you may still provide all or some of the source files at the initial submission. Please note that individual figure files larger than 10 MB must be uploaded separately. **If your paper is accepted, you will you be requested, at the revision stage, to put your paper in the correct format by supplying individual files for the manuscript, tables, figures, etc. and any other items required for the publication of your article. To find out more, please read the rest of the Preparation section.**

### NEW SUBMISSIONS

Submission to this journal proceeds totally online and you will be guided stepwise through the creation and uploading of your files. The system automatically converts your files to a single PDF file, which is used in the peer-review process.

### References

There are no strict requirements on reference formatting at submission. References can be in any style or format as long as the style is consistent. Where applicable, author(s) name(s), journal title/book title, chapter title/article title, year of publication, volume number/book chapter and the pagination must be present. Use of DOI is highly encouraged. The reference style used by the journal will be applied to the accepted article by Elsevier at the proof stage. Note that missing data will be highlighted at proof stage for the author to correct.

### Formatting requirements

There are no strict formatting requirements for articles at initial submission (for requirements for revised submissions, please see REVISED SUBMISSIONS section below) but all manuscripts must contain the essential elements needed to convey your manuscript, for example Abstract, Keywords, Introduction, Methods, Results, Conclusions, Artwork and Tables with Captions.

If your article includes any Videos and/or other Supplementary material, this should be included in your initial submission for peer review purposes.

Divide the article into clearly defined sections.

Please ensure the text of your paper is double-spaced — this is an essential peer review requirement.

### Figures and tables embedded in text - Your Paper Your Way

If you choose the Your Paper Your Way option when submitting your manuscript for the first time, please ensure the figures and the tables included in the single file are placed next to the relevant text in the manuscript, rather than at the bottom or the top of the file.

## Subdivision

Manuscript files should be structured as follows: (1) Title page, including Disclosure of interest and Acknowledgments, etc.; (2) Manuscript file including Abstract, Keywords, Abbreviations, Main text, References, Legends of figures and tables; (3) Table files; (4) Figure files; (5) Supplementary files; (6) ICMJE forms.

## Manuscript Headings

Original Article level 1 headings are: Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusions. Articles should include the level 2 subsection heading Study Limitations at the end of the Discussion section. Longer articles may need other level 2 and/or level 3 subsection headings to clarify their content, especially the Results and Discussion sections.

Other types of articles such as Commentaries and Special Communications do not require this format.

## Title Page

Include these elements in the title page in the following sequence, double-spaced: (1) Running head of no more than 40 character spaces (no abbreviations); (2) Title (no abbreviations); (3) Author(s) full name(s) and highest academic degree(s); (4) The name(s) of the institution(s), section(s), division(s), and department(s) where the study was performed and the institutional affiliation(s) of the author(s) at the time of the study. An asterisk after an author's name and a footnote may indicate a change in affiliation; (5) Acknowledgment of any presentation of this material, to whom, when, and where; (6) Acknowledgment of financial support, including grant numbers and any other needed acknowledgments. Explanations of any conflicts of interest; (7) Name, address, business telephone number, and e-mail address of corresponding author; and (8) Clinical trial registration number, if applicable. Please note that clinical trial registration will now be required as of January 1, 2016. The grace period will end January 1, 2017 when registration will be mandatory.

## Abstract

For articles reporting original data (Original Articles, Brief Reports) and Review Articles (including Meta-Analyses), a structured abstract is required (see the [Instructions for Structured Abstracts](#)). Authors should make sure the key elements from the Reporting Guideline (eg, CONSORT, PRISMA, etc.) they followed for their manuscript are included in the abstract as well as the body of the paper. For other manuscripts (e.g., Commentaries, Editorials and Special Communications), include a conventional, unstructured abstract of no more than 250 words.

## Keywords

All abstracts must include provide 3 to 5 Keywords identified by the author. Keywords must be selected from the US National Library of Medicine's (NLM) *Medical Subject Headings*, which is available at <http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MBrowser.html>.

## Abbreviations

*Archives'* editorial policy is to **minimize the use of abbreviations**. Fewer abbreviations make it easier for the multidisciplinary readership to follow the text. Authors should include a list of abbreviations in their manuscript file directly following the keywords (just above the introduction). *Archives* uses only standard abbreviations with Davis's and Dorland's as our guides. Abbreviations that are used only in tables, appendices, or figures are not included in the list and should be defined in the table, appendix, or figure legend. However, abbreviations that are in the list need not be re-defined in a table footnote or figure legend. All abbreviation lists **must** be alphabetized. All abbreviations must be defined upon first mention in the body of the manuscript. The abbreviations SD (standard deviation) and SE (standard error) require no definition in *Archives*.

## Results

When data are summarized in the Results section, specify the statistical methods used to analyze them. Describe the success of any blinding of observations. Report treatment complications. Give numbers of observations. Report losses to observation (ie, dropouts from a clinical trial). Present results in logical sequence in the text, tables, and illustrations. *Archives* aims to publish no more than 5 figures per manuscript so restrict tables and figures to those needed to explain arguments and to assess their support. Use graphs as an alternative to tables with many entries; do not duplicate data in graphs and tables. Do not repeat in the text all the data in the tables, illustrations, or both; emphasize or summarize only important observations.

While there may be occasional exceptions, *Archives* is committed to the need for clinical trial reports to be accompanied by adequate periods of follow-up. A lack of sufficient follow-up may be detrimental to a paper's acceptance.

## Discussion

Emphasize the new and important aspects of the study and the conclusions that follow from them. Do not repeat in detail data or other material given in the introduction or the Results section. Include in the Discussion section the implications of the findings and their limitations, including implications for future research. Authors should address the issue of effect magnitude, in terms of both the statistics reported and the implications of the research. Relate the observations to other relevant studies.

## Study Limitations

Include the subsection (Level 2 heading), "Study Limitations" to discuss the limitations of the study.

## Conclusions

Link the conclusions with the study's goals but avoid unqualified statements not supported by the data. Avoid claiming priority and alluding to work that is incomplete. State new hypotheses when warranted, but clearly label them as such. Recommendations, when appropriate, may be included.

## Graphical abstract

Although a graphical abstract is optional, its use is encouraged as it draws more attention to the online article. The graphical abstract should summarize the contents of the article in a concise, pictorial form designed to capture the attention of a wide readership. Graphical abstracts should be submitted as a separate file in the online submission system. Image size: Please provide an image with a minimum of 531 × 1328 pixels (h × w) or proportionally more. The image should be readable at a size of 5 × 13 cm using a regular screen resolution of 96 dpi. Preferred file types: TIFF, EPS, PDF or MS Office files. You can view [Example Graphical Abstracts](#) on our information site.

Authors can make use of Elsevier's Illustration and Enhancement service to ensure the best presentation of their images and in accordance with all technical requirements: [Illustration Service](#).

## Highlights

Highlights are a short collection of bullet points that convey the core findings of the article. Highlights are optional and should be submitted in a separate editable file in the online submission system. Please use 'Highlights' in the file name and include 3 to 5 bullet points (maximum 85 characters, including spaces, per bullet point). You can view [example Highlights](#) on our information site.

## Main Manuscript

### Introduction

State the purpose of the article. Summarize the rationale for the study or observation. Give only pertinent references, and do not review the subject extensively. Do not include data or conclusions from the work being reported. Do not include a heading for this section.

### Methods

Describe the selection of the observational or experimental subjects (patients or experimental animals, including controls) clearly. Discuss eligibility of experimental subjects. Give details about randomization. Describe the methods for any blinding of observations. Identify the methods, equipment and materials, and procedures in sufficient detail to allow others to reproduce the results. Reference established methods, including statistical methods (see below); provide very brief descriptions for methods that have been published but are not well known; describe new or substantially modified methods, give reasons for using them, and evaluate their limitations. Identify precisely all drugs and chemicals used, including generic name(s), dose(s), and route(s) of administration.

While there may be occasional exceptions, *Archives* is committed to the need for clinical trial reports to be accompanied by adequate periods of follow-up. A lack of sufficient follow-up may be detrimental to a paper's acceptance.

When reporting work with human subjects, indicate whether the procedures followed protocol and accord with the ethical standards of the responsible institutional review board, ethics committee or with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2013, as appropriate for the country where the research took place.<sup>2</sup>

Do not use patients' names, initials, or hospital numbers, especially in any illustrative material. When reporting experiments on animals, indicate whether the procedures followed accord with the institution's committee on animal experimentation or with the National Research Council's guide on the care and use of laboratory animals. *Archives* may require authors to verify the above procedures.

Describe statistical methods in enough detail to enable knowledgeable readers with access to the original data to verify the reported results. When possible, quantify findings and present them with appropriate indicators of measurement error or uncertainty (eg, confidence intervals [CIs]). Avoid sole reliance on statistical hypothesis testing, such as *P* values, which fails to convey important quantitative information.

Researchers should report and identify the specific statistical test used and the obtained statistical value. Researchers should supplement the results of any statistical value. Researchers should supplement the results of any statistical significance test with the use of effect size values or CIs. Measures of effect size or CIs should be routinely included in quantitative clinical trials reported in rehabilitation research. The statistical power values and the corresponding type II error probability should always be reported for statistically nonsignificant results.

The investigator should ensure that there is sufficient power to detect, as statistically significant, a clinically meaningful treatment effect of an *a priori* specified size<sup>4</sup>. References for study design and statistical methods should be to standard works (with pages stated) rather than to papers in which designs or methods were originally reported.

Specify any general use computer programs used. Avoid nontechnical uses of technical terms in statistics, such as "random" (which implies a randomizing device), "normal," "significant," "correlation," or "sample." Define statistical terms, abbreviations, and symbols.

When submitting manuscripts on randomized controlled trials (RCTs), authors must include the CONSORT (Consolidated Standards for Reporting Trials) flow diagram. See the [Reporting Guidelines](#).

### Figure legends

A list of figure legends should be provided after the reference list, listing each figure in order by number. Legends/captions should not be embedded in the figure files themselves.

### Figure captions

Ensure that each illustration has a caption. A caption should comprise a brief title (**not** on the figure itself) and a description of the illustration. Keep text in the illustrations themselves to a minimum but explain all symbols and abbreviations used.

### Tables

Submit each table as a separate file. Accepted file formats are PDF and Word (Please do not upload Excel files). If needed, Excel files will be requested from the authors upon a final editorial decision of accept. Number tables consecutively in the order of their first citation in the text. Include a brief title for each table, include a short or abbreviated heading for each column. Place explanatory matter in footnotes, not in the title or column headings. Explain in footnotes all nonstandard abbreviations that are used in each table. For footnotes, use the following symbols, in this sequence: \*, †, ‡, §, ||, ¶, #, \*\*, ††, ‡‡

Identify statistical measures of variations such as standard deviation and standard error of the mean. Do not use internal horizontal and vertical rules. Be sure that each table is cited in the text in order. Using too many tables in relation to the length of the text may produce typesetting difficulties.

Data from another published or unpublished source may only be used with permission and must be acknowledged fully. It is the author's responsibility to obtain such permission.

### Supplementary data

*Archives* accepts electronic supplementary material to support and enhance your scientific research. Supplementary files offer the author additional possibilities to publish supporting applications, high-resolution images, background datasets, sound clips, and more. Supplementary files supplied will be published online alongside the electronic version of your article in Elsevier Web products, including ScienceDirect: ☐ <http://www.sciencedirect.com>.

### Suppliers

Before the References section, provide a Suppliers list with contact information (names and complete mailing addresses) for manufacturers of devices and other non-drug products used directly in a study (ie, do not provide such information for products not directly used in your research but mentioned in studies you cite). Identify equipment and/or materials in text, tables, and legends by superscript lower case letters. List suppliers consecutively in the order they are mentioned in the text.

Manufacturer names and locations should **not** be listed in the text where the product is introduced. Do not list Suppliers in the References list. Do not list drug manufacturers in the Suppliers list.

### References

References in manuscripts accepted by *Archives* shall include only material that is retrievable through standard literature searches. Number references consecutively in the order in which they first appear in the text. Identify references in text, tables, and legends by superscript Arabic numerals. References cited only in tables or in legends to figures should be numbered in accordance with a sequence established by the first identification in the text of the particular table or figure.

Try to avoid using abstracts as references; "unpublished observations" and "personal communications" may not be used as references, although references to written, not oral, communications may be inserted (in parentheses) in the text. Avoid "personal communication" unless it provides essential information not available from a public source. In this case, cite the name of the person and date of communication in parentheses in the text. For scientific articles, authors should obtain written permission and confirmation of accuracy from the source of personal communication.

Include among the references those papers **accepted** but not yet published; designate the journal and add "In press." Authors must obtain written permission to cite such papers as well as verification that they have been accepted for publication. Editors will request from the author(s) a copy of the letter from the journal accepting the "in press" article if the manuscript in which it is cited is accepted by *Archives*. Information from manuscripts **submitted** but not yet accepted should be cited in the text as "(unpublished observations)" with written permission from the source.

The references must be verified by the author(s) against the original documents. List all authors and/or editors for each reference, up to 6 authors. If there are 7 or more authors, truncate the list to the first 3 names and add "et al."

### Citations in the running text

Number references consecutively in the order in which they first appear in the text. Identify references in text, tables, and legends by superscript Arabic numerals. References cited only in tables or in legends to figures should be numbered in accordance with a sequence established by the first identification in the text of the particular table or figure.

### Data references

This journal encourages you to cite underlying or relevant datasets in your manuscript by citing them in your text and including a data reference in your Reference List. Data references should include the following elements: author name(s), dataset title, data repository, version (where available), year, and global persistent identifier. Add [dataset] immediately before the reference so we can properly identify it as a data reference. The [dataset] identifier will not appear in your published article.

### Reference management software

Most Elsevier journals have a standard template available in key reference management packages. This covers packages using the Citation Style Language, such as Mendeley (☐ <http://www.mendeley.com/features/reference-manager>) and also others like EndNote (☐ <http://www.endnote.com/support/enstyles.asp>) and Reference Manager (☐ <http://refman.com/downloads/styles>). Using plug-ins to word processing packages which are available from the above sites, authors only need to select the appropriate journal template when preparing their article and the list of references and citations to these will be formatted according to the journal style as described in this Guide. The process of including templates in these packages is constantly ongoing. If the journal you are looking for does not have a template available yet, please see the list of sample references and citations provided in this Guide to help you format these according to the journal style.



#### Reference formatting

There are no strict requirements on reference formatting at submission. References can be in any style or format as long as the style is consistent. Where applicable, author(s) name(s), journal title/book title, chapter title/article title, year of publication, volume number/book chapter and the pagination must be present. Use of DOI is highly encouraged. The reference style used by the journal will be applied to the accepted article by Elsevier at the proof stage. Note that missing data will be highlighted at proof stage for the author to correct. If you do wish to format the references yourself they should be arranged according to the following examples:

#### Reference style

**Text:** Indicate references by (consecutive) superscript Arabic numerals in the order in which they appear in the text. The numerals are to be used *outside* periods and commas, *inside* colons and semicolons. For further detail and examples you are referred to the AMA Manual of Style, A Guide for Authors and Editors, Tenth Edition, ISBN 0-978-0-19-517633-9 (see <http://www.amanualofstyle.com>).  
**List:** Number the references in the list in the order in which they appear in the text. Click [here](#) for examples of correct reference formats.

#### Journal abbreviations in references

The titles of journals should be abbreviated according to the style used in *MEDLINE*. Consult *List of Serials Indexed for Online Users*, which is available from the NLM at <http://www.nlm.nih.gov/tsd/serials/tsiou.html>.

#### AudioSlides

The journal encourages authors to create an AudioSlides presentation with their published article. AudioSlides are brief, webinar-style presentations that are shown next to the online article on ScienceDirect. This gives authors the opportunity to summarize their research in their own words and to help readers understand what the paper is about. [More information and examples are available](#). Authors of this journal will automatically receive an invitation e-mail to create an AudioSlides presentation after acceptance of their paper.

#### Submission checklist

*Archives* requires the completion and upload of a checklist with each manuscript. Please follow the instructions on the checklist, which can be downloaded [here](#), to ensure all required manuscript elements are included with your submission. Please note that this submission checklist is NOT the same as a reporting guideline checklist or form noted above. This is a separate item specific to the *Archives*.

For any further information please visit our customer support site at <http://support.elsevier.com>.

## **List of Abbreviations**

**BADS:** Behavioural Assessment of the Dysexecutive Syndrome

***M:*** Mean

**MS:** Multiple Sclerosis

***n:*** Number of participants

**NeuroQol:** Quality of Life in Neurological Disorders Measure

**NHS:** National Health Service

**OCF:** Objective cognitive functioning

**PASAT:** Paced Auditory Serial Additions Test

**PHQ-9:** Patient Health Questionnaire - 9

**PROMIS:** Patient Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System

***SD:*** Standard Deviation

**WAIS:** Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale

**WMS:** Wechsler Memory Scale



## Abstract

**Objective:** To investigate whether self-efficacy remains predictive of perceived cognitive impairment after controlling for objective cognitive functioning, and to further examine the relationship between self-efficacy and cognitive domains, as measured objectively.

**Design:** A cross-sectional design was employed.

**Setting:** General community setting within a semi-rural part of the United Kingdom.

**Participants:** A convenience sample of twenty-five participants with a diagnosis of Multiple Sclerosis. Participants were recruited via National Health Service clinics and the Multiple Sclerosis Society. Eligible participants were those with a diagnosis of Multiple Sclerosis (any subtype), aged  $\geq 18$  years, of fluent English language, and with sufficient cognitive and motor ability to complete neuropsychological assessment.

**Intervention(s):** Not applicable.

**Main Outcome Measure(s):** The main outcome measures included the Liverpool Self-efficacy Scale<sup>1</sup> as a measure of self-efficacy, and the Cognitive Function (v.2) questionnaire of the Quality of Life in Neurological Disorders (Neuro-QOL) Measures<sup>2</sup> to assess perceived cognitive impairment. Objective cognitive functioning, i.e., attention, processing speed, memory, and executive functioning, was assessed using a variety of neuropsychological measures.

