

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Injured Athletes: Appraisal, Coping, Optimism, Rehabilitation
Adherence, and Rehabilitation Engagement

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of

Master of Science

In

Psychology

At Massey University, Albany, New Zealand.

Steven James Langdon

2015

i. Abstract

The relationship between optimism, appraisal of injuries, coping processes, engagement with the rehabilitation program, and injury rehabilitation adherence, in injured athletes has not been extensively examined. These factors have been examined extensively individually and some of the factors have been extensively investigated together, but these factors have not been examined in detail as a complete process (Albinson & Petrie, 2003; Chang, 2002; Gustafsson & Skoog, 2012; Walker, Thatcher, & Lavalley, 2007)

A group of 23 injured athletes participated in this research. Data collection was undertaken across a period of 8 weeks, with questionnaires being administered online through links sent out via email. The questionnaires were examining demographics, optimism, cognitive appraisal, coping, rehabilitation adherence, and rehabilitation engagement. The optimism, cognitive appraisal, and coping questionnaires were completed prior to or as soon as possible after the athletes first treatment session. The rehabilitation adherence and rehabilitation engagement questionnaires were completed at the end of each week for a period of eight weeks after the initial questionnaires were completed.

Psychometric evaluations found an acceptable level of internal consistency for the measures. Correlation analysis found relationships between rehabilitation adherence and rehabilitation engagement. The initial status and rate of change for rehabilitation adherence and engagement were examined. Suggesting that; injured athletes that are high in rehabilitation adherence at the beginning of their rehabilitation treatment become less adherent at a slower rate than injured

athletes who are initially low in adherence, athletes who are initially high in rehabilitation engagement become less engaged at a slower rate than injured athletes who initially are low in rehabilitation engagement, and that injured athletes who are becoming less adherent will become less engaged at a faster rate as time passes from when the injured athlete suffered their injury. Limitations and implications for future research are discussed.

ii. Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr Richard Fletcher for being my supervisor. Your support, guidance, and advice has been greatly appreciated. You encouraged me to challenge myself.

Thank you to my parents; Grant and Lynne, for encouraging me and supporting me whilst I did my thesis.

To my participants, thank you so very much. You made it possible for me to do this research.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Northern 14/018.

iii. Table of Contents

i.	Abstract.....	i
ii.	Acknowledgements.....	iii
iii.	Table of Contents.....	iv
iv.	List of Tables.....	vi
v.	List of Figures.....	vii
1	Introduction to Current Research.....	1
2	Literature review.....	5
2.1	Stress Appraisal and Coping.....	5
2.1.1	Transactional model of stress.....	7
2.1.2	Stress process model.....	9
2.1.3	Grief response model.....	10
2.1.4	Cognitive appraisal model.....	11
2.1.5	Integrated model of response to sport injury.....	13
2.2	Optimism.....	20
2.3	Rehabilitation Adherence.....	25
2.4	Rehabilitation Engagement.....	30
2.5	Purpose of Current Study.....	35
2.6	Research Questions.....	35
3	Methodology.....	36
3.1	Participants.....	36
3.2	Procedures.....	36
3.3	Measures.....	38
3.3.1	Appraisal and coping questionnaire.....	38
3.3.2	Life orientation test revised.....	39
3.3.3	Rehabilitation adherence questionnaire.....	40
3.3.4	Utrecht work engagement scale-9.....	40
3.4	Analyses.....	41
4	Results.....	44
4.1	Descriptive Statistics.....	44
4.2	Reliability Analysis.....	46
4.3	Data Exploration.....	50
4.3.1	Rehabilitation adherence.....	50

