The HEART mobile phone trial: the partial mediating effects of self-efficacy on physical activity among cardiac patients

Ralph Maddison1*, Leila Pfaffli1, Ralph Stewart2, Andrew Kerr3, Yannan Jiang1, Jonathan Rawstorn1, Karen Carter1 and Robyn Whittaker1

1 National Institute for Health Innovation, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand
2 Auckland City Hospital, Auckland, New Zealand
3 Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

*Correspondence: Ralph Maddison, National Institute for Health Innovation, University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142, New Zealand. E-mail: r.maddison@nih.gov.auckland.ac.nz

INTRODUCTION

The ubiquitous use of mobile phones offers important new opportunities to bring self-management support directly to people with long-term conditions such as cardiovascular disease (CVD) (1). Mobile health (mHealth) programs offer several advantages for supporting patient self-management, compared with traditional office-based approaches: (1) they can be delivered anywhere at any time and for extended periods, facilitating regular communication and behavioral maintenance; (2) they can be designed to send messages in a time-sensitive manner that fits with the individual’s lifestyle; (3) they are proactive and do not require prompting by the user before support is offered; (4) they can be personalized and tailored to suit specific demographic and health needs; (5) they increase access (e.g., less travel); (6) they allow cheaper provision of services than face-to-face contacts; and (7) they provide a way of reducing inequalities due to their widespread adoption by all cultural and socioeconomic groups.

Research on the use of mHealth for delivering healthcare and improving disease self-management (2) has increased in recent years (3). This research has targeted a wide range of health conditions (4) and a number of systematic reviews support the delivery of mobile phone text messaging interventions (3–5) for achieving behavior change. However, a recent (2014) meta-review highlighted that the quality of future studies needs to be improved and interventions should employ behavior change theory (4).

A recent randomized controlled trial of a mobile phone text messaging and Internet intervention (HEART) showed a statistically significant treatment effect on self-reported leisure-time physical activity and walking (secondary outcomes) but not on peak oxygen uptake (PVO2; primary outcome), which favored the intervention group at 24 weeks (6). In response to the lack of theoretical basis of many mHealth interventions to-date (4) the HEART intervention content development was...
A two-arm, parallel, randomized controlled trial was conducted with baseline data collection procedures. Interested participants were referred to the research team to schedule measures and existing databases. After screening for eligibility, nurses referred eligible participants to the research team to schedule measures and existing databases. The primary outcome (PVO2) was determined using respiratory gas analysis during a standardized treadmill exercise testing protocol (26). Self-reported physical activity levels were assessed using the international physical activity questionnaire long form (IPAQ-LF) (27). Self-efficacy (task) was assessed using a valid measure on a scale of 0 “no confidence to 100% complete confidence” (28). An example item is, “how confident are you that you can complete 30 min of physical activity at a moderate effort on most days of next week?” Scores were summed with greater values indicating greater efficacy to exercise for longer periods of time and at a greater level of intensity. For barrier efficacy, participants rated their confidence to overcome seven common reasons (e.g., bad weather, lack of time, pain, or discomfort) preventing people from participating in exercise sessions (12). Efficacy strength was calculated by summing the scores and dividing by total number of items.

In accordance with the recommendations of Kraemer et al. (23) for testing mediators of treatment effects in randomized clinical trials, hierarchical regression analyses were conducted on the observed participants’ data with post intervention physical activity (leisure-time and walking) at 24 weeks as the criterion measures. According to Kraemer et al., a mediator measures an event or change occurring during treatment, and must correlate with the treatment choice, hence possibly be a result of treatment, and have either a main or interactive effect on the outcome. Their analytic approach differs conceptually from that of Baron and Kenny (29) in several important ways. According to Kraemer et al. with mediation, demonstration of precedence is required, thus a mediator occurs during treatment. Similarly, demonstration of correlation is required. In the absence of such criteria, they argue that the interpretation of whether a relationship is mediating or moderating is often arbitrary. The analytic model, in contrast to the several linear models proposed by Baron and Kenny, is exactly the same for moderators and mediators. The difference lies in how M (Mediator or Moderator) is defined in terms of time relation to treatment onset and correlation with treatment choice (23).

RESULTS
All statistical analyses were performed using SAS version 9.3 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA). Statistical tests were two-sided at 5% significance level. Treatment evaluations were performed on the principle of intention to treat (ITT), using observed data collected from all randomized participants. Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) regression model was used to evaluate the main treatment effect on the outcome measured at 24 weeks, adjusting for the baseline outcome, age, sex, ethnicity (Māori vs. non-Māori), and exercise history. Change in self-efficacy at 24 weeks was added
as the mediator of interest to the main model for evaluation of its mediation effect.