**Results:** Using regression analyses, self-efficacy was found to significantly predict perceived cognitive impairment, even after controlling for objective cognitive functioning. Self-efficacy accounted for 45% of the variance in perceived cognitive impairment ( $F_{(1,22)} = 8.92, p = .001$ ). Correlational analyses revealed a significant

relationship between self-efficacy and processing speed, and self-efficacy and executive function.

**Conclusion(s):** Self-efficacy is associated with the perception of cognitive impairment in people with Multiple Sclerosis, and therefore may be an important aspect of self-management programmes.

**Key words:** Self-efficacy, cognition, Multiple Sclerosis.

Multiple Sclerosis (MS) is an autoimmune disease of the central nervous system causing inflammation, demyelination and axonal loss within the brain and spinal cord<sup>3</sup>. A review of the General Practice Research Database estimated the prevalence of MS in the U.K to be 203.4 per 100,000 population in 2010, with women accounting for 72% of the prevalence rates<sup>4</sup>. Clinical symptoms vary dependent upon the lesion site affected, and the subsequent disease course of either relapsing-remitting or progressive MS. However, symptoms can include motor, cognitive, and behavioural deficits<sup>5</sup>, and neuropsychiatric complications such as depression and anxiety<sup>6</sup>.

The research literature refers to a number of different psychological processes that may impact upon an individual's ability to adjust to life with a physical health condition, such as MS<sup>7</sup>. One of these psychological processes, grounded in social-cognitive theory, is self-efficacy. Differentiated from outcome expectancies, i.e., the understanding that performing a behaviour will lead to a specific outcome<sup>8</sup>, self-efficacy expectations refers to the degree to which an individual believes that they are able to perform a task in order to produce a desired outcome<sup>9</sup>. Self-efficacy is one of the major determinants of peoples choice of activities, how much effort they expend in a task, and how long they persist in the face of difficulties<sup>9,10</sup>. Yet, possibly due to the unpredictable nature of the disease, people with MS experience lower levels of self-efficacy than people with other physical health conditions, including spinal cord injury<sup>11</sup>.

Research suggests that self-efficacy is associated with health-related quality of life, depression, and social functioning<sup>12</sup>, as well as physical activity in people with MS<sup>13</sup>.

However, only three studies to date have investigated the relationship between self-efficacy and cognition in people with MS. Initial research examined self-efficacy in the context of perceived cognitive impairment i.e., impairment as measured by patient self-report. Research by Schmitt and colleagues in 2014 found self-efficacy to be predictive of perceived cognitive impairment in a sample of individuals with a range diagnostic subtypes<sup>12</sup>. Expanding these initial findings, longitudinal research found self-efficacy to remain predictive of perceived cognitive impairment over a three-year period<sup>14</sup>. Although depression and fatigue are associated with perceived cognitive impairment in MS<sup>15</sup>, self-efficacy continues to be predictive of perceived cognitive impairment even when these variables are controlled for<sup>14</sup>.

More recent research has begun to consider the relationship between self-efficacy and objective cognitive functioning, i.e., cognitive ability as measured using computer or clinician administered neuropsychological assessments. Using a sample of participants with clinically isolated syndrome or early relapsing-remitting MS, Jongen and colleagues (2015) found self-efficacy to be associated with power of attention, reaction time variability, and speed of memory, using a computerised battery of cognitive tests<sup>16</sup>. The findings suggest that self-efficacy positively affects performance on cognitive tests, particularly in the cognitive domains most typically affected by MS<sup>16</sup>. The authors also hypothesised that cognitive ability may impact upon self-efficacy, in that individuals with greater cognitive capacity may feel better able to manage their symptoms as compared to individuals with impaired cognition<sup>16</sup>.

Cognitive impairments are reported to occur in approximately 45-65% of people with MS, and commonly include deficits in attention, memory, and executive functioning<sup>17</sup>. The impact of cognitive impairment is wide spread, and includes a greater risk of unemployment, reduced engagement in social activities, and increased difficulties undertaking activities of everyday living<sup>18</sup>. Therefore, understanding psychological variables associated with cognition is essential in order to continue to develop self-management interventions that are grounded in the evidence base.

The primary aim of this study was to address the current gaps in the research literature by investigating whether self-efficacy remains predictive of perceived cognitive impairment, even when objective cognitive functioning has been controlled for. Secondly, this study aimed to add to the currently limited literature base by examining the relationship between self-efficacy and objective cognitive functioning using ecologically valid measurement tools.

## **Methods**

### ***Participants***

The participant sample ( $n = 25$ ) was recruited from National Health Service clinics and from local branches of the MS Society, based within a semi-rural area in North Wales, United Kingdom. Eligible participants were those with a diagnosis of MS, aged  $\geq 18$  years, of fluent English language, and with sufficient cognitive and motor ability to complete neuropsychological assessment. Exclusion criteria included co-morbid

neurological diagnoses (including diagnosis of a dementia syndrome), current substance misuse, and significant current mental health difficulties that would impact upon capacity to provide informed consent.

## ***Measures***

***Clinical Measures.*** Participants completed five questionnaire measures.

*Self-efficacy.* Self-efficacy was measured using the Liverpool Self-efficacy Scale<sup>1</sup>. This is an 11-item Likert-type scale, consisting of two domains of control and personal agency. The scale has been validated using a sample of people with MS; the authors report good internal consistency ( $\alpha = 0.81$ ) and acceptable test-retest reliability (intraclass correlation coefficient of 0.79)<sup>1</sup>. Low scores on this scale are associated with low self-efficacy.

*Perceived cognitive impairment.* The Cognitive Function questionnaire of the Quality of Life in Neurological Disorders<sup>2</sup> (Neuro-QOL) short-form measure (version 2) assesses both executive function and general concerns (e.g., attention, memory, planning, and organising), and consists of 8 items scored on a 5-point Likert scale. This short-form measure allows for raw scores to be converted into standardised T scores ( $M = 50$ ,  $SD = 10$ ). Higher scores denote less perceived cognitive difficulty.

*Multiple Sclerosis subtype and neurological impairment.* MS subtype was assessed using self-report. Where participants were unsure as to their diagnosis, their MS specialist nurse was consulted (with written consent) to obtain this information. Neurological impairment was assessed using the Multiple Sclerosis Questionnaire<sup>19</sup>. This 17-item questionnaire has been demonstrated to be highly cross-correlated with other measures of impairment in MS and is therefore recommended as a valid and accurate measure<sup>19</sup>.

*Fatigue.* The Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System (PROMIS) Fatigue short form for MS was administered to assess fatigue<sup>20</sup>. This measure includes 8 items scored using a 5-point Likert scale. Raw scores are converted to standardised T scores ( $M = 50$ ,  $SD = 10$ ). The PROMIS measures have been shown to be valid for use with people with MS<sup>21</sup>. Higher scores on this measure are associated with greater levels of fatigue.

*Depression.* Symptoms associated with depression were assessed using the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9)<sup>22</sup>. This 9-item measure is scored using a 4-point Likert-type scale. The PHQ-9 has been validated for use in a MS sample<sup>23</sup>. Higher scores are associated with greater symptoms of depression.

***Neuropsychological measures.*** Participants completed a series of neuropsychological assessments, covering a breadth of cognitive domains.

*Attention.* The Paced Auditory Serial Additions Test (PASAT)<sup>24</sup> was initially developed as a measure of information processing speed and flexibility. It has since been adapted<sup>25</sup>, and subsequently has been extensively used within the MS population as a measure of attention. Participants are presented with a series of single-digit numbers using a pre-recorded tape, and are required to add the most recent number to the one presented immediately before it. Participants are not required to keep a running total, but to provide the sum of the last two numbers heard. There are two subtests, and the numbers are presented at a rate of every three seconds on the first subtest and every two seconds on the following subtest. On each subtest, participants are presented with a total of 60

numbers. The PASAT has demonstrated good internal consistency<sup>26</sup>. High scores represent greater attentional abilities.

*Processing Speed.* The symbol search and coding subtests of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale fourth edition (WAIS-IV)<sup>26</sup> were administered as a measure of speed of information processing. The symbol search subtest assesses both processing speed and visual perception. On the symbol search subtest, participants are required to scan a series of symbols presented sequentially in a row, and identify whether they match a target symbol. On the coding subtest, participants are required to translate symbols, each uniquely associated with a number, into boxes. Both the symbol search and coding subtests are timed tasks of two minutes each, and therefore participants are encouraged to work as quickly and accurately as possible. Scores on the symbol search and coding subtests are converted into a processing speed index score ( $M = 100$ ,  $SD = 15$ ). Higher scores reflect a quicker processing speed.

*Memory.* The Logical Memory subtests of the Wechsler Memory Scale fourth edition (WMS-IV)<sup>28</sup> were administered as a measure of immediate and delayed verbal memory. The researcher read two short stories, which participants were required to recall both immediately and after a 30-minute delay. There are two versions available, one for adults (16-69 years) and one for older adults (aged 65-90 years). These were administered accordingly given the participant's age. Higher scores indicate greater recall.

*Executive Function.* Executive functioning was measured using the 6 Elements Test of the Behavioural Assessment of the Dysexecutive Syndrome (BADS)<sup>29</sup>. This is a set task of ten minutes in which participants are instructed to undertake three different types of tasks, a dictation task, a picture-naming task, and an arithmetic task. Participants are



advised to adhere to specific rules throughout the task, with points deducted if the rules are not observed. Low scores represent executive dysfunction.

## **Procedure**

Ethical approval was obtained from the School of Psychology, Bangor University, and from the Research and Ethics Committee of local Health Board. Participants were recruited via three methods: Potential participants who met the eligibility criteria were approached during their routine National Health Service (NHS) MS nurse appointment, and the third author approached potential participants at their NHS clinical psychology appointment. The first author also contacted the local branches of the MS Society and presented details about the research study at Society meetings. Potential participants were provided with a bilingual (English and Welsh) information pack, containing an information sheet and an initial contact form. Interested participants were advised to return the initial contact form to the first author using a freepost envelope provided in the information pack. Upon receipt of the initial contact form, participants were contacted via telephone and a research appointment was arranged. Appointments took place within NHS premises or within the participants' own home. Written consent was obtained at the start of the appointment, and subsequently, the questionnaire and neuropsychological measures were administered. Measures were completed over 1-3 appointments as requested by the research participant to accommodate for participant fatigue. Recruitment and testing took place between September 2016 and March 2017.

## Data analyses

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23 was used to perform all analyses. In order to create a single measure of objective cognitive functioning, tests measuring the four individual cognitive domains (i.e., attention, processing speed, memory, executive function) were standardised and averaged, before the four cognitive domain scores were averaged to create a single measure. Specifically, the raw scores for each neuropsychological assessment were converted into standardised scores using normative data. The WMS-IV Logical Memory subtest raw scores were converted into scaled scores using normative data based upon age ( $M = 10$ ,  $SD = 3$ ). These two scaled scores were each transformed into z scores. An average of the two z scores was then calculated to produce an overall z score for verbal memory. For the WAIS-IV symbol search and coding subtests, again, each raw score was converted into a scaled score using normative data based upon age ( $M = 10$ ,  $SD = 3$ ). The sum of the two scaled scores were then transformed into a processing speed composite score ( $M = 100$ ,  $SD = 15$ ). A final z score for processing speed was then calculated from the composite score. Scores on the PASAT and the BADS 6 Elements Test were converted into z scores to generate a total score for attention and executive functioning respectively. Finally, the z scores for each cognitive domain were averaged, using the mean, to create a unified measure of objective cognitive functioning ( $M = 0$ ,  $SD = 1$ ).

The primary aim of this study was to determine whether self-efficacy remains predictive of perceived cognitive impairment, even when objective cognitive functioning has been controlled for. This aim was addressed using hierarchical regression analyses, with

perceived cognitive impairment as the outcome variable, and objective cognitive functioning and self-efficacy as the predictor variables. Objective cognitive functioning was entered into the regression model at stage 1 (Model 1), and self-efficacy was entered into the model at stage 2 (Model 2). This study also aimed to further examine the relationship between self-efficacy and objective cognitive functioning. Therefore correlational analyses were performed between self-efficacy and the cognitive domains of attention, processing speed, memory, and executive functioning. The data were initially examined to determine whether the assumptions for parametric analyses were met, and either Pearson's product or Spearman's rho analyses were performed, dependent upon whether the data were normally distributed.

## **Results**

### **Participants**

Descriptive statistics for demographic variables, self-efficacy, fatigue, perceived cognitive impairment, and depression are presented in Table 1. The majority of participants were female ( $n = 18$ ), and all participants were aged between 31 and 78 ( $M = 52.92$ ,  $SD = 12.96$ ). Ten participants had a diagnosis of relapsing-remitting MS (40%), nine participants had a diagnosis of secondary progressive MS (36%), and six participants had a diagnosis of primary progressive MS (24%). Participants had experienced symptoms of MS for between 33 and 480 months ( $M = 185.68$ ,  $SD = 111.28$ ), and had received a diagnosis of MS between 22 and 300 months prior to undertaking the research project ( $M = 132.16$ ,  $SD = 91.30$ ).

Table 1.

*Descriptive statistics for demographic and disease-related variables, fatigue, depression, self-efficacy, and perceived cognitive impairment*

|                                       | <u>Values (n = 25)</u>     |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <i>Education level</i>                |                            |
| School or less                        | 8 (32)                     |
| College course or equivalent          | 7 (28)                     |
| University degree or higher           | 10 (40)                    |
| <i>Employment Status</i>              |                            |
| Employed full time                    | 7 (28)                     |
| Unemployed                            | 3 (12)                     |
| Retired/retired on ill-health grounds | 15 (60)                    |
| <i>Ethnicity</i>                      |                            |
| White British                         | 21 (84)                    |
| Welsh                                 | 1 (4)                      |
| Other ethnicity                       | 3 (12)                     |
| <i>PROMIS-Fatigue</i>                 | 58.85 ± 10.52 (34.7, 81.3) |
| <i>PHQ-9</i>                          | 9.6 ± 7.14 (0, 26)         |
| <i>Liverpool Self-efficacy Scale</i>  |                            |
| Control subscale                      | 15.76 ± 4.42 (7, 24)       |
| Personal agency subscale              | 13 ± 3.01 (6, 20)          |
| Total score                           | 28.76 ± 6.95 (14, 44)      |
| <i>NeuroQOL-Cognitive Function</i>    | 42.72 ± 7.72 (25.9, 56.3)  |

Note. Values are mean ± SD (minimum, maximum) or n (%).

Details regarding neurological impairment for the sample are provided in Table 2. Based upon the mean score on the PHQ-9, the sample was experiencing a mild to moderate level of depression. Perceived cognitive impairment and fatigue fell within one standard deviation of the population mean. Group means and standard deviations for performance on neuropsychological assessments are displayed in the appendix.

Table 2.

*Neurological impairment (MS Questionnaire<sup>19</sup>)*

|   | (%) |
|---|-----|
| Require an aid to walk                        | 48  |
| Uses a wheelchair for almost all activities   | 16  |
| Mild weakness                                 | 12  |
| Moderate or severe weakness                   | 64  |
| Mildly impaired sensation                     | 28  |
| Moderately or severely impaired sensation     | 56  |
| Mildly impaired visual acuity                 | 4   |
| Moderately or severely impaired visual acuity | 12  |
| Mildly uncoordinated                          | 32  |
| Moderately or severely uncoordinated          | 24  |
| Mild difficulties with speech                 | 12  |
| Moderate or severe difficulties with speech   | 12  |
| Mild difficulty with balance                  | 16  |
| Moderate or severe difficulty with balance    | 68  |
| Mild spasticity and/or spasms                 | 40  |
| Moderate or severe spasticity and/or spasms   | 48  |
| Mild difficulty with swallowing               | 32  |
| Moderate or severe difficulty with swallowing | 4   |
| Difficulties with bowel or bladder function   | 76  |
| Mild dizziness or vertigo                     | 32  |
| Moderate to severe dizziness or vertigo       | 12  |

### **Regression analysis**

A hierarchical regression analysis revealed that objective cognitive functioning only explained 12% of the variance in perceived cognitive impairment, and this model (Model 1) was not significantly better than chance ( $F_{(1,23)} = 3.15, p = .089$ ). When both objective cognitive functioning and self-efficacy were entered at stage 2 (Model 2), they explained 45% of the variance and significantly contributed to the model ( $F_{(1,22)} = 8.92, p = .001$ ).

The regression analysis is detailed in Table 3.

Table 3.

*Regression analyses*

| Variable                | Model 1 |      |         | Model 2 |       |         |
|-------------------------|---------|------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
|                         | B       | SE B | $\beta$ | B       | SE B  | $\beta$ |
| Constant                | 44.46   | 1.78 | -       | 19.90   | 6.95  | -       |
| OCF                     | 2.67    | 1.50 | .35     | -0.48   | 1.49  | -.06    |
| Self-efficacy           | -       | -    | -       | 0.78    | 0.22  | .70**   |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> | -       | .08  | -       | -       | .40   | -       |
| R <sup>2</sup> Change   | -       | .12  | -       | -       | .33   | -       |
| F Change                | -       | 3.15 | -       | -       | 13.05 | -       |

Note. OCF, objective cognitive functioning; \*\* $p = .002$

**Correlational analyses***Correlational analysis between self-efficacy and cognitive domains*

A significant relationship between self-efficacy and processing speed was found on both the personal agency subscale and the total self-efficacy score. A significant relationship between executive function and both the control subscale and self-efficacy total score was also found. No other significant relationships were found between self-efficacy and cognitive domains. All correlational analyses are demonstrated in Table 4.

Table 4.