4.3.2	Rehabilitation engagement.....	55
4.4	Correlation Analysis	61
4.5	Change Over Time.....	62
5	Discussion.....	68
5.1	Summary	68
5.2	Findings	70
5.3	Limitations.....	76
5.4	Implications of Research Findings.....	76
6	Conclusion.....	80
7	References	81
8	Appendices.....	98
8.1	Appendix A: Participant Information Sheet.....	98
8.2	Appendix B: Letter Requesting Access.....	104
8.3	Appendix C: Participant Consent Form.....	107
8.4	Appendix D: Participant Debrief Letter.....	108
8.5	Appendix E: Demographic Questionnaire.....	110
8.6	Appendix F: Cognitive Appraisal and Coping Questionnaire	111
8.7	Appendix G: Life Orientation Test Revised	114
8.8	Appendix H: Rehabilitation Adherence Questionnaire.....	116
8.9	Appendix I: Modified Utrecht Work Engagement Scale	119

iv. List of Tables

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of all Measurement Variables.....	45
Table 2. Reliability Coefficients of the Rehabilitation Adherence Questionnaire (RAQ) and Modified Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) using All Items at Each Time Point	46
Table 3. Subscale Reliability Coefficients of the RAQ and UWES Using All Items at Each Time Point.....	47
Table 4. Reliability Coefficients of the RAQ After Items With Negative Corrected Item-Total Correlations Were Removed at Each Time Point.....	48
Table 5. Subscale Reliability Coefficients of the RAQ at Each Time Point With Negative Corrected Item-Total Correlations Removed	49
Table 6. Reliability of the Optimism, Appraisal, and Coping Questionnaires	49
Table 7. Bivariate Correlation Matrix for Target Variables in Study	61
Table 8. Descriptive Statistics for the Change in Rehabilitation Adherence and Rehabilitation Engagement Over Time. Using Fitted Separate Within-Person OLS Regression Models for Rehabilitation Adherence and Rehabilitation engagement as a Function of Linear Time (n = 21)	62

v. List of Figures

Figure 1. Sports injury stress process model10

Figure 2. Integrated model of psychological response to the sport injury and rehabilitation process. Adapted from “An Integrated Model of Response to Sport Injury: Psychological and Sociological Dynamics,” by D. Wiese-Bjornstal, A. Smith, S. Shaffer, and M. Morrey, 1998, *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 10, p. 49. Copyright 1998 by Association for Advancement of Applied Sport Psychology14

Figure 3. Empirical growth plots for 21 participants’ total rehabilitation adherence score changes over time.50

Figure 4. Smooth nonparametric trajectories superimposed on empirical growth plots for participants’ total rehabilitation adherence scores. Showing smooth nonparametric summaries of how individuals change over time.51

Figure 5. Empirical growth plots for participants’ total rehabilitation adherence scores with fitted OLS trajectories overlaid, displaying change over time.....52

Figure 6. Comparing the collections of smooth nonparametric and fitted OLS trajectories across participants’ total rehabilitation adherence scores. Presenting average change trajectories for the both the smooth nonparametric and fitted OLS trajectories. Panel A displays all participants’ smooth nonparametric trajectories. Panel B displays all participants’ fitted OLS trajectories.....53

Figure 7. Identifying potential predictors of change by examining fitted OLS trajectories for participants’ total rehabilitation adherence scores displayed separately by level of sport competition. With average trajectories in red.....54

Figure 8. Empirical growth plots for 21 participants' total rehabilitation engagement scores changes over time.....55

Figure 9. Smooth nonparametric trajectories superimposed on empirical growth plots for participants' total rehabilitation engagement scores. Showing smooth nonparametric summaries of how individuals change over time.56

Figure 10. Empirical growth plots for participants' total rehabilitation engagement scores with fitted Ordinary least squares (OLS) trajectories overlaid, displaying change over time.57

Figure 11. Comparing the collections of smooth nonparametric and fitted OLS trajectories across participants' total rehabilitation engagement scores. Presenting average change trajectories for the both the smooth nonparametric and fitted OLS trajectories. Panel A displays all participants' smooth nonparametric trajectories. Panel B displays all participants' fitted OLS trajectories.....58

Figure 12. Identifying potential predictors of change by examining fitted OLS trajectories for participants' total rehabilitation engagement scores displayed separately by level of sport competition. With average trajectories in red.....59