*Correlational analyses between self-efficacy and cognitive domains*

|                     | Cognitive Domain |                               |        |                    |
|---------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|--------|--------------------|
|                     | Attention        | Processing Speed <sup>a</sup> | Memory | Executive Function |
| Control             | .11              | .33                           | .31    | .49*               |
| Personal agency     | .31              | .51**                         | .34    | .26                |
| Total self-efficacy | .15              | .43*                          | .33    | .42*               |

Note. \*\*p&lt;. 01, \*p&lt;. 05 (2-tailed)

All values are Spearman's rho, unless otherwise stated

<sup>a</sup> = Pearson's r

## Discussion

Extending previous research<sup>12,14</sup>, this study found self-efficacy significantly predicts perceived cognitive impairment in individuals MS, even when controlling for objective cognitive functioning. In this sample, objective cognitive functioning was not a significant predictor of perceived cognitive impairment. This may be due to discrepancy between perceived and objective cognitive impairment found in individuals with MS<sup>30</sup>. The relationship between self-efficacy and specific cognitive domains was also investigated. Unlike previous research by Jongen and colleague (2015)<sup>16</sup>, there was not a significant relationship between attention and self-efficacy, although this may be due to differences in measurement. However, this study found a significant relationship between processing speed and self-efficacy, and executive functioning and self-efficacy. One of the strengths of this study was the use of ecologically valid measures of objective cognitive functioning. Furthermore, this study adds to the current literature on self-

efficacy and objective cognitive functioning by including people with a wider variety of diagnostic subtypes.

The findings from this study have both clinical and research implications. With regard to research implications, this study was the first to examine whether self-efficacy remains predictive of perceived cognitive impairment, whilst controlling for objective cognitive functioning. This study may therefore benefit from replication to ensure the findings are robust. With regard to clinical practice, clinicians may wish to consider whether self-management interventions, aimed at enhancing self-efficacy, reduce perceived cognitive impairment. Such studies would need to be carefully evaluated to determine their effectiveness. However, this is a meaningful area of rehabilitative work that has the potential to improve health outcomes for people with MS.

#### *Study limitations*

Previous research has found perceived cognitive impairment to be associated with depression and fatigue in individuals with MS<sup>15</sup>. However, due to the relatively small sample size and therefore limited statistical power of this study, depression and fatigue were not entered into the regression analysis. In addition, no demographic or disease-related variables were entered in to the regression model. However, previous research has not found a relationship between demographic variables (including age and diagnostic subtype) and self-efficacy in a sample of people with MS<sup>1</sup>. It is therefore possible that these variables would not have significantly contributed to the regression model.



Due to the cross-sectional design of this study, it is not possible to infer the direction of causality between self-efficacy and perceived cognitive impairment. Indeed, some authors have proposed that cognitive ability may affect self-efficacy, as opposed to self-efficacy affecting cognition<sup>16</sup>. Longitudinal research would be required to address this question. This study also assessed self-efficacy for MS in terms of sense of control and personal agency, as opposed to self-efficacy specifically in regard to cognition. However, participants were aware that they had consented to take part in a study on self-efficacy and cognition, and so it is reasonable to infer that they completed the self-efficacy measure with cognition in mind. Finally, due to the relatively small sample size included in this study, one should interpret the findings with some cautiousness.

### **Conclusion**

The present study was the first to examine the role of objective cognitive functioning in the relationship between self-efficacy and perceived cognitive impairment in people with MS. This study found that self-efficacy was predictive of perceived cognitive impairment, and remained so after controlling for objective cognitive functioning. There was a significant relationship between processing speed and self-efficacy, and executive functioning and self-efficacy; this study did not find a significant relationship between attention and self-efficacy, or verbal memory and self-efficacy.

## References

1. Airlie, J., Baker, G. A., Smith, S. J., & Young, C. A. (2001). Measuring the impact of Multiple Sclerosis on psychosocial functioning: The development of a new self-efficacy scale. *Clinical Rehabilitation*, 15(3), 259-265. doi: 10.1191/026921501668362643
2. Gershon, R.C., Lai, J.S., Bode, R., Choi, S., Moy, C., Bleck, T., Miller, D.,... Cella, D. (2012). Neuro-QOL: Quality of life item banks for adults with neurological disorders: Item development and calibrations based upon clinical and general population testing. *Quality of Life Research*, 21(3), 475-486. doi: 10.1007/s111136-011-9958-8
3. Kos, D., Kerckhofs, E., Nagels, G., D'hooghe, M. B., & Ilsbrouckx, S. (2008). Origin of fatigue in Multiple Sclerosis: Review of the literature. *Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair*, 22(1), 91-100. doi: 10.1177/1545968306298934
4. Mackenzie, I. S., Morant, S. V., Bloomfield, G. A., MacDonald, T. M., & O'Riordan, J. (2014). Incidence and prevalence of Multiple Sclerosis in the U.K. 1990–2010: A descriptive study in the General Practice Research Database. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*, 85(1), 76-84. doi: 10.1136/jnnp-2013-305450
5. Lezak, M.D., Howieson, D.B., Bigler, E.R., & Tranel, D. (2012). *Neuropsychological assessment*. New York: Oxford University Press.
6. Paparrigopoulos, T., Ferentinos, P., Kouzoupis, A., Koutsis, G., & Papadimitriou,

- G. N. (2010). The neuropsychiatry of Multiple Sclerosis: Focus on disorders of mood, affect and behaviour. *International Review of Psychiatry*, 22(1), 14-21. doi: 10.3109/09540261003589323.
7. Dennison, L., Moss-Morris, R., & Chalder, T. (2009). A review of psychological correlates of adjustment in patients with Multiple Sclerosis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 29(2), 141-153. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2008.12.001
  8. Bandura, A., Adams, N. E., & Beyer, J. (1977). Cognitive processes mediating behavioral change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35(3), 125.
  9. Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
  10. Rutter Goodworth, M. C., Stepleman, L., Hibbard, J., Johns, L., Wright, D., Hughes, M. D., & Williams, M. J. (2016). Variables Associated with Patient Activation in Persons with Multiple Sclerosis. Faculty Publications. *Grad School of Clinical Psychology* (Paper No. 250). Retrieved from [http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/gscp\\_fac/250](http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/gscp_fac/250)
  11. Shnek, Z. M., Foley, F. W., LaRocca, N. G., Gordon, W. A., DeLuca, J., Schwartzman, H. G., ... & Irvine, J. (1997). Helplessness, self-efficacy, cognitive distortions, and depression in Multiple Sclerosis and spinal cord injury. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 19(3), 287-294.
  12. Schmitt, M.M., Goverover, Y., DeLuca, J., Chiaravalloti, N. (2014). Self-efficacy as a predictor of self-reported physical, cognitive and social functioning in Multiple Sclerosis. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 59(1), 27-34. doi: 10.1037/a0035288.

13. Motl, R. W., Snook, E. M., McAuley, E., & Gliottoni, R. C. (2006). Symptoms, self- efficacy, and physical activity among individuals with Multiple Sclerosis. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 29(6), 597-606. doi: 10.1002/nur.20161
14. Hughes, A.J., Beier, M., Hartoonian, N., Turner, A.P., Amtmann, D., Ehde, D.M. (2015). Self-efficacy as a longitudinal predictor of perceived cognitive impairment in individuals with Multiple Sclerosis. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 96, 913-919. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2015.01.008
15. Kinsinger, S. W., Lattie, E., & Mohr, D. C. (2010). Relationship between depression, fatigue, subjective cognitive impairment, and objective neuropsychological functioning in patients with Multiple Sclerosis. *Neuropsychology*, 24(5), 573. doi: 10.1037/a0019222.
16. Jongen, P. J., Wesnes, K., van Geel, B., Pop, P., Schrijver, H., Visser, L. H., ... & Brands, A. M. (2015). Does self-efficacy affect cognitive performance in persons with clinically isolated syndrome and early relapsing remitting Multiple Sclerosis? *Multiple Sclerosis International* (Article ID: 960282). doi: 10.1155/2015/960282
17. DeSousa, E. A., Albert, R. H., & Kalman, B. (2002). Cognitive impairments in Multiple Sclerosis: A review. *American Journal of Alzheimer's disease and other Dementias*, 17(1), 23-29.
18. Kalmar, J. H., Gaudino, E. A., Moore, N. B., Halper, J., & DeLuca, J. (2008). The relationship between cognitive deficits and everyday functional activities in multiple sclerosis. *Neuropsychology*, 22(4), 442-449. doi: 10.1037/0894-4105.22.4.442

19. Goodin, D. S. (1998). A questionnaire to assess neurological impairment in Multiple Sclerosis. *Multiple Sclerosis Journal*, 4(5), 444-451.
20. Cook, K.F., Bamer, A.M., Roddey, T.S., Kraft, G.H., Kim, J., & Amtmann, D. (2012). A PROMIS fatigue short form for use by individuals who have Multiple Sclerosis. *Quality of Life Research*, 21(6), 1021-1030. doi: 10.1007/s11136-011-0011-8
21. Senders, A., Hanes, D., Bourdette, D., Whitham, R., & Shinto, L. (2014). Reducing survey burden: Feasibility and validity of PROMIS measures in Multiple Sclerosis. *Multiple Sclerosis Journal*, 20(8), 1102-1111. doi: 10.1177/1352458513517279
22. Spitzer, R. L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J. B., & Patient Health Questionnaire Primary Care Study Group. (1999). Validation and utility of a self-report version of PRIME-MD: The PHQ primary care study. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 282(18), 1737-1744. doi: 10.1001/jama.282.18.1737
23. Amtmann, D., Kim, J., Chung, H., Bamer, A. M., Askew, R. L., Wu, S., ... & Johnson, K. L. (2014). Comparing CESD-10, PHQ-9, and PROMIS depression instruments in individuals with Multiple Sclerosis. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 59(2), 220-229. doi: 10.1037/a0035919
24. Gronwall, D.M.A. (1977). Paced auditory serial-addition task: A measure of recovery from concussion. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 44, 367-373.
25. Rao, S. M., Leo, G. J., Haughton, V. M., ST. Aubin-Faubert, P., & Bernadin, L. (1989). Correlation of magnetic resonance imaging with neuropsychological testing in Multiple Sclerosis, *Neurology*, 39, 161-166

26. Tombaugh, T.N. (2006). A comprehensive review of the Paced Auditory Serial Additions Test (PASAT). *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*, 21, 53-76.  
doi:10.1016/j.acn.2005.07.006
27. Wechsler, D. (2008). *Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale Fourth Edition*. London: Pearson.
28. Wechsler, D. (2010). *Wechsler Memory Scale Fourth Edition*. London: Pearson.
29. Wilson, B.A., Alderman, N., Burgess, P.W., Emslie, H., & Evans, J.J. (1996). Behavioural Assessment of the Dysexecutive Syndrome Manual. Bury St Edmunds: Thames Valley Test Company.
30. Middleton, L.S., Denney, D.R., Lynch, S.G., & Parmenter, B. (2006). The relationship between perceived and objective cognitive functioning in Multiple Sclerosis. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*, 21(5), 487-494. doi: 10.1016/j.acn.2006.06.008

## **Appendices**

1. Funnel plot for publication bias (fatigue)
2. Funnel plot for publication bias (self-efficacy)
3. Empirical paper – Cognitive profile of research participants
4. Bangor University, School of Psychology Ethics Committee Approval
5. NHS IRAS Research Ethics Committee Form
6. Initial Research Ethics Committee Approval Letter
7. Research and Development Approval Letter
8. Notification of non-substantial amendments and corresponding Research  
Ethics Committee approval letters
9. Initial contact form – English
10. Initial contact form - Welsh
11. Participant information sheet – English
12. Participant information sheet – Welsh
13. Participant consent form – English
14. Participant consent form – Welsh
15. Demographic questionnaire
16. MS questionnaire
17. Liverpool self-efficacy scale
18. PROMIS-Fatigue
19. Patient Health Questionnaire – 9
20. NeuroQol - Cognitive Function
21. Word counts




Figure 1. Funnel plot for fatigue






Figure 2. Funnel plot for self-efficacy

Table 1.

*Means and standard deviations for neuropsychological assessment scores (non transformed)*

| <i>Measure</i>                         | <i>M ± SD</i> | <i>Range</i> |
|--|---------------|--------------|
| PASAT A 3" Total Correct Raw Score     | 35.83 ± 12.57 | 16 - 60      |
| PASAT A 2" Total Correct Raw Score     | 28.38 ± 9.65  | 10 - 50      |
| WAIS-IV Symbol Search                  | 25.44 ± 7.32  | 9 - 38       |
| WAIS-IV Coding                         | 56.75 ± 18.11 | 32 - 101     |
| WMS-IV Logical Memory 1 (Adults)       | 24.55 ± 6.91  | 13 - 36      |
| WMS-IV Logical Memory 1 (Older adults) | 34.25 ± 10.15 | 22 - 44      |
| WMS-IV Logical Memory 2 (Adults)       | 19.65 ± 8.06  | 5 - 34       |
| WMS-IV Logical Memory 2 (Older adults) | 18.50 ± 8.10  | 11 - 26      |
| BADS 6 Elements Profile Score          | 3.08 ± 1.32   | 0 - 4        |

Note. BADS, Behavioural Assessment of the Dysexecutive Syndrome; PASAT, Paced Auditory Serial Additions Test; WAIS, Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale; WMS, Wechsler Memory Scale.

## Welcome to the Integrated Research Application System

## IRAS Project Filter

The integrated dataset required for your project will be created from the answers you give to the following questions. The system will generate only those questions and sections which (a) apply to your study type and (b) are required by the bodies reviewing your study. Please ensure you answer all the questions before proceeding with your applications.

Please complete the questions in order. If you change the response to a question, please select 'Save' and review all the questions as your change may have affected subsequent questions.

Please enter a short title for this project (maximum 70 characters)  
Self-efficacy and cognition in Multiple Sclerosis

1. Is your project research?

☒ Yes ☐ No

2. Select one category from the list below:

- ☐ Clinical trial of an investigational medicinal product
- ☐ Clinical investigation or other study of a medical device
- ☐ Combined trial of an investigational medicinal product and an investigational medical device
- ☐ Other clinical trial to study a novel intervention or randomised clinical trial to compare interventions in clinical practice
- ☐ Basic science study involving procedures with human participants
- ☒ Study administering questionnaires/interviews for quantitative analysis, or using mixed quantitative/qualitative methodology
- ☐ Study involving qualitative methods only
- ☐ Study limited to working with human tissue samples (or other human biological samples) and data (specific project only)
- ☐ Study limited to working with data (specific project only)
- ☐ Research tissue bank
- ☐ Research database

If your work does not fit any of these categories, select the option below:

☐ Other study

2a. Please answer the following question(s):

- a) Does the study involve the use of any ionising radiation? ☐ Yes ☒ No
- b) Will you be taking new human tissue samples (or other human biological samples)? ☐ Yes ☒ No
- c) Will you be using existing human tissue samples (or other human biological samples)? ☐ Yes ☒ No

3. In which countries of the UK will the research sites be located? (Tick all that apply)

- ☐ England
- ☐ Scotland

- ☒ Wales  
☐ Northern Ireland

3a. In which country of the UK will the lead NHS R&D office be located:

- ☐ England  
☐ Scotland  
☒ Wales  
☐ Northern Ireland  
☐ This study does not involve the NHS

4. Which applications do you require?

**IMPORTANT:** If your project is taking place in the NHS and is led from England select 'IRAS Form'. If your project is led from Northern Ireland, Scotland or Wales select 'NHS/HSC Research and Development Offices' and/or relevant Research Ethics Committee applications, as appropriate.

- ☐ IRAS Form  
☒ NHS/HSC Research and Development offices  
☐ Social Care Research Ethics Committee  
☒ Research Ethics Committee  
☐ Confidentiality Advisory Group (CAG)  
☐ National Offender Management Service (NOMS) (Prisons & Probation)

For NHS/HSC R&D Offices in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales the CI must create NHS/HSC Site Specific Information forms, for each site, in addition to the study wide forms, and transfer them to the PIs or local collaborators.

For participating NHS organisations in England different arrangements apply for the provision of site specific information. Refer to IRAS Help for more information.

5. Will any research sites in this study be NHS organisations?

- ☒ Yes ☐ No

6. Do you plan to include any participants who are children?

- ☐ Yes ☒ No

7. Do you plan at any stage of the project to undertake intrusive research involving adults lacking capacity to consent for themselves?

- ☐ Yes ☒ No

Answer Yes if you plan to recruit living participants aged 16 or over who lack capacity, or to retain them in the study following loss of capacity. Intrusive research means any research with the living requiring consent in law. This includes use of identifiable tissue samples or personal information, except where application is being made to the Confidentiality Advisory Group to set aside the common law duty of confidentiality in England and Wales. Please consult the guidance notes for further information on the legal frameworks for research involving adults lacking capacity in the UK.

8. Do you plan to include any participants who are prisoners or young offenders in the custody of HM Prison Service or who are offenders supervised by the probation service in England or Wales?

- ☐ Yes ☒ No

|  |
|--|
|  |
| <b>9. Is the study or any part of it being undertaken as an educational project?</b><br><br><input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No<br><br>Please describe briefly the involvement of the student(s):<br>The student will be involved in all aspects of the project. |
| <b>9a. Is the project being undertaken in part fulfillment of a PhD or other doctorate?</b><br><br><input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No   |
| <b>10. Will this research be financially supported by the United States Department of Health and Human Services or any of its divisions, agencies or programs?</b><br><br><input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No  |
| <b>11. Will identifiable patient data be accessed outside the care team without prior consent at any stage of the project (including identification of potential participants)?</b><br><br><input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No                                   |

## Site-Specific Information Form (NHS sites)

**Is the site hosting this research a NHS site or a non-NHS site?** NHS sites include Health and Social Care organisations in Northern Ireland. The sites hosting the research are the sites in which or through which research procedures are conducted. For NHS sites, this includes sites where NHS staff are participants.

- ☒ NHS site  
☐ Non-NHS site

*This question must be completed before proceeding. The filter will customise the form, disabling questions which are not relevant to this application.*

*One Site-Specific Information Form should be completed for each research site and submitted to the relevant R&D office with the documents in the checklist. See guidance notes.*

*The data in this box is populated from Part A:*

Title of research:  
Self-efficacy and cognition in people with a diagnosis of Multiple Sclerosis.

Short title: Self-efficacy and cognition in Multiple Sclerosis

Chief Investigator: Title Forename/Initials Surname  
Mrs Laura E Spencer

Name of NHS Research Ethics Committee to which application for ethical review is being made:  
WalesRECS

Project reference number from above REC: 15/WA/0186

**1-1. Give the name of the NHS organisation responsible for this research site**

Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board

**1-3. In which country is the research site located?**

- ☐ England  
☒ Wales  
☐ Scotland  
☐ Northern Ireland

**1-4. Is the research site a GP practice or other Primary Care Organisation?**

- ☐ Yes ☒ No

**2. Who is the Principal Investigator or Local Collaborator for this research at this site?**

Select the appropriate title: ☒ Principal Investigator  
☐ Local Collaborator

Title Forename/Initials Surname  
 Mrs Laura E Spencer  
 Post Trainee Clinical Psychologist  
 Qualifications BSc Psychology with Clinical and Health Psychology, University of Wales, 2010  
 MSc Foundations of Clinical Psychology, Bangor University, 2011  
 Organisation Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board  
 Work Address Clinical Psychology Programme  
 School of Psychology  
 Bangor University, Bangor, Gwynedd  
 PostCode LL57 2AS  
 Work E-mail psp4eb@bangor.ac.uk  
 Work Telephone 07972763722  
 Mobile  
 Fax

a) Approximately how much time will this person allocate to conducting this research? Please provide your response in terms of Whole Time Equivalents (WTE).  
 0.2WTE

b) Does this person hold a current substantive employment contract, Honorary Clinical Contract or Honorary Research Contract with the NHS organisation or accepted by the NHS organisation? ☒ Yes ☐ No

A copy of a current CV for the Principal Investigator (maximum 2 pages of A4) must be submitted with this form.

3. Please give details of all locations, departments, groups or units at which or through which research procedures will be conducted at this site and describe the activity that will take place.

Please list all locations/departments etc where research procedures will be conducted within the NHS organisation, describing the involvement in a few words. Where access to specific facilities will be required these should also be listed for each location.

Name the main location/department first. Give details of any research procedures to be carried out off site, for example in participants' homes.

| Location   | Activity/facilities   |
|--|---|
| 1 The North Wales Brain Injury Service, Hesketh Road, Colwyn Bay, LL29 8AY   | All participant testing will take place within the premises including the administration of neuropsychological measures and questionnaires.   |
| 2 Should participants be unable to attend the North Wales Brain Injury Service, or prefer to be seen at home, then a home visit will be conducted. | All participant testing will take place within the participants home, including the administration of neuropsychological measures and questionnaires.   |
| 3 Other NHS site   | Where participants are unable to attend the North Wales Brain Injury Service, and would not like to be seen at home, an appointment in another NHS location within Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board may be arranged depending upon room availability, eg., within the participants local GP surgery. |

## 6. Please give details of all other members of the research team at this site.

1

Title Forename/Initials Surname  
 Dr Craig Roberts  
 Work E-mail Craig.Roberts@Wales.nhs.uk  
 Employing organisation Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board  
 Post Consultant Neuropsychologist  
 Qualifications 2005 Doctorate in Clinical Psychology University of Wales, Bangor  
 2000 MA in Clinical Psychology (Cum Laude) University of Stellenbosch  
 1996 Hon. BA in Psychology (Cum Laude) University of Stellenbosch  
 1993 B. Economic Sciences University of Stellenbosch  
 Role in research team: other (please specify) Academic Supervisor  
 a) Approximately how much time (approximately) will this person allocate to conducting this research? Please provide your response in terms of Whole Time Equivalents (WTE).  
 0.2WTE  
 b) Does this person hold a current substantive employment contract, Honorary Clinical Contract or Honorary Research Contract with the NHS organisation or accepted by the NHS organisation? ☒ Yes ☐ No

## 8. Does the Principal Investigator or any other member of the site research team have any direct personal involvement (e.g. financial, share-holding, personal relationship etc) in the organisation sponsoring or funding the research that may give rise to a possible conflict of interest?

☐ Yes ☒ No

## 7. What is the proposed local start and end date for the research at this site?

Start date: 04/07/2016  
 End date: 04/07/2017  
 Duration (Months): 12

## 8-1. Give details of all non-clinical intervention(s) or procedure(s) that will be received by participants as part of the research protocol. (These include seeking consent, interviews, non-clinical observations and use of questionnaires.)

Columns 1-4 have been completed with information from A10 as below:

1. Total number of interventions/procedures to be received by each participant as part of the research protocol.
2. If this intervention would have been routinely given to participants as part of their care, how many of the total would have been routine?
3. Average time taken per intervention (minutes, hours or days)
4. Details of who will conduct the procedure, and where it will take place

Please complete Column 5 with details of the names of individuals or names of staff groups who will conduct the procedure at this site.

| Intervention or procedure | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4                           | 5                                |
|---------------------------|---|---|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Participant approached to | 1 | 0 | 2 | MS clinicians will approach | MS Clinicians at the MS clinics, |



|  |                |   |  |
|--|----------------|---|--|
| potentially be included in the research study                  | minutes        | participants with details regarding the study and will provide an envelope containing the study information sheet (in English and Welsh), the initial contact form, and a free post envelope. This stage will take place in the MS clinic.  | I.e., MS nurse, occupational therapist, physiotherapist, consultant neurologist. |
| Telephone conversation to determine consent to participate.    | 1 0 5 minutes  | CI will telephone potential participants and answer any questions they may have, and determine consent. A convenient date, time, and location will be arranged to undertake the assessment.   | Laura Spencer  |
| Questionnaire measures   | 8 0 40 minutes | The participant will provide written consent, and will complete the demographic questionnaire, the NeuroQOL, Patient Health Questionnaire-9, PROMIS-FatigueMS, MS Questionnaire, Liverpool Self-efficacy scale, and the BADS Dysexecutive Questionnaire. This will take place at the North Wales Brain Injury Service, other BCUHB premises, or at the participants own home. | Laura Spencer  |
| Neuropsychological measures                                    | 6 0 50 minutes | The CI will administer the DKEFS-Verbal Fluency and Trail Making Tests, Paced Auditory Serial Additions Test, The WMS-IV List Learning and Logical Memory tests, WAIS-IV Coding and Symbol Search tests, and the BADS Modified 6 Elements test. This will take place at the North Wales Brain Injury Service, other BCUHB premises, or at the participants own home.          | Laura Spencer  |
| Debrief  | 1 0 5 minutes  | The CI will verbally debrief the participant. This will take place at the North Wales Brain Injury Service, other BCUHB premises, or at the participants own home.  | Laura Spencer  |
| Participant will be asked to complete the initial contact form | 1 0 5 mins     | Potential participants who are interested in the study will be advised to return the initial contact form to the CI using the free post envelope provided. This will take place at the patient's own home.  | Laura Spencer  |

8-2. Will any aspects of the research at this site be conducted in a different way to that described in Part A or the protocol?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, please note any relevant changes to the information in the above table.

Are there any changes other than those noted in the table?

10. How many research participants/samples is it expected will be recruited/obtained from this site?

It is hoped that 33 participants will be recruited.

11. Give details of how potential participants will be identified locally and who will be making the first approach to them to take part in the study.

The CI will present the research project to the multi-disciplinary team at the MS clinic at Ysbyty Glan Glwyd. Clinicians will be asked to identify participants who meet the inclusion criteria for the study from their current caseloads. Potential participants will be approached initially by their clinician to: 1) Determine whether they are interested in the study, 2) Determine whether they would be happy to receive a study information sheet (either in English or Welsh) which may be provided immediately during the appointment, 3) Determine whether they would be happy to be contacted by the CI approximately one week later to discuss the project. This contact will also be an opportunity for potential participants to ask any questions regarding the project and a brief discussion of the research process. Before participating in the project, participants will provide written consent.

12. Who will be responsible for obtaining informed consent at this site? What expertise and training do these persons have in obtaining consent for research purposes?

| Name                   | Expertise/training   |
|------------------------|--|
| Mrs Laura Spencer (CI) | The CI has previous experience of obtaining consent for research purposes during involvement in two previous research projects as part of her BSc and MSc in clinical psychology. The CI is fully informed about the nature of the study, and is aware of the process of taking consent. |

15-1. Is there an independent contact point where potential participants can seek general advice about taking part in research?

Yes, Involving People, through Health & Care Research Wales:

(Tel: 02920 230457  
research-involvement@wales.nhs.uk  
Health and Care Research Wales Support Centre, Castlebridge 4, 15 – 19 Cowbridge Road East, Cardiff, CF11 9AB)

15-2. Is there a contact point where potential participants can seek further details about this specific research project?

Yes, The CI (Mrs Laura Spencer) and Dr. Craig Roberts can be approached should potential participants wish to seek further details about the study. Both contacts are members of the research team.

18. Are there any changes that should be made to the generic content of the information sheet to reflect site-specific issues in the conduct of the study? A substantial amendment may need to be discussed with the Chief Investigator and submitted to the main REC.

No

Please provide a copy on headed paper of the participant information sheet and consent form that will be used locally. Unless indicated above, this must be the same generic version submitted to/approved by the main REC for the study while including relevant local information about the site, investigator and contact points for participants (see guidance notes).

17. What local arrangements have been made for participants who might not adequately understand verbal explanations or written information given in English, or who have special communication needs? (e.g. translation, use of interpreters etc.)

Participants deemed not able to provide informed consent will not be approached to take part in the study. Capacity to consent will be determined by the patients treating clinician at the MS clinic. All study information will be available in both English and Welsh. Participants who are not fluent in English will not be approached to participate as the neuropsychological measures are only available for use in the English language.

**18. What local arrangements will be made to inform the GP or other health care professionals responsible for the care of the participants?**

Participants GP and MS Nurse (Mrs Yvonne Copleland) will be informed via writing that the participant has consented to take part in the research. Informed written consent to do so will be obtained from all participants prior to their involvement. Should any participants experience any distress as a result of taking part in the research, their GP and MS Nurse may be contacted again, with the participants consent, to ensure the well being of the participant.

**18. What arrangements (e.g. facilities, staffing, psychosocial support, emergency procedures) will be in place at the site, where appropriate, to minimise the risks to participants and staff and deal with the consequences of any harm?**

No direct risks are anticipated to participants or staff.

As participants will be asked to complete a series of questionnaires about their symptoms of MS, this has the potential to cause some distress. Furthermore, completion of neuropsychological assessments has the potential to cause some distress. As the CI is a trainee clinical psychologist, it is anticipated that any distress may be resolved immediately within the testing session. However, all participants will also be advised that they should contact their GP and/or MS clinician should they experience any distress. Furthermore, participants GP and MS Nurse (Mrs Yvonne Copleland) will be informed via writing that the participant has consented to take part in the research.

As participants are required to complete neuropsychological assessments, they may request feedback upon their scores. Participants will be provided with this feedback by the CI and/or academic supervisor.

Once the testing session has finished participant's will receive a full debrief regarding the study and its aims. Participants who consent to do so will also receive a newsletter outlining the main results of the study.

Possible risks to the research team include those associated with lone working. Where possible, the testing session will take place at the North Wales Brain Injury Service in Colwyn Bay or other NHS premises. Where testing occurs within the participants own homes, the BCUHB Lone Worker Policy will be adhered to.

The research team have been trained in basic life support.

No additional staffing will be required.

**20. What are the arrangements for the supervision of the conduct of the research at this site? Please give the name and contact details of any supervisor not already listed in the application.**

The CI will be supervised by Dr. Craig Roberts. The North Wales Clinical Psychology Programme (NWCPP) has a monitoring role regarding the study. The CI is required to submit 6-monthly reports to the NWCPP until completion of the study in June 2017.

**21. What external funding will be provided for the research at this site?**

- ☐ Funded by commercial sponsor  
☐ Other funding  
☒ No external funding

How will the costs of the research be covered?

The costs of the research will be covered by the North Wales Clinical Psychology Programme. The CI is a trainee clinical psychologist undertaking a doctorate in clinical psychology with the programme.

**23. Authorisations required prior to R&D approval**

The local research team are responsible for contacting the local NHS R&D office about the research project. Where the research project is proposed to be coordinated centrally and therefore there is no local research team, it is the

responsibility of the central research team to instigate this contact with local R&D.

NHS R&D offices can offer advice and support on the set-up of a research project at their organisation, including information on local arrangements for support services relevant to the project. These support services may include clinical supervisors, line managers, service managers, support department managers, pharmacy, data protection officers or finance managers depending on the nature of the research.

Obtaining the necessary support service authorisations is not a pre-requisite to submission of an application for NHS research permission, but all appropriate authorisations must be in place before NHS research permission will be granted. Processes for obtaining authorisations will be subject to local arrangements, but the minimum expectation is that the local R&D office has been contacted to notify it of the proposed research project and to discuss the project's needs prior to submission of the application for NHS research permission via IRAS.

Failure to engage with local NHS R&D offices prior to submission may lead to unnecessary delays in the process of this application for NHS research permissions.

**Declaration:**

☒ I confirm that the relevant NHS organisation R&D office has been contacted to discuss the needs of the project and local arrangements for support services. I understand that failure to engage with the local NHS R&D office before submission of this application may result in unnecessary delays in obtaining NHS research permission for this project.

Please give the name and contact details for the NHS R&D office staff member you have discussed this application with:

Please note that for some sites the NHS R&D office contact may not be physically based at the site. For contact details refer to the guidance for this question.

|                |                           |                   |         |
|----------------|---------------------------|-------------------|---------|
|                | Title                     | Forename/Initials | Surname |
|                | Ms                        | Debra             | Slater  |
| Work E-mail    | Debra.Slater@Wales.nhs.uk |                   |         |
| Work Telephone | 01248384877               |                   |         |

**Declaration by Principal Investigator or Local Collaborator**

1. The information in this form is accurate to the best of my knowledge and I take full responsibility for it.
2. I undertake to abide by the ethical principles underpinning the World Medical Association's Declaration of Helsinki and relevant good practice guidelines in the conduct of research.
3. If the research is approved by the main REC and NHS organisation, I undertake to adhere to the study protocol, the terms of the application of which the main REC has given a favourable opinion and the conditions requested by the NHS organisation, and to inform the NHS organisation within local timelines of any subsequent amendments to the protocol.
4. If the research is approved, I undertake to abide by the principles of the Research Governance Framework for Health and Social Care.
5. I am aware of my responsibility to be up to date and comply with the requirements of the law and relevant guidelines relating to the conduct of research.
6. I undertake to disclose any conflicts of interest that may arise during the course of this research, and take responsibility for ensuring that all staff involved in the research are aware of their responsibilities to disclose conflicts of interest.
7. I understand and agree that study files, documents, research records and data may be subject to inspection by the NHS organisation, the sponsor or an independent body for monitoring, audit and inspection purposes.

8. I take responsibility for ensuring that staff involved in the research at this site hold appropriate contracts for the duration of the research, are familiar with the Research Governance Framework, the NHS organisation's Data Protection Policy and all other relevant policies and guidelines, and are appropriately trained and experienced.
9. I undertake to complete any progress and/or final reports as requested by the NHS organisation and understand that continuation of permission to conduct research within the NHS organisation is dependent on satisfactory completion of such reports.
10. I undertake to maintain a project file for this research in accordance with the NHS organisation's policy.
11. I take responsibility for ensuring that all serious adverse events are handled within the NHS organisation's policy for reporting and handling of adverse events.
12. I understand that information relating to this research, including the contact details on this application, will be held by the R&D office and may be held on national research information systems, and that this will be managed according to the principles established in the Data Protection Act 1998.
13. I understand that the information contained in this application, any supporting documentation and all correspondence with the R&D office and/or the REC system relating to the application will be subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information Acts and may be disclosed in response to requests made under the Acts except where statutory exemptions apply.

This section was signed electronically by Mrs Laura Spencer on 08/07/2016 09:46.

Job Title/Post: Trainee Clinical Psychologist  
Organisation: Betsi Cadwaladr University health Board  
Email: psp4eb@bangor.ac.uk

## Ethical approval granted for 2016-15686 Self-efficacy and cognition in people with a diagnosis of Multiple Sclerosis



ethics@bangor.ac.uk

Thu 02/06/2016, 10:23

Laura Elizabeth Spencer ▾



Reply all | ▾

Inbox

Dear Laura,

2016-15686 Self-efficacy and cognition in people with a diagnosis of Multiple Sclerosis

Your research proposal number 2016-15686

has been reviewed by the Psychology Ethics and Research Committee

and the committee are now able to confirm ethical and governance approval for the above research on the basis described in the application form, protocol and supporting documentation. This approval lasts for a maximum of three years from this date.

Ethical approval is granted for the study as it was explicitly described in the application

If you wish to make any non-trivial modifications to the research project, please submit an amendment form to the committee, and copies of any of the original documents reviewed which have been altered as a result of the amendment. Please also inform the committee immediately if participants experience any unanticipated harm as a result of taking part in your research, or if any adverse reactions are reported in subsequent literature using the same technique elsewhere.



**Pwyllgor Moseg Ymchwil Cymru 5  
Wales Research Ethics Committee 5  
Bangor**

Clinical Academic Office  
Ysbyty Gwynedd Hospital  
Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board  
Bangor, Gwynedd  
LL57 2PW  
Telephone/ Facsimile: 01248 - 384.877  
Email: [Rossela.Roberts@wales.nhs.uk](mailto:Rossela.Roberts@wales.nhs.uk)

24 June 2016

Mrs Laura E Spencer  
Trainee Clinical Psychologist  
Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board  
Clinical Psychology Programme  
School of Psychology  
Bangor University, Bangor, Gwynedd  
LL57 2AS [psp4eb@bangor.ac.uk](mailto:psp4eb@bangor.ac.uk)

Dear Mrs Spencer,

**Study title:** Self-efficacy and cognition in people with a diagnosis of Multiple Sclerosis.  
**REC reference:** 16/WA/0186  
**IRAS project ID:** 196799

Thank you for your letter of 20 June 2016, responding to the Committee's request for further information on the above research and submitting revised documentation.

The further information has been considered on behalf of the Committee by the Chair.

We plan to publish your research summary wording for the above study on the HRA website, together with your contact details. Publication will be no earlier than three months from the date of this opinion letter. Should you wish to provide a substitute contact point, require further information, or wish to make a request to postpone publication, please contact the REC Manager, Dr Rossela Roberts, [rossela.roberts@wales.nhs.uk](mailto:rossela.roberts@wales.nhs.uk)

**Confirmation of ethical opinion**

On behalf of the Committee, I am pleased to confirm a favourable ethical opinion for the above research on the basis described in the application form, protocol and supporting documentation as revised, subject to the conditions specified below.

### **Conditions of the favourable opinion**

The REC favourable opinion is subject to the following conditions being met prior to the start of the study.

Management permission must be obtained from each host organisation prior to the start of the study at the site concerned.

Management permission should be sought from all NHS organisations involved in the study in accordance with NHS research governance arrangements. Each NHS organisation must confirm through the signing of agreements and/or other documents that it has given permission for the research to proceed (except where explicitly specified otherwise).

Guidance on applying for NHS permission for research is available in the Integrated Research Application System, [www.hra.nhs.uk](http://www.hra.nhs.uk) or at <http://www.rdforum.nhs.uk>.

Where a NHS organisation's role in the study is limited to identifying and referring potential participants to research sites ("participant identification centre"), guidance should be sought from the R&D office on the information it requires to give permission for this activity.

For non-NHS sites, site management permission should be obtained in accordance with the procedures of the relevant host organisation.

Sponsors are not required to notify the Committee of management permissions from host organisations

### **Registration of Clinical Trials**

All clinical trials (defined as the first four categories on the IRAS filter page) must be registered on a publically accessible database within 6 weeks of recruitment of the first participant (for medical device studies, within the timeline determined by the current registration and publication trees).

There is no requirement to separately notify the REC but you should do so at the earliest opportunity e.g. when submitting an amendment. We will audit the registration details as part of the annual progress reporting process.

To ensure transparency in research, we strongly recommend that all research is registered but for non-clinical trials this is not currently mandatory.

If a sponsor wishes to contest the need for registration they should contact Catherine Blewett ([catherineblewett@nhs.net](mailto:catherineblewett@nhs.net)), the HRA does not, however, expect exceptions to be made. Guidance on where to register is provided within IRAS.

**It is the responsibility of the sponsor to ensure that all the conditions are complied with before the start of the study or its initiation at a particular site (as applicable).**

### **Ethical review of research sites**

#### **NHS sites**

The favourable opinion applies to all NHS sites taking part in the study, subject to management permission being obtained from the NHS/HSC R&D office prior to the start of the study (see "Conditions of the favourable opinion" above).



## Approved documents

The final list of documents reviewed and approved by the Committee is as follows:

| <i>Document</i>   | <i>Version</i> | <i>Date</i>  |
|---|----------------|--------------|
| REC Application Form [REC_Form_03062016]  | -              | 03 June 2016 |
| Research protocol or project proposal [Research protocol]                                 | 3              | 20 June 2016 |
| Response to Request for Further Information [Response to request for further information] | -              | 20 June 2016 |
| GP/consultant information sheets or letters   | 2              | 26 May 2016  |
| Other [Letter to G.P and other healthcare professionals]                                  | 1              | 20 June 2016 |
| Other [Participant G.P details]   | 1              | 20 June 2016 |
| Other [Initial contact form]  | 3              | 20 June 2016 |
| Participant consent form [Participant consent form]                                       | 3              | 20 June 2016 |
| Participant information sheet [Participant Information Sheet]                             | 3              | 20 June 2016 |
| Validated questionnaire [Patient Health Questionnaire]                                    | 1              | 26 May 2016  |
| Validated questionnaire [PROMIS Fatigue MS]   | 1              | 26 May 2016  |
| Validated questionnaire [MS Questionnaire]  | 1              | 26 May 2016  |
| Validated questionnaire [Liverpool Self-efficacy scale]                                   | 1              | 26 May 2016  |
| Validated questionnaire [NeuroQol Cognitive function]                                     | 1              | 26 May 2016  |
| Non-validated questionnaire [Demographic Questionnaire]                                   | 2              | 26 May 2016  |
| Summary CV for Chief Investigator (CI) [Laura Spencer]                                    | 1              | 26 May 2016  |
| Summary CV for supervisor [Craig Roberts]   | 1              | 26 May 2016  |
| Evidence of Sponsor insurance or indemnity [Insurance certificate]                        | -              | 20 July 2015 |

## Statement of compliance

The Committee is constituted in accordance with the Governance Arrangements for Research Ethics Committees and complies fully with the Standard Operating Procedures for Research Ethics Committees in the UK.

## After ethical review

### Reporting requirements

The attached document “*After ethical review – guidance for researchers*” gives detailed guidance on reporting requirements for studies with a favourable opinion, including:

- Notifying substantial amendments
- Adding new sites and investigators
- Notification of serious breaches of the protocol
- Progress and safety reports
- Notifying the end of the study

The HRA website also provides guidance on these topics, which is updated in the light of changes in reporting requirements or procedures.

### User Feedback

The Health Research Authority is continually striving to provide a high quality service to all applicants and sponsors. You are invited to give your view of the service you have received and the application procedure. If you wish to make your views known please use the feedback form available on the HRA website: <http://www.hra.nhs.uk/about-the-hra/governance/quality-assurance/>

### HRA Training

We are pleased to welcome researchers and R&D staff at our training days – see details at <http://www.hra.nhs.uk/hra-training/>

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| <b>16/WA/0186</b> | <b>Please quote this number on all correspondence</b> |
|-------------------|---|

With the Committee's best wishes for the success of this project.

Yours sincerely



**Dr Philip Wayman White, MBChB, MRSM**  
**Chair**  
E-mail: [rossela.roberts@wales.nhs.uk](mailto:rossela.roberts@wales.nhs.uk)

*Enclosures:* "After ethical review – guidance for researchers"

Copy: Sponsor: Hefin Francis  
School of Psychology  
Adeilad Brigantia, Penrallt Road  
Bangor University, Bangor  
LL57 2GD [h.francis@bangor.ac.uk](mailto:h.francis@bangor.ac.uk)

R&D Office: Miss Debra Slater  
R&D Office  
Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board  
Ysbyty Gwynedd,  
Bangor, LL57 2PW [debra.slater@wales.nhs.uk](mailto:debra.slater@wales.nhs.uk)



GIG  
CYMRU  
NHS  
WALES

Bwrdd Iechyd Prifysgol  
Betsi Cadwaladr  
University Health Board

Panel Arolygu Mewnol Y&D  
R&D Internal Review Panel

Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board  
Ysbyty Gwynedd  
Clinical Academic Office  
Bangor, Gwynedd  
LL57 2PW

Mrs Laura Spencer  
Clinical Psychology Programme#  
School of Psychology  
Bangor University  
Bangor  
LL57 2AS  
[psp4eb@bangor.ac.uk](mailto:psp4eb@bangor.ac.uk)

Chairman/Cadeirydd – Dr Nefyn Williams PhD, FRCGP  
Email: [rossela.roberts@wales.nhs.uk](mailto:rossela.roberts@wales.nhs.uk)  
[debra.slater@wales.nhs.uk](mailto:debra.slater@wales.nhs.uk)  
[sion.lewis@wales.nhs.uk](mailto:sion.lewis@wales.nhs.uk)  
Tel/Fax: 01248 384 877

09<sup>th</sup> August 2016

Dear Mrs Laura Spencer

Re: Confirmation that R&D governance checks are complete / R&D approval granted

Study Title Self-efficacy and cognition in people with a diagnosis of Multiple Sclerosis.  
IRAS reference 196799  
REC reference 16/WA/0186

The above research project was reviewed at the meeting of the BCUHB R&D Internal Review Panel

Thank you for responding to the Panel's request for further information. The R&D office considered the response on behalf of the Panel and is satisfied with the scientific validity of the project, the risk assessment, the review of the NHS cost and resource implications and all other research management issues pertaining to the revised application.

The Internal Review Panel is pleased to confirm that all governance checks are now complete and to grant approval to proceed at Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board sites as described in the application.

The documents reviewed and approved are listed below:

| Document:                                       | Version: | Date:              |
|---|----------|--------------------|
| R&D Form  | V5.3.1   | 04/07/2016         |
| SSI Form  | V5.3.1   | 08/07/2016         |
| Protocol  | V3       | 20/06/2016         |
| Information sheet                               | V4       | 08/08/2016         |
| Consent Form                                    | V4       | 08/08/2016         |
| Initial contact form                            | V4       | 08/08/2016         |
| Letter to Clinicians                            | V2       | 26/05/2016         |
| Letter to GP and other Healthcare Professionals | V1       | 20/06/2016         |
| Summary CV: Roberts                             |          | 26/05/2016         |
| Summary CV: Spencer                             |          | 20/02/2016         |
| Evidence of Insurance (UMAL)                    |          | Expires 31/07/2016 |
| REC Favourable Opinion                          |          | 24/06/2016         |

The study should not commence until the Ethics Committee reviewing the research has confirmed final ethical approval ('favourable opinion').

All research conducted at the Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board sites must comply with the Research Governance Framework for Health and Social Care in Wales (2009). An electronic link to this document is provided on the BCUHB R&D WebPages. Alternatively, you may obtain a paper copy of this document via the R&D Office.

Attached you will find a set of approval conditions outlining your responsibilities during the course of this research. Failure to comply with the approval conditions will result in the withdrawal of the approval to conduct this research in the Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board.

If your study is adopted onto the NISCHR Clinical Research Portfolio (CRP), it will be a condition of this NHS research permission, that the Chief Investigator will be required to regularly upload recruitment data onto the portfolio database. To apply for adoption onto the NISCHR CRP, please go to: <http://www.wales.nhs.uk/sites3/page.cfm?orgid=580&pid=31979>. Once adopted, NISCHR CRP studies may be eligible for additional support through the NISCHR Clinical Research Centre. Further information can be found at: <http://www.wales.nhs.uk/sites3/page.cfm?orgid=580&pid=28571> and/or from your NHS R&D office colleagues.

To upload recruitment data, please follow this link: [http://www.crncc.nihr.ac.uk/about\\_us/processes/portfolio/p\\_recruitment](http://www.crncc.nihr.ac.uk/about_us/processes/portfolio/p_recruitment). Uploading recruitment data will enable NISCHR to monitor research activity within NHS organizations, leading to NHS R&D allocations which are activity driven. Uploading of recruitment data will be monitored by your colleagues in the R&D office.

If you need any support in uploading this data, please contact [debra.slater@wales.nhs.uk](mailto:debra.slater@wales.nhs.uk) or [sion.lewis@wales.nhs.uk](mailto:sion.lewis@wales.nhs.uk)

If you would like further information on any other points covered by this letter please do not hesitate to contact me.

On behalf of the Panel, I would like to take this opportunity to wish you every success with your research.

Yours sincerely,



Dr. Rossela Roberts, MICR, CSci  
Clinical Governance Officer (R&D/Ethics)

Copy to:

Academic Supervisor: Dr Craig Roberts  
The North Wales Brain Injury Service  
Hesketh road  
Colwyn Bay  
Conwy  
LL29 8AY [craig.roberts@wales.nhs.uk](mailto:craig.roberts@wales.nhs.uk)

Sponsor: Hefin Francis  
School of Psychology#Brigantia Buildings  
Bangor University  
Bangor  
LL57 2AS [h.francis@bangor.ac.uk](mailto:h.francis@bangor.ac.uk)

## Notification of Non-Substantial/Minor Amendments(s) for NHS Studies

This template must only be used to notify NHS/HSC R&D office(s) of amendments, which are NOT categorised as Substantial Amendments.  
 If you need to notify a Substantial Amendment to your study then you MUST use the appropriate Substantial Amendment form in IRAS.

### Instructions for using this template

- For guidance on amendments refer to <http://www.hra.nhs.uk/research-community/during-your-research-project/amendments/>
- This template should be completed by the CI and optionally authorised by Sponsor, if required by sponsor guidelines.
- This form should be submitted according to the instructions provided for NHS/HSC R&D at <http://www.hra.nhs.uk/research-community/during-your-research-project/amendments/which-review-bodies-need-to-approve-or-be-notified-of-which-types-of-amendments/>. If you do not submit your notification in accordance with these instructions then processing of your submission may be significantly delayed.

### 1. Study Information

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Full title of study:   | Self-efficacy and cognition in people with a diagnosis of Multiple Sclerosis |
| IRAS Project ID:   | 196799   |
| Sponsor Amendment Notification number:                               | 1  |
| Sponsor Amendment Notification date:                                 | 18.08.2016   |
| Details of Chief Investigator:                                       |  |
| Name (first name and surname)  | Laura Spencer  |
| Address:   | 3 South Street, Llanfairfechan, Conwy  |
| Postcode:  | LL33 0RF   |
| Contact telephone number:  | 07972763722  |
| Email address:   | psp4eb@bangor.ac.uk  |
| Details of Lead Sponsor:   |  |
| Name:  | Mr. Hefin Francis  |
| Contact email address:   | h.francis@bangor.ac.uk   |
| Details of Lead Nation:  |  |
| Name of lead nation delete as appropriate                            | Wales  |
| If England led is the study going through CSP? delete as appropriate | N/A  |
| Name of lead R&D office:   | Debra Slater<br>Research Governance Officer                                  |

**Partner Organisations:**

Health Research Authority, England

NHS Research Scotland

HSC Research & Development, Public Health Agency, Northern Ireland

NIHR Clinical Research Network, England

NIHR Clinical Research Network, Wales

NIHR Clinical Research Network, Northern Ireland

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | BCUHB<br>Ysbyty Gwynedd<br>Penrhos Garneid<br>Bangor LL57 2PW |
|--|---|

**Pwyllgor Moeseg Ymchwil Cymru 5**  
**Wales Research Ethics Committee 5**  
**Bangor**

Clinical Academic Office  
 Ysbyty Gwynedd Hospital  
 Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board  
 Bangor, Gwynedd  
 LL57 2PW  
 Telephone/ Facsimile: 01248 - 384.877  
 Email: [Rosalea.Roberts@wales.nhs.uk](mailto:Rosalea.Roberts@wales.nhs.uk)

18 August 2016

Mrs Laura E Spencer  
 Trainee Clinical Psychologist  
 Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board  
 Clinical Psychology Programme  
 School of Psychology  
 Bangor University,  
 Bangor, Gwynedd  
 LL57 2AS [psp4eb@bangor.ac.uk](mailto:psp4eb@bangor.ac.uk)

Dear Mrs Spencer

**Study title:** Self-efficacy and cognition in people with a diagnosis of Multiple Sclerosis.  
**REC reference:** 16/WA/0186  
**Amendment number:** 01  
**Amendment date:** 18 August 2016  
**IRAS project ID:** 196799

Thank you for your letter of 18 August 2016, notifying the Committee of the above amendment.

The Committee does not consider this to be a "substantial amendment" as defined in the Standard Operating Procedures for Research Ethics Committees. The amendment does not therefore require an ethical opinion from the Committee and may be implemented immediately, provided that it does not affect the approval for the research given by the R&D office for the relevant NHS care organisation.

#### Documents received

The documents received were as follows:


| Document                            | Version | Date           |
|-------------------------------------|---------|----------------|
| Notice of Minor Amendment           | 01      | 18 August 2016 |
| Other [Initial contact form]        | 4       | 08 August 2016 |
| Participant consent form            | 4       | 08 August 2016 |
| Participant information sheet (PIS) | 4       | 08 August 2016 |

**Statement of compliance**

The Committee is constituted in accordance with the Governance Arrangements for Research Ethics Committees and complies fully with the Standard Operating Procedures for Research Ethics Committees in the UK.

|             |  |
|-------------|--|
| 16/WA/0186: | Please quote this number on all correspondence |
|-------------|--|

Yours sincerely



**Dr Rossella Roberts**  
**Research Ethics Service Manager**

Email: [Rossella.Roberts@wales.nhs.uk](mailto:Rossella.Roberts@wales.nhs.uk)

|       |             |   |
|-------|-------------|---|
| Copy: | Sponsor:    | Hefin Francis<br>School of Psychology<br>Adellad Brigantia<br>Penrallt Road<br>Bangor University<br>Bangor<br>Gwynedd<br>LL57 2GD<br><a href="mailto:h.francis@bangor.ac.uk">h.francis@bangor.ac.uk</a>   |
|       | R&D Office: | Miss Debra Slater<br>R&D Office<br>Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board<br>Ysbyty Gwynedd<br>Bangor<br>Gwynedd<br>LL57 2PW<br><a href="mailto:debra.slater@wales.nhs.uk">debra.slater@wales.nhs.uk</a> |



### Notification of Non-Substantial/Minor Amendments(s) for NHS Studies

This template must only be used to notify NHS/HSC R&D office(s) of amendments, which are NOT categorised as Substantial Amendments.  
 If you need to notify a Substantial Amendment to your study then you MUST use the appropriate Substantial Amendment form in IRAS.

#### Instructions for using this template

- For guidance on amendments refer to <http://www.hra.nhs.uk/research-community/during-your-research-project/amendments/>
- This template should be completed by the CI and optionally authorised by Sponsor, if required by sponsor guidelines.
- This form should be submitted according to the instructions provided for NHS/HSC R&D at <http://www.hra.nhs.uk/research-community/during-your-research-project/amendments/which-review-bodies-need-to-approve-or-be-notified-of-which-types-of-amendments/>. If you do not submit your notification in accordance with these instructions then processing of your submission may be significantly delayed.

#### 1. Study Information

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Full title of study:   | Self-efficacy and cognition in people with a diagnosis of Multiple Sclerosis |
| IRAS Project ID:   | 196799   |
| Sponsor Amendment Notification number:   | 2  |
| Sponsor Amendment Notification date:   | 19.09.2016   |
| Details of Chief Investigator:   |  |
| Name (first name and surname)  | Laura Spencer  |
| Address:   | 3 South Street, Llanfairfechan, Conwy  |
| Postcode:  | LL33 0RF   |
| Contact telephone number:  | 07972763722  |
| Email address:   | psp4eb@bangor.ac.uk  |
| Details of Lead Sponsor:   |  |
| Name:  | Mr. Hefin Francis  |
| Contact email address:   | h.franis@bangor.ac.uk  |
| Details of Lead Nation:  |  |
| Name of lead nation<br><i>delete as appropriate</i>                            | Wales  |
| If England led is the study going through CSP?<br><i>delete as appropriate</i> | N/A  |
| Name of lead R&D office:   | Debra Slater<br>Research Governance Officer                                  |

**Partner Organisations:**

Health Research Authority, England

NIHR Clinical Research Network, England

NHS Research Scotland

NISCHR Permissions Co-ordinating Unit, Wales

HSC Research & Development, Public Health Agency, Northern Ireland

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | BCUHB<br>Ysbyty Gwynedd<br>Penrhos Gareded<br>Bangor LL57 2PW |
|--|---|

**Pwyllgor Moeseg Ymchwil Cymru 5**  
**Wales Research Ethics Committee 5**  
**Bangor**

Clinical Academic Office  
 Ysbyty Gwynedd Hospital  
 Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board  
 Bangor, Gwynedd  
 LL57 2PW  
 Telephone/ Facsimile: 01248 - 384.877  
 Email: [Rossela.Roberts@wales.nhs.uk](mailto:Rossela.Roberts@wales.nhs.uk)

20 September 2016

Mrs Laura E Spencer  
 Trainee Clinical Psychologist  
 Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board  
 Clinical Psychology Programme  
 School of Psychology  
 Bangor University  
 Bangor  
 Gwynedd  
 LL57 2AS  
[psp4eb@bangor.ac.uk](mailto:psp4eb@bangor.ac.uk)

Dear Mrs Spencer

**Study title:** Self-efficacy and cognition in people with a diagnosis of Multiple Sclerosis.  
**REC reference:** 16/WA/0186  
**Amendment number:** 02  
**Amendment date:** 19 September 2016  
**IRAS project ID:** 196799

Thank you for your letter of 19 September 2016, notifying the Committee of the above amendment.

The Committee does not consider this to be a "substantial amendment" as defined in the Standard Operating Procedures for Research Ethics Committees. The amendment does not therefore require an ethical opinion from the Committee and may be implemented immediately, provided that it does not affect the approval for the research given by the R&D office for the relevant NHS care organisation.

#### Documents received

The documents received were as follows:

| Document   | Version | Date              |
|--|---------|-------------------|
| Interview schedules or topic guides for participants [Rey Auditory Verbal Learning Test] | 1       | 19 September 2016 |
| Notice of Minor Amendment  | 02      | 19 September 2016 |
| Research protocol or project proposal [Protocol V4]                                      | 4       | 19 September 2016 |

**Statement of compliance**

The Committee is constituted in accordance with the Governance Arrangements for Research Ethics Committees and complies fully with the Standard Operating Procedures for Research Ethics Committees in the UK.

|  |
|--|
| 18/WA/0186: Please quote this number on all correspondence |
|--|

Yours sincerely



Dr Rosalea Roberts  
Research Ethics Service Manager

Email: [Rosalea.Roberts@wales.nhs.uk](mailto:Rosalea.Roberts@wales.nhs.uk)

|       |             |  |
|-------|-------------|--|
| Copy: | Sponsor:    | Heffn Francis<br>School of Psychology<br>Adelard Brigantia, Penrill Road<br>Bangor University<br>Bangor<br>Gwynedd<br>LL57 2GD <a href="mailto:h.franis@bangor.ac.uk">h.franis@bangor.ac.uk</a>                      |
|       | R&D Office: | Miss Debra Slater<br>Clinical Academic Office<br>Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board<br>Ysbyty Gwynedd<br>Bangor<br>Gwynedd<br>LL57 2PW <a href="mailto:debra.slater@wales.nhs.uk">debra.slater@wales.nhs.uk</a> |

### Notification of Non-Substantial/Minor Amendments(s) for NHS Studies

This template must only be used to notify NHS/HSC R&D office(s) of amendments, which are NOT categorised as Substantial Amendments.  
 If you need to notify a Substantial Amendment to your study then you MUST use the appropriate Substantial Amendment form in IRAS.

#### Instructions for using this template

- For guidance on amendments refer to <http://www.hra.nhs.uk/research-community/during-your-research-project/amendments/>
- This template should be completed by the CI and optionally authorised by Sponsor, if required by sponsor guidelines.
- This form should be submitted according to the instructions provided for NHS/HSC R&D at <http://www.hra.nhs.uk/research-community/during-your-research-project/amendments/which-review-bodies-need-to-approve-or-be-notified-of-which-types-of-amendments/>. If you do not submit your notification in accordance with these instructions then processing of your submission may be significantly delayed.

#### 1. Study Information

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Full title of study:  | Self-efficacy and cognition in people with a diagnosis of Multiple Sclerosis |
| IRAS Project ID:  | 196799   |
| Sponsor Amendment Notification number:                                  | 3  |
| Sponsor Amendment Notification date:                                    | 11.10.2016   |
| Details of Chief Investigator:  |  |
| Name (first name and surname)   | Laura Spencer  |
| Address:  | 3 South Street, Llanfairfechan, Conwy  |
| Postcode:   | LL33 0RF   |
| Contact telephone number:   | 07972763722  |
| Email address:  | psp4eb@bangor.ac.uk  |
| Details of Lead Sponsor:  |  |
| Name:   | Mr. Hefin Francis  |
| Contact email address:  | h.francis@bangor.ac.uk   |
| Details of Lead Nation:   |  |
| Name of lead nation<br>delete as appropriate                            | Wales  |
| If England led is the study going through CSP?<br>delete as appropriate | N/A  |
| Name of lead R&D office:  | Debra Slater<br>Research Governance Officer                                  |

**Partner Organisations:**

Health Research Authority, England

NHS Research Scotland

HSC Research & Development, Public Health Agency, Northern Ireland

NIHR Clinical Research Network, England

NISCHR Permissions Co-ordinating Unit, Wales

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | BCUHB<br>Ysbyty Gwynedd<br>Penrhos Gareded<br>Bangor LL57 2PW |
|--|---|

**Pwyllgor Moeleg Ymchwil Cymru 5**  
**Wales Research Ethics Committee 5**  
**Bangor**

Clinical Academic Office  
Ysbyty Gwynedd Hospital  
Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board  
Bangor, Gwynedd  
LL57 2PW  
Telephone/ Facsimile: 01248 - 384.877  
Email: [Rosseta.Roberts@wales.nhs.uk](mailto:Rosseta.Roberts@wales.nhs.uk)

24 October 2016

Mrs Laura E Spencer  
Trainee Clinical Psychologist  
Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board  
Clinical Psychology Programme  
School of Psychology  
Bangor University,  
Bangor,  
Gwynedd  
LL57 2AS

[psp4eb@bangor.ac.uk](mailto:psp4eb@bangor.ac.uk)

Dear Mrs Spencer

**Study title:** Self-efficacy and cognition in people with a diagnosis of Multiple Sclerosis.  
**REC reference:** 16/WA/0186  
**Amendment number:** 03  
**Amendment date:** 11 October 2016  
**IRAS project ID:** 196799

Thank you for your letter of 11 October 2016, notifying the Committee of the above amendment.

The Committee does not consider this to be a "substantial amendment" as defined in the Standard Operating Procedures for Research Ethics Committees.

The amendment does not therefore require an ethical opinion from the Committee and may be implemented immediately, provided that it does not affect the approval for the research given by the R&D office for the relevant NHS care organisation.

#### Documents received

The documents received were as follows:


| Document                              | Version | Date            |
|---------------------------------------|---------|-----------------|
| Notice of Minor Amendment             | 03      | 11 October 2016 |
| Research protocol or project proposal | 5       | 11 October 2016 |

**Statement of compliance**

The Committee is constituted in accordance with the Governance Arrangements for Research Ethics Committees and complies fully with the Standard Operating Procedures for Research Ethics Committees in the UK.

|             |  |
|-------------|--|
| 16/WA/0186: | Please quote this number on all correspondence |
|-------------|--|

Yours sincerely



**Dr Rossella Roberts**  
**Research Ethics Service Manager**

Email: [Rossella.Roberts@wales.nhs.uk](mailto:Rossella.Roberts@wales.nhs.uk)

|       |             |   |
|-------|-------------|---|
| Copy: | Sponsor:    | Hefin Francis<br>School of Psychology<br>Adeliad Brigantia, Penrallt Road<br>Bangor University, Bangor<br>LL57 2GD<br><a href="mailto:h.francis@bangor.ac.uk">h.francis@bangor.ac.uk</a>        |
|       | R&D Office: | Miss Debra Slater<br>R&D Office<br>Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board<br>Ysbyty Gwynedd,<br>Bangor<br>LL57 2PW<br><a href="mailto:debra.slater@wales.nhs.uk">debra.slater@wales.nhs.uk</a> |



### Notification of Non-Substantial/Minor Amendments(s) for NHS Studies

This template must only be used to notify NHS/HSC R&D office(s) of amendments, which are NOT categorised as Substantial Amendments.

If you need to notify a Substantial Amendment to your study then you MUST use the appropriate Substantial Amendment form in IRAS.

#### Instructions for using this template

- For guidance on amendments refer to <http://www.hra.nhs.uk/research-community/during-your-research-project/amendments/>
- This template should be completed by the CI and optionally authorised by Sponsor, if required by sponsor guidelines.
- This form should be submitted according to the instructions provided for NHS/HSC R&D at <http://www.hra.nhs.uk/research-community/during-your-research-project/amendments/which-review-bodies-need-to-approve-or-be-notified-of-which-types-of-amendments/>. If you do not submit your notification in accordance with these instructions then processing of your submission may be significantly delayed.

#### 1. Study Information

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Full title of study:  | Self-efficacy and cognition in people with a diagnosis of Multiple Sclerosis |
| IRAS Project ID:  | 196799   |
| Sponsor Amendment Notification number:                                  | 4  |
| Sponsor Amendment Notification date:                                    | 26.10.2016   |
| Details of Chief Investigator:  |  |
| Name [first name and surname]   | Laura Spencer  |
| Address:  | 3 South Street, Llanfairfechan, Conwy  |
| Postcode:   | LL33 0RF   |
| Contact telephone number:   | 07972763722  |
| Email address:  | psp4eb@bangor.ac.uk  |
| Details of Lead Sponsor:  |  |
| Name:   | Mr. Hefin Francis  |
| Contact email address:  | h.francis@bangor.ac.uk   |
| Details of Lead Nation:   |  |
| Name of lead nation<br>delete as appropriate                            | Wales  |
| If England led is the study going through CSP?<br>delete as appropriate | N/A  |
| Name of lead R&D office:  | Debra Slater<br>Research Governance Officer                                  |

**Partner Organisations:**

Health Research Authority, England

NHS Research Scotland

HSC Research & Development, Public Health Agency, Northern Ireland

NIHR Clinical Research Network, England

NISCHR Permissions Co-ordinating Unit, Wales

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | BCUHB<br>Ysbyty Gwynedd<br>Penrhos Gareded<br>Bangor LL57 2PW |
|--|---|

**Pwyllgor Moeseg Ymchwil Cymru 5**  
**Wales Research Ethics Committee 5**  
**Bangor**

Clinical Academic Office  
 Ysbyty Gwynedd Hospital  
 Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board  
 Bangor, Gwynedd  
 LL57 2PW  
 Telephone/ Facsimile: 01248 - 384.877  
 Email: [Rossela.Roberts@wales.nhs.uk](mailto:Rossela.Roberts@wales.nhs.uk)

26 October 2016

Mrs Laura E Spencer  
 Trainee Clinical Psychologist  
 Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board  
 Clinical Psychology Programme  
 School of Psychology  
 Bangor University,  
 Bangor,  
 Gwynedd  
 LL57 2AS [psp4eb@bangor.ac.uk](mailto:psp4eb@bangor.ac.uk)

Dear Mrs Spencer

**Study title:** Self-efficacy and cognition in people with a diagnosis of Multiple Sclerosis.  
**REC reference:** 16/WA/0186  
**Amendment number:** 04  
**Amendment date:** 26 October 2016  
**IRAS project ID:** 196799

Thank you for your letter of 26 October 2016, notifying the Committee of the above amendment.

The Committee does not consider this to be a "substantial amendment" as defined in the Standard Operating Procedures for Research Ethics Committees.

The amendment does not therefore require an ethical opinion from the Committee and may be implemented immediately, provided that it does not affect the approval for the research given by the R&D office for the relevant NHS care organisation.

#### Documents received

The documents received were as follows:


| Document                              | Version | Date            |
|---------------------------------------|---------|-----------------|
| Notice of Minor Amendment             | 04      | 26 October 2016 |
| Research protocol or project proposal | 6       | 26 October 2016 |

**Statement of compliance**

The Committee is constituted in accordance with the Governance Arrangements for Research Ethics Committees and complies fully with the Standard Operating Procedures for Research Ethics Committees in the UK.

|             |  |
|-------------|--|
| 16/WA/0186: | Please quote this number on all correspondence |
|-------------|--|

Yours sincerely



**Dr Rossela Roberts**  
**Research Ethics Service Manager**

Email: [Rossela.Roberts@wales.nhs.uk](mailto:Rossela.Roberts@wales.nhs.uk)

|       |             |   |
|-------|-------------|---|
| Copy: | Sponsor:    | Hefin Francis<br>School of Psychology<br>Adeilad Brigantia<br>Penrallt Road<br>Bangor University<br>Bangor<br>Gwynedd<br>LL57 2GD<br><a href="mailto:h.francis@bangor.ac.uk">h.francis@bangor.ac.uk</a>   |
|       | R&D Office: | Miss Debra Slater<br>R&D Office<br>Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board<br>Ysbyty Gwynedd<br>Bangor<br>Gwynedd<br>LL57 2PW<br><a href="mailto:debra.slater@wales.nhs.uk">debra.slater@wales.nhs.uk</a> |

COLEG IECHYD A GWYDDORAU YMDDYGIAD  
COLLEGE OF HEALTH & BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES

YSGOL SEICOLEG  
SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY



NWCPP-RSCGC

**RHAGLEN SEICOLEG CLINIGOL GOGLEDD CYMRU  
NORTH WALES CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAMME**

**Initial Contact Form**



PRIFYSGOL  
**BANGOR**  
UNIVERSITY

**Study title:** Self-efficacy and cognition in people with Multiple Sclerosis

**Name of researcher:** Laura Spencer, Trainee Clinical Psychologist

**Supervised by:** Dr Craig Roberts, Clinical Neuropsychologist

If you are interested in participating in our research, please read and complete the following, and return to Laura Spencer using the stamped addressed envelope provided within one month of receipt. Thank you.

Please initial  
box

☐

I agree to be contacted to discuss the research study

**Name (please print):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Contact Address & postcode:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Contact Telephone Number:**

\_\_\_\_\_

Thank you for considering participating in this research study. I will look forward to speaking with you in the near future. Laura Spencer.



NWCPP-RSCGC



PRIFYSGOL  
**BANGOR**  
UNIVERSITY

### Ffurflen Cyswllt Cyntaf

**Teitl yr astudiaeth:** Hunaneffeithlonrwydd a gwybyddiaeth mewn pobl â Sglerosis Ymledol

**Enw'r ymchwilydd:** Laura Spencer, Seicolegydd Clinigol dan Hyfforddiant

**Dan oruchwyliaeth:** Dr Craig Roberts, Niwroseicolegydd Clinigol

Os oes gennych ddiddordeb mewn cymryd rhan yn ein hymchwyl, darllenwch y wybodaeth a llenwch y darn isod, a dychwelyd y ffurflen i Laura Spencer yn yr amlen barod o fewn mis o'i derbyn. Diolch.

Llofnodwch  
y bocs

Rwy'n cytuno y gellwch gysylltu â mi i drafod yr astudiaeth ymchwyl

☐

**Enw (wedi'i brintio)** \_\_\_\_\_

**Llofnod:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Cyfeiriad cyswllt a'r cod post:**

---

---

---

**Rhif ffôn:**

---

Diolch am ystyried cymryd rhan yn yr astudiaeth ymchwyl hon. Edrychaf ymlaen at siarad â chi yn y dyfodol agos. Laura Spencer.

COLEG IECHYD A GWYDDORAU YMDDYGIAD  
COLLEGE OF HEALTH & BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES

YSGOL SEICOLEG  
SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY



NWCPP-RSCGC

**RHAGLEN SEICOLEG CLINIGOL GOGLEDD CYMRU  
NORTH WALES CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAMME**



PRIFYSGOL  
**BANGOR**  
UNIVERSITY

### **Participant Information Sheet**

**Study title:** Self-efficacy and cognition in people with Multiple Sclerosis

**Name of researcher:** Laura Spencer, Trainee Clinical Psychologist

**Supervised by:** Dr Craig Roberts, Clinical Neuropsychologist

We would like to invite you to take part in our research. Before you decide, please take time to read the following information about what this would involve for you. Thank you.

#### **What is the purpose of this study?**

We are interested in how people's thinking skills (e.g., memory and problem solving) may be affected by self-efficacy, or how well one believes that they are able to perform a task. We are also interested in understanding how people's thinking skills may be affected by fatigue and mood, and by the severity of their symptoms of multiple sclerosis. We hope this research will help us to support people with multiple sclerosis more effectively in the future.

#### **Why have I been invited to participate?**

You have been invited to participate because you have a diagnosis of multiple sclerosis, and you have attended an appointment at one of the multiple sclerosis clinics.

#### **What would taking part involve?**

If you decide that you may be interested in taking part our research, please complete the initial contact form enclosed, and return using the stamped addressed envelope provided. If you return the initial contact form, Laura will contact you by telephone approximately one week later to discuss the study further and answer any questions you may have. At the end of the conversation, Laura will ask if you would like to participate in the study.

If you are still interested in taking part, Laura will arrange to meet with you in person at a convenient time and date. This may be at your own home, at the North Wales Brain Injury Service in Colwyn Bay, or at another NHS building (whichever is preferable to you).

In the appointment you will be asked to complete a series of short questionnaires about self-efficacy, your mood, levels of fatigue, symptoms of multiple sclerosis, and your thinking skills. You will also be asked to complete some tasks to look at your thinking skills, e.g., we may ask you to remember a short story. The appointment will last no longer than two hours, but could be split over two shorter appointments if you would prefer.

#### **What are the possible benefits of taking part?**

There is no direct benefit to yourself from taking part however your participation will have the potential of benefitting people with multiple sclerosis in the future.

**What are the possible disadvantages and risks of taking part?**

It is anticipated that the study will take no longer two hours of your time. Sometimes people can find it difficult to complete some of the tasks, which could be frustrating or upsetting. You will also be asked to complete a questionnaire about your mood and symptoms of multiple sclerosis, which might raise some difficult emotions. If you find this is the case for you then we would encourage you to speak to your clinician at the multiple sclerosis clinic or your GP. If you find you are becoming upset then we can stop at any time. You can also choose to withdraw from the study should you wish.

**Will taking part in the study affect the care I receive in the NHS?**

Taking part in the study will not affect the care that you receive in the NHS. If you agree to take part in this research, I will notify your G.P. and Mrs. Yvonne Copeland, MS specialist nurse. This is to ensure your safety and well-being. With your permission, I may collect information about your symptoms of multiple sclerosis from your medical records.

**Who is organising and funding this study?**

This study is organised and funded by the North Wales Clinical Psychology Programme at Bangor University.

**Who has reviewed this study?**

The study has been reviewed and approved by an independent panel of people from the School of Psychology at Bangor University, and from the NHS Research Ethics Committee.

**What if something goes wrong?**

If you have any concerns about the research study, you may contact Laura Spencer via telephone on 07972763722 or via e-mail at [psp4eb@bangor.ac.uk](mailto:psp4eb@bangor.ac.uk). You may also wish to contact Dr. Craig Roberts, Clinical Neuropsychologist, at the North Wales Brain Injury Service via telephone on 01492 807770 or via e-mail at [Craig.Roberts@Wales.nhs.uk](mailto:Craig.Roberts@Wales.nhs.uk)

If neither Laura nor Dr. Roberts are able to address your concerns satisfactorily and/or you wish to raise a complaint about the study, please contact Mr. Hefin Francis, School of Psychology Manager:

Mr. Hefin Francis  
School of Psychology Manager  
Bangor University,  
School of Psychology,  
Brigantia Building,  
Penrallt Road,  
Gwynedd,  
LL57 2DG.

Tel: 01248 388339  
E-mail: [h.francis@bangor.ac.uk](mailto:h.francis@bangor.ac.uk)



COLEG IECHYD A GWYDDORAU YMDDYGIAD  
COLLEGE OF HEALTH & BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES

YSGOL SEICOLEG  
SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY

**What will happen if I don't want to carry on with the study?**

You may withdraw from the study at any time, without giving any reason, and without your care in the NHS being affected in any way. Should you wish to withdraw, you can also ask for your data to be removed from the study.

**How will my information be kept confidential?**

All information collected will be kept confidentially. The only exceptions to confidentiality are where there are concerns about your safety, or that of somebody else's, then Laura will have a duty to share this information with other professionals. Where incidental disclosures are made, it may also be necessary to share this information with other professionals. In these circumstances, Laura will make every effort to inform you about this first. The data collected will be stored securely and separately from your personal details. Only Laura and Dr. Craig Roberts will have access to the data, and data will be destroyed upon completion of the project in accordance with NHS guidelines.

**What will happen to the results of this study?**

The results of the study will be used to write a report for Bangor University as part of the Doctoral training programme. Laura Spencer may also write a report for publication in a scientific journal. If you wish, you will be able to receive a letter detailing the results of the study in the post. All information about participants will be anonymous, so you will not be identifiable in any written documentation.

**Thank you for taking the time to read this information sheet.**

Yours Sincerely,

Laura Spencer  
Trainee Clinical Psychologist

Supervised by Dr. Craig Roberts  
Clinical Neuropsychologist



### Taflen wybodaeth i gyfranogwyr

**Teitl yr astudiaeth:** Hunaneffeithlonrwydd a gwybyddiaeth mewn pobl â Sglerosis Ymledol

**Enw'r ymchwilydd:** Laura Spencer, Seicolegydd Clinigol dan Hyfforddiant

**Dan oruchwyliaeth:** Dr Craig Roberts, Niwroseicolegydd Clinigol

Hoffem eich gwahodd i gymryd rhan yn ein hymchwyl. Cyn i chi benderfynu, cymerwch amser i ddarllen y wybodaeth isod ynglŷn â'r hyn y byddai'n ei olygu i chi. Diolch.

#### **Beth yw diben yr astudiaeth hon?**

Mae gennym ddiddordeb yn y ffordd y gall sgiliau meddwl pobl (e.e. cof a datrys problemau) gael eu heffeithio gan hunaneffeithlonrwydd, neu ba mor dda y mae rhywun yn credu y gallant wneud tasg. Mae gennyf ddiddordeb hefyd mewn deall sut y gall sgiliau meddwl pobl gael eu heffeithio gan flinder a thymor, a chan ba mor ddifrifol yw eu symptomau o sglerosis ymledol. Rydym yn gobeithio y bydd yr ymchwyl hwn yn ein helpu i gefnogi pobl sydd â sglerosis ymledol yn fwy effeithiol yn y dyfodol.

#### **Pam y gofynnwyd imi gymryd rhan?**

Rydych wedi cael gwahoddiad i gymryd rhan oherwydd eich bod wedi cael diagnosis o sglerosis ymledol.

#### **Beth y byddai cymryd rhan yn ei olygu?**

Os penderfynwch y byddai gennych ddiddordeb cymryd rhan yn yr ymchwyl, llenwch y ffurflen cyswllt cyntaf amgaeedig, a'i dychwelyd yn yr amlen barod a ddarperir. Os byddwch yn dychwelyd y ffurflen cyswllt cyntaf, bydd Laura yn cysylltu â chi drwy eich ffonio tua wythnos yn ddiweddarach i drafod yr astudiaeth ymhellach ac ateb unrhyw gwestiynau sydd gennych. Ar ddiwedd y sgwrs, bydd Laura yn gofyn a hoffech gymryd rhan yn yr astudiaeth.

Os bydd dal gennych chi ddiddordeb mewn cymryd rhan, bydd Laura yn trefnu i'ch cyfarfod yn bersonol ar adeg ac mewn lle cyfleus. Gall hyn fod yn eich cartref eich hun, yng Ngwasanaeth Anaf i'r Ymennydd Gogledd Cymru ym Mae Colwyn, neu adeilad GIG arall (pa un bynnag sydd orau gennych chi).

Yn yr apwyntiad gofynnir i chi lenwi cyfres o holiaduron byr ynglŷn â'ch hunaneffeithlonrwydd, eich tymor, lefelau blinder, symptomau o sglerosis ymledol a'ch sgiliau meddwl. Gofynnir i chi hefyd wneud ychydig o dasgau er mwyn gweld eich sgiliau meddwl, e.e. gallwn ofyn i chi gofio stori fer. Ni fydd yr apwyntiad yn para mwy na dwy awr, ond gellir ei rannu i ddau apwyntiad byrrach os byddai'n well gennych.

**Beth yw'r manteision posibl o gymryd rhan?**

Nid oes unrhyw fudd uniongyrchol i chi o gymryd rhan ond mae'n bosibl y bydd eich cyfranogiad o fudd i bobl gyda sglerosis ymledol yn y dyfodol.

**Beth yw'r anfanteision a'r risgiau posib o gymryd rhan?**

Rhagwelir na fydd yr astudiaeth yn cymryd mwy na dwy awr o'ch amser. Weithiau gall fod yn anodd i bobl gyflawni rhai o'r tasgau, a gall hyn fod yn rhwystredig neu'n achosi gofid. Gofynnir i chi hefyd lenwi holiadur am eich tymer a symptomau sglerosis ymledol, a all ysgogi rhai emosiynau anodd. Os bydd hyn yn wir i chi, yna byddem yn eich annog i siarad â'ch clinigwr yn y clinig sglerosis ymledol neu â'ch meddyg teulu. Os bydd yn achosi gofid i chi, gallwn roi'r gorau iddi ar unrhyw adeg. Gallwch hefyd dynnu'n ôl o'r astudiaeth os dymunwch.

**Fydd cymryd rhan yn yr astudiaeth yn effeithio ar y gofal a dderbyniad yn y GIG?**

Ni fydd cymryd rhan yn yr astudiaeth yn effeithio ar y gofal a dderbyniwch yn y GIG. Os ydych yn cytuno i gymryd rhan yn yr ymchwil hwn, byddaf yn rhoi gwybod i'ch meddyg teulu a Mrs. Yvonne Copeland, nyrs arbenigol MS. Mae hyn er mwyn sicrhau eich diogelwch a'ch lles. Gyda'ch caniatâd, gallaf gasglu gwybodaeth am eich symptomau o sglerosis ymledol o'ch cofnodion meddygol.

**Pwy sy'n trefnu ac yn cyllido'r astudiaeth hon?**

Trefnir ac ariannir yr astudiaeth hon gan Raglen Seicoleg Glinigol Gogledd Cymru, ym Mhrifysgol Bangor.

**Pwy sydd wedi adolygu'r astudiaeth hon?**

Mae'r astudiaeth wedi'i hadolygu a'i chymeradwyo gan banel annibynnol o bobl yn yr Ysgol Seicoleg ym Mhrifysgol Bangor, ac o Bwyllgor Moeseg Ymchwil y GIG.

**Beth os aiff rhywbeth o'i le?**

Os oes gennych unrhyw bryderon ynglŷn â'r astudiaeth ymchwil, gellwch gysylltu â Laura Spencer drwy ffonio 07972763722 neu anfon e-bost at [psp4eb@bangor.ac.uk](mailto:psp4eb@bangor.ac.uk). Gallwch hefyd gysylltu â Dr. Craig Roberts, Niwroseicolegydd Clinigol, yng Ngwasanaeth Anaf i'r Ymennydd Gogledd Cymru drwy ffonio 01492 807770 neu anfon e-bost at [Craig.Roberts@Wales.nhs.uk](mailto:Craig.Roberts@Wales.nhs.uk)

Os na fydd Laura na Dr. Roberts yn gallu rhoi sylw boddhaol i'ch pryderon ac/neu rydych eisiau gwneud cwyn am yr astudiaeth, cysylltwch â Mr Hefin Francis, Rheolwr yr Ysgol Seicoleg:

Mr. Hefin Francis  
Rheolwr yr Ysgol Seicoleg  
Prifysgol Bangor,  
Ysgol Seicoleg,  
Adeilad Brigantia,  
Ffordd Penrallt,  
Gwynedd,  
LL57 2DG.

Ffôn: 01248 388339  
E-bost: [h.francis@bangor.ac.uk](mailto:h.francis@bangor.ac.uk)

**Beth fydd yn digwydd os na fyddaf yn dymuno parhau â'r astudiaeth?**

Gellwch dynnu'n ôl o'r astudiaeth ar unrhyw adeg heb roi rheswm, ac ni fydd eich gofal yn y GIG yn cael ei effeithio mewn unrhyw ffordd. Os byddwch yn dymuno tynnu'n ôl, gallwch ofyn i'ch data gael ei dynnu o'r astudiaeth hefyd.

**Sut fydd fy ngwybodaeth yn cael ei chadw'n gyfrinachol?**

Bydd yr holl wybodaeth a gesglir yn cael ei chadw'n hollol gyfrinachol. Yr unig eithriad i gyfrinachedd yw os oes pryderon am eich diogelwch, neu ddiogelwch rhywun arall, yna bydd yn ddyletswydd ar Laura i rannu'r wybodaeth honno gyda gweithwyr proffesiynol eraill. Os datgelir rhywbeth yn ddamweiniol, efallai bydd rhaid rhannu'r wybodaeth hon gyda gweithwyr proffesiynol eraill hefyd. Yn yr amgylchiadau hyn, bydd Laura yn gwneud pob ymdrech i roi gwybod i chi yn gyntaf. Cedwir yr holl ddata a gesglir yn ddiogel ac ar wahân oddi wrth unrhyw fanylion personol amdanoch. Dim ond Laura a Dr. Craig Roberts fydd yn cael gweld y data, a chaiff y data eu dinistrio ar ôl cwblhau'r project yn unol â chanllawiau'r GIG.

**Beth fydd yn digwydd i ganlyniadau'r astudiaeth hon?**

Defnyddir canlyniadau'r astudiaeth i ysgrifennu adroddiad i Brifysgol Bangor fel rhan o'r rhaglen hyfforddi ddoethurol. Efallai y bydd Laura Spencer hefyd yn ysgrifennu adroddiad i'w gyhoeddi mewn cylchgrawn gwyddonol. Os dymunwch, cewch lythyr drwy'r post yn rhoi manylion am ganlyniadau'r astudiaeth. Bydd yr holl wybodaeth am gyfranogwyr yn ddienw, ac ni fydd modd eich adnabod mewn unrhyw ddogfennaeth ysgrifenedig.

**Diolch i chi am roi o'ch amser i ddarllen y daflen wybodaeth hon.**

Yn gywir,

Laura Spencer  
Seicolegydd Clinigol dan Hyfforddiant

Dan oruchwyliath Dr. Craig Roberts  
Niwroseicolegydd Clinigol

COLEG IECHYD A GWYDDORAU YMDDYGIAD  
COLLEGE OF HEALTH & BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES

YSGOL SEICOLEG  
SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY



NWCPP-RSCGC

**RHAGLEN SEICOLEG CLINIGOL GOGLEDD CYMRU  
NORTH WALES CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAMME**



PRIFYSGOL  
**BANGOR**  
UNIVERSITY

Participant Identification Number:

### Participant Consent Form

**Study title:** Self-efficacy and cognition in people with Multiple Sclerosis

**Name of researcher:** Laura Spencer, Trainee Clinical Psychologist

**Supervised by:** Dr Craig Roberts, Clinical Neuropsychologist

Please initial  
box

1. I confirm that I have read the Participant Information Sheet dated 08/08/2016 for the above study.
2. I have had the opportunity to consider the information and ask questions, and I have had any questions answered satisfactorily.
3. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving any reason, and without my care anywhere in the NHS being affected.
4. I understand that the information collected about me may be used to support other research in the future at the North Wales Brain Injury Service.
5. I understand that information may be shared with other professionals where there are concerns regarding my safety and/or the safety of other people, and where incidental disclosures are made.
6. I give my consent for my General Practitioner to be informed that I have agreed to participate in this research.
7. I give my consent for Mrs. Yvonne Copeland, MS Specialist Nurse, to be informed that I have agreed to participate in this research.
8. I give my consent for Laura to access my medical records.
9. I agree to take part in the above study.

COLEG IECHYD A GWYDDORAU YMDDYGIAD  
COLLEGE OF HEALTH & BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES

YSGOL SEICOLEG  
SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY

|                              |               |                    |
|------------------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| _____<br>Name of Participant | _____<br>Date | _____<br>Signature |
|------------------------------|---------------|--------------------|

|   |               |                    |
|---|---------------|--------------------|
| _____<br>Name of Person<br>Taking Consent | _____<br>Date | _____<br>Signature |
|---|---------------|--------------------|



NWCPP-RSCGC

Rhif Adnabod y Cyfranogwr:

**RHAGLEN SEICOLEG CLINIGOL GOGLEDD CYMRU**  
**NORTH WALES CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAMME**



PRIFYSGOL  
**BANGOR**  
UNIVERSITY

**Ffurflen Gydsynio i Rai sy'n Cymryd Rhan**

**Teitl yr astudiaeth:** Hunaneffeithlonrwydd a gwybyddiaeth mewn pobl â Sglerosis Ymledol

**Enw'r ymchwilydd:** Laura Spencer, Seicolegydd Clinigol dan Hyfforddiant

**Dan oruchwyliaeth:** Dr Craig Roberts, Niwroseicolegydd Clinigol

1. Cadarnhaf fy mod wedi darllen y daflen wybodaeth i gyfranogwyr dyddiedig 20/06/2016 ar gyfer yr astudiaeth uchod. ☐
2. Rwyf wedi cael cyfle i ystyried y wybodaeth a gofyn cwestiynau, ac wedi cael atebion boddhaol i unrhyw gwestiynau oedd gennyf. ☐
3. Deallaf fy mod yn cymryd rhan o'm gwirfodd, a bod gennyf hawl i dynnu'n ôl ar unrhyw adeg, heb roi unrhyw reswm, a heb i hynny effeithio ar fy ngofal mewn unrhyw ran o'r GIG. ☐
4. Deallaf y bydd y wybodaeth a gesglir amdanaf yn cael ei defnyddio i gefnogi ymchwil arall yn y dyfodol yng Ngwasanaeth Anaf i'r Ymennydd Gogledd Cymru. ☐
5. Deallaf y gellir rhannu gwybodaeth gyda gweithwyr proffesiynol eraill lle bo pryderon ynghylch fy niogelwch fy hun a/neu ddiogelwch pobl eraill, a phan ddatgelir rhywbeth yn ddamweiniol. ☐
6. Rwy'n cytuno i'm Meddyg Teulu gael gwybod fy mod wedi cytuno i gymryd rhan yn yr ymchwil hon. ☐
7. Rwy'n cytuno Mrs Yvonne Copeland, Nyrs Arbenigol MS, gael gwybod fy mod wedi cytuno i gymryd rhan yn yr ymchwil hon. ☐
8. Rwy'n caniatáu i Laura weld fy nghofnodion meddygol. ☐
9. Rwy'n cytuno i gymryd rhan yn yr astudiaeth uchod. ☐

COLEG IECHYD A GWYDDORAU YMDDYGIAD  
COLLEGE OF HEALTH & BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES  
YSGOL SEICOLEG  
SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY

---

Enw'r cyfranogwr

---

Dyddiad

---

Llofnod

---

Enw'r Unigolyn  
yn cymryd cydsyniad

---

Dyddiad

---

Llofnod





Participant Identification Number:

### Demographic Questionnaire

*The following questions are designed to collect information regarding your background. Please tick the appropriate boxes, or write in the spaces provided. Thank you.*

**1. Please specify your gender**

Male ☐ Female ☐ Other ☐

**2. What was your age in years on your last birthday?** \_\_\_\_\_

**3. What is your current marital status?**

Married/Civil Partnership ☐ Cohabiting/Living with partner ☐  
In a relationship but living separately ☐ Single ☐  
Divorced/Separated ☐ Widowed ☐

**4. How would you describe your ethnicity? (Please choose one option that best describes your ethnic group or background)**

|   |                          |  |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| White:  |                          | Black/African/Caribbean/Black British: |                          |
| Welsh/English/Scottish/Northern Irish/British | <input type="checkbox"/> | African                                | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Irish   | <input type="checkbox"/> | Caribbean                              | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Gypsy or Irish Traveller                      | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |                          |
| Asian/Asian British:                          |                          | Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups           | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Indian  | <input type="checkbox"/> | White and Black Caribbean              | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Pakistani                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | White and Black African                | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Bangladeshi                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | White and Asian                        | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Chinese                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |                          |
| Other ethnic group                            |                          |  |                          |
| Arab  | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |                          |
| Any other ethnic group, please describe _____ |                          |  |                          |

**5. What is your first language?**

Welsh ☐ English ☐  
Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

**6. What age did you start school?** \_\_\_\_\_

**7. What age did you leave school?** \_\_\_\_\_

**8. Do you hold any formal qualifications? (Please specify, e.g., O Level, A Level, Degree, NVQ etc)**

---

---

---

**9. Please specify your current employment status**

Employed (full time)

☐  
☐

Employed (part time)

☐  
☐

Retired

Unemployed

Please specify your main occupation (current or previous):

---

**10. What subtype of Multiple Sclerosis have you been diagnosed with?**

Clinically isolated syndrome

☐

Relapsing and remitting multiple sclerosis

☐

Benign multiple sclerosis

☐

Secondary progressive multiple sclerosis

☐

Primary progressive multiple sclerosis

☐

Not known

☐

**11. When do you feel your symptoms of multiple sclerosis first started? (Please specify how many months or years)**

---

**12. How long ago were you diagnosed with multiple sclerosis? (Please specify how many months or years)**

---

**13. Other than multiple sclerosis, do you have any long-term illnesses, health problems, or disabilities?**

(Please  
specify)

---

---

## MS Questionnaire

Participant Identification Number: \_\_\_\_\_

### Appendix 1.

Multiple Sclerosis (MS) Information: Patient Scoring

1. Which of the following three descriptions best characterizes your disease? (circle one)

1. I have attacks where I am worse for a period of time (lasting longer than 24 hours) followed by an improvement in my condition (although not necessarily back to where I was before the attack). In between attacks I am stable.
2. My disease began as indicated above but subsequently it changed so that now I have been getting progressively worse, even when I am not having an attack.

How long ago did this change take place? \_\_\_\_\_

3. From the beginning, my disease has gotten steadily and progressively worse, even when I am not having an attack.

2. Which of the following best describes your ability to walk? (circle one)

1. I can walk without any problem.
2. I have some difficulties with walking but I can walk without aid for 500 meters or more (i.e., approximately the length of five football fields or one third of a mile).
3. I have some difficulties with walking but I can walk without aid for about 300 meters (i.e., approximately the length of three football fields or one fifth of a mile).
4. I have some difficulties with walking but I can walk without aid for about 200 meters (i.e., approximately the length of two football fields or one tenth of a mile).
5. I have some difficulties with walking but I can walk without aid for about 100 meters (i.e., approximately the length of one football field or 300 feet).
6. I require an aid (e.g. cane, crutch, walker or another person) to walk 100 meters (300 feet).
7. I require an aid (e.g. cane, crutch, walker or another person) to walk 20 meters (60 feet).
8. I require an aid (e.g. cane, crutch, walker or another person) to walk 8 meters (25 feet).
9. I use a wheelchair for almost all activities.
10. I am confined to bed most of the time.

3. When you move about, what percentage of the time do you:

1. walk without aid? \_\_\_\_\_
2. use a cane, a single crutch, or hold onto another person? \_\_\_\_\_
3. use a walker or other bilateral support? \_\_\_\_\_
4. use a wheel chair? \_\_\_\_\_

Total=100%

4. Which of the following best describes your functional abilities? (circle one)

1. I am able to carry out my usual daily activities without limitation.
2. I have limitations but can carry out most of my usual daily activities, even if I may require some special provisions such as altered work hours or naps.
3. I am able to carry out about only half of my usual daily activities even with special provisions.
4. I am severely limited in my ability to carry out my usual daily activities.
5. I require assistance with even my basic self care activities such as dressing, bathing, transferring and going to the bathroom.

5. Which of the following best describes your strength (power)? (circle each location only once)

1. My strength (power) is normal in the following locations:  
(Right arm, Left arm, Right leg, Left leg, Face)
2. I am mildly weak in the following locations:  
(Right arm, Left arm, Right leg, Left leg, Face)
3. I am moderately weak in the following locations:  
(Right arm, Left arm, Right leg, Left leg, Face)
4. I am severely weak in the following locations:  
(Right arm, Left arm, Right leg, Left leg, Face)

6. Which of the following best describes your sensation (feeling)? (circle each location only once)

1. My sensation (feeling) is normal in the following locations:  
(Right arm, Left arm, Right leg, Left leg, Face)
2. My sensation (feeling) is mildly impaired in the following locations:  
(Right arm, Left arm, Right leg, Left leg, Face)
3. My sensation (feeling) is moderately impaired in the following locations:  
(Right arm, Left arm, Right leg, Left leg, Face)
4. My sensation (feeling) is severely impaired in the following locations:  
(Right arm, Left arm, Right leg, Left leg, Face)

7. Which of the following best describes your corrected visual acuity (i.e., using glasses if necessary)? (circle each eye only once)

1. My corrected vision is normal in the following locations:  
(Right eye, Left eye)
2. My corrected vision is mildly impaired in the following locations:  
(Right eye, Left eye)
3. My corrected vision is moderately impaired in the following locations:  
(Right eye, Left eye)
4. My corrected vision is severely impaired in the following locations:  
(Right eye, Left eye)

MS Questionnaire

Participant Identification Number: \_\_\_\_\_

8. Which of the following best describes your double vision? (circle one)

1. I don't experience double vision.
2. I experience double vision only occasionally.
3. I experience double vision moderately often.
4. I experience double vision most of the time.

9. Which of the following best describes your coordination? (circle each location only once)

1. My coordination is normal in the following areas:  
(Right arm, Left arm, Right leg, Left leg)
2. I am mildly uncoordinated in the following areas:  
(Right arm, Left arm, Right leg, Left leg)
3. I am moderately uncoordinated in the following areas:  
(Right arm, Left arm, Right leg, Left leg)
4. I am severely uncoordinated in the following areas:  
(Right arm, Left arm, Right leg, Left leg)

10. Do you have dif/fulty speaking or with your speech? \_\_\_\_\_; If yes, is this dif/fulty mild, moderate or severe? \_\_\_\_\_

11. Which of the following best describes your balance? (circle one)

1. I have no dif/fulty with my balance
2. I have mild dif/fulty with my balance
3. I have moderate dif/fulty with my balance
4. I have severe dif/fulty with my balance

12. Which of the following best describes the spasticity (stiffness) and/or spasms (brief involuntary contraction) of your muscles? (circle each location once)

1. I have no spasticity and/or spasms in the following locations:  
(Right arm, Left arm, Right leg, Left leg)
2. I have mild spasticity and/or spasms in the following locations:  
(Right arm, Left arm, Right leg, Left leg)
3. I have moderate spasticity and/or spasms in the following locations:  
(Right arm, Left arm, Right leg, Left leg)
4. I have severe spasticity and/or spasms in the following locations:  
(Right arm, Left arm, Right leg, Left leg)

13. Which of the following best describes your cognitive (thinking) ability? (circle one)

1. I have had no change in my cognitive (thinking) abilities.

2. I have had a mild impairment of my cognitive (thinking) abilities.

3. I have had a moderate impairment of my cognitive (thinking) abilities.

4. I have had a severe impairment of my cognitive (thinking) abilities.

5. I am unable to handle my affairs because of my severe cognitive problems.

14. Which of the following best describes your mood since getting MS? (circle one)

1. My mood has been unchanged since getting MS.

2. I have become depressed or more depressed since getting MS.

3. Although I am not pleased to have MS, I have become a more cheerful person since getting it.

15. Do you have dif/fulty swallowing? \_\_\_\_\_; If yes, is the dif/fulty mild, moderate, or severe? \_\_\_\_\_

16. Which of the following best describes your bowel and bladder function? (circle all that are appropriate but circle the bowel and bladder at least once)

1. I have normal function of my:  
(Bladder, Bowel)

2. I have urgency (i.e., I have to go quickly when I feel the urge) of my:  
(Bladder, Bowel)

3. I have frequency (i.e., I go unusually often) of my:  
(Bladder, Bowel)

4. I have hesitancy (i.e., I have dif/fulty getting started) of my:  
(Bladder, Bowel)

5. I am occasionally incontinent (less than once a week) of my:  
(Bladder, Bowel)

6. I am frequently incontinent (weekly or more often but less than daily) of my:  
(Bladder, Bowel)

7. I am frequently incontinent (daily or more often) of my:  
(Bladder, Bowel)

8. I require intermittent catheterization

9. I require an indwelling catheter.

10. I have constipation.

17. Do you experience vertigo or dizziness (i.e. a sense or a feeling of motion)? \_\_\_\_\_; If yes, is your dizziness mild, moderate, or severe?  
\_\_\_\_\_

Liverpool Self Efficacy Questionnaire

Think about how you have been feeling over the last week. Please read the following statements and indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with them by circling one answer to each question.

|     |   | <b>Strongly<br/>agree</b> | <b>Agree</b> | <b>Disagree</b> | <b>Strongly<br/>Disagree</b> |
|-----|---|---------------------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------------------|
| 1.  | Since my diagnosis was confirmed, my life has been beset with difficulties over which I have no control | 1                         | 2            | 3               | 4                            |
| 2.  | I feel in control of my life  | 4                         | 3            | 2               | 1                            |
| 3.  | I rely on others to help me make decisions  | 1                         | 2            | 3               | 4                            |
| 4.  | Sometimes I feel that my MS controls my life  | 1                         | 2            | 3               | 4                            |
| 5.  | I often feel helpless when dealing with my difficulties   | 1                         | 2            | 3               | 4                            |
| 6.  | The way my MS affects me in the future mostly depends on me   | 4                         | 3            | 2               | 1                            |
| 7.  | I worry about how I will cope in the future   | 1                         | 2            | 3               | 4                            |
| 8.  | Despite my difficulties, I still manage to cope with daily life   | 4                         | 3            | 2               | 1                            |
| 9.  | There is really no way I can solve some of the problems I have with my MS                               | 1                         | 2            | 3               | 4                            |
| 10. | Despite my MS, I can do anything I set my mind to   | 4                         | 3            | 2               | 1                            |
| 11. | I am confident I can overcome my difficulties   | 4                         | 3            | 2               | 1                            |

PROMIS Fatigue MS  
Participant Identification Number:

**PROMIS-Fatigue<sub>MS</sub>**

| <i>In the past 7 days...</i>  | <b>Never</b>          | <b>Rarely</b>           | <b>Some-<br/>times</b> | <b>Often</b>           | <b>Always</b>        |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| How often were you too tired to think clearly?                                      | 1                     | 2                       | 3                      | 4                      | 5                    |
| How often were you too tired to enjoy life?   | 1                     | 2                       | 3                      | 4                      | 5                    |
| How often did you find yourself getting tired easily?                               | 1                     | 2                       | 3                      | 4                      | 5                    |
| How often did you feel tired even when you hadn't done anything?                    | 1                     | 2                       | 3                      | 4                      | 5                    |
| How often did you have trouble finishing things because of your fatigue?            | 1                     | 2                       | 3                      | 4                      | 5                    |
| How often did you have to push yourself to get things done because of your fatigue? | 1                     | 2                       | 3                      | 4                      | 5                    |
| How often did your fatigue interfere with your social activities?                   | 1                     | 2                       | 3                      | 4                      | 5                    |
| <i>In the past 7 days...</i>  | <b>Not at<br/>all</b> | <b>A little<br/>bit</b> | <b>Some-<br/>what</b>  | <b>Quite a<br/>bit</b> | <b>Very<br/>Much</b> |
| To what degree did your fatigue interfere with your physical functioning?           | 1                     | 2                       | 3                      | 4                      | 5                    |

Patient Health Questionnaire  
Participant Identification Number:

## PATIENT HEALTH QUESTIONNAIRE-9 (PHQ-9)

Over the **last 2 weeks**, how often have you been bothered  
by any of the following problems?  
(Use "✓" to indicate your answer)

|   | Not at all | Several<br>days | More<br>than half<br>the days | Nearly<br>every<br>day |
|---|------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Little interest or pleasure in doing things  | 0          | 1               | 2                             | 3                      |
| 2. Feeling down, depressed, or hopeless   | 0          | 1               | 2                             | 3                      |
| 3. Trouble falling or staying asleep, or sleeping too much  | 0          | 1               | 2                             | 3                      |
| 4. Feeling tired or having little energy  | 0          | 1               | 2                             | 3                      |
| 5. Poor appetite or overeating  | 0          | 1               | 2                             | 3                      |
| 6. Feeling bad about yourself — or that you are a failure or<br>have let yourself or your family down   | 0          | 1               | 2                             | 3                      |
| 7. Trouble concentrating on things, such as reading the<br>newspaper or watching television   | 0          | 1               | 2                             | 3                      |
| 8. Moving or speaking so slowly that other people could have<br>noticed? Or the opposite — being so fidgety or restless<br>that you have been moving around a lot more than usual | 0          | 1               | 2                             | 3                      |
| 9. Thoughts that you would be better off dead or of hurting<br>yourself in some way   | 0          | 1               | 2                             | 3                      |

FOR OFFICE CODING 0 +      +      +       
=Total Score:     

If you checked off **any** problems, how **difficult** have these problems made it for you to do your  
work, take care of things at home, or get along with other people?

|   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|--|
| Not difficult<br>at all<br><input type="checkbox"/> | Somewhat<br>difficult<br><input type="checkbox"/> | Very<br>difficult<br><input type="checkbox"/> | Extremely<br>difficult<br><input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|---|---|--|

NeuroQOL-CF

Participant Identification Number:

**Cognition Function– Short Form**

**Please respond to each question or statement by marking one box per row.**

| In the past 7 days... |   | Never                         | Rarely<br>(once)              | Sometimes<br>(2-3 times)      | Often<br>(once a<br>day)      | Very often<br>(several<br>times a<br>day) |
|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| NQCOG641              | I had to read something several times to understand it.....               | <input type="checkbox"/><br>5 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>4 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>3 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>2 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>1             |
| NQCOG751              | My thinking was slow.....   | <input type="checkbox"/><br>5 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>4 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>3 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>2 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>1             |
| NQCOG771              | I had to work really hard to pay attention or I would make a mistake..... | <input type="checkbox"/><br>5 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>4 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>3 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>2 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>1             |
| NQCOG801              | I had trouble concentrating.....  | <input type="checkbox"/><br>5 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>4 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>3 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>2 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>1             |

**How much DIFFICULTY do you currently have...**

|          | None   | A little                      | Somewhat                      | A lot                         | Cannot do                     |                               |
|----------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| NQCOG221 | reading and following complex instructions (e.g., directions for a new medication)?.....   | <input type="checkbox"/><br>5 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>4 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>3 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>2 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>1 |
| NQCOG241 | planning for and keeping appointments that are not part of your weekly routine, (e.g., a therapy or doctor appointment, or a social gathering with friends and family)?..... | <input type="checkbox"/><br>5 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>4 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>3 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>2 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>1 |
| NQCOG251 | managing your time to do most of your daily activities?.....   | <input type="checkbox"/><br>5 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>4 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>3 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>2 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>1 |
| NQCOG401 | learning new tasks or instructions?.....   | <input type="checkbox"/><br>5 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>4 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>3 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>2 | <input type="checkbox"/><br>1 |

©2008-2013 David Cella and the PROMIS Health Organization on behalf of the National Institute for Neurological Disorders and Stroke (NINDS). Used with permission.



## **Word counts**

**Thesis Abstract:** 292

**Chapter 1 – Meta analysis and Literature review:** 3,548 (including title page, footnotes, list of abbreviations, and abstract, but excluding tables, figures, and references)

**Chapter 2 – Empirical Paper:** 3,437 (including title page, footnotes, list of abbreviations, and abstract, but excluding tables, figures, and references)

**Chapter 3 – Contributions to Theory & Clinical Practice:** 3,135 (excluding references)

**Total Word Count:** 10,120 (excluding tables, figures and reference lists)

**Appendices Word Count:** 9,443 (including all tables, all figures, and all references, and the list of appendices. Excluding the ethics appendices)