Significant main treatment effects were observed in favor of the intervention for leisure-time physical activity [group difference: 426 MET-min/week, 95% confidence interval (CI) (16, 836), \( P = 0.04 \)] and walking [group difference: 500 MET-min/week, 95% CI (91, 908), \( P = 0.01 \)] at 24 weeks (see Table 1).

Change in task self-efficacy significantly mediated the treatment effect on leisure-time physical activity (\( P = 0.021 \)) by 13% [group difference: 369 MET-min/week, 95% CI (−37, 775), \( P = 0.07 \)], but not on walking (\( P = 0.51 \)) with only 4% relative reduction in treatment effect [group difference: 481 MET-min/week, 95% CI (68, 894), \( P = 0.02 \)]. Barrier efficacy did not meet the conditions for mediation and was not included in the analysis (see Table 1).

### DISCUSSION

The main findings from this study can be summarized as follows. A theory-based mHealth intervention involving text messaging and Internet support had a positive effect on physical activity levels. The effect was most likely mediated through increased self-efficacy to undertake more physical activity at increasing intensity. Self-efficacy can be targeted in mHealth interventions and has potential to increase physical activity behavior.

In the present study, the HEART intervention had a positive effect on task efficacy but not for barrier efficacy. Task efficacy referred to participants’ confidence to exercise for greater intensity and increasing duration. Intervention content (messages and Internet) targeted all sources of self-efficacy, including mastery experiences, social modeling, social persuasion, and physiological responses, which may have had a stronger impact on participants’ confidence to perform exercise, but not for overcoming barriers to exercise. The lack of effect on barrier efficacy was surprising given that the text messages and role models vignettes did address this construct. While items were drawn from a previous study of New Zealand patients with CVD; (12) it is possible that the barriers (e.g., weather, discomfort/pain, work commitments) assessed in this study were not salient for this population. Future studies might need to consider identifying more relevant barriers (30).

Notwithstanding the issues above, this study does provide some support for the intervention successfully manipulating key constructs of Social Cognitive Theory. This is important as it is unclear whether existing behavior change theories are relevant for mobile delivered interventions (31). While mHealth behavior intervention development could benefit from greater application of health behavior theories, Riley et al. (31) argued that current theories appear inadequate to inform such mHealth intervention development as these interventions become more interactive and adaptive. They suggested that consideration be given to the development of more dynamic feedback system theories of health behavior, utilizing longitudinal data from mobile devices and control systems engineering models.

This study has several strengths and limitations that should be considered when interpreting the findings. Data were obtained from an adequately powered RCT, which used computer randomization to ensure allocation concealment, and an objective measure for the primary outcome, with blinded assessors. The HEART intervention was also developed using established theory. The main limitation was the use of a self-reported measure of physical activity behavior, which is associated with recall bias. Objective assessment of physical activity (e.g., accelerometry) was not feasible in this study due to logistic reasons; but should be used in subsequent research.

Opportunities for future research exist. First, the use of alternative theoretical frameworks or embedding key behavior change strategies common to many behavior change theories may enhance the impact of future mHealth interventions (31). Second, other potential mediators (including attitudes to or preferences for physical activity) and moderators (age, sex, ethnicity) of mHealth interventions should be considered. Third and finally, while the HEART intervention utilized text messaging and a website, it was predominantly unidirectional and did not include many interactive features. Future interventions should harness many of the existing native smart phone features including application to enhance participant interaction and encourage behavior change. These could include self-monitoring features such as recording activities and visual representation of progress, passive collection of physical activity data, social media features, as well as opportunity to interact with health practitioners.

### CONCLUSION

An mHealth intervention had a positive effect on physical activity levels, which was most likely mediated through increases in self-efficacy. Future trials should examine other potential mediators related to this type of intervention, including attitudes to or preferences for physical activity.
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Table 1 | Treatment effects\(^a\) with and without self-efficacy as the mediator.

| Outcome at 24 weeks | Intervention | Control | Difference in groups | Lower 95% CI | Upper 95% CI | \( P \)-value |
|---------------------|-------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| **LEISURE-TIME PA** |             |         |                     |             |             |             |
| Main model          | 1394        | 968     | 426                 | 16          | 836         | 0.042       |
| Model with mediator\(^b\) | 1363        | 994     | 369                 | −37         | 775         | 0.075       |
| **WALKING**         |             |         |                     |             |             |             |
| Main model          | 1690        | 1191    | 500                 | 91          | 908         | 0.017       |
| Model with mediator\(^b\) | 1681        | 1199    | 481                 | 68          | 894         | 0.023       |

\(^a\) Linear regression model adjusting for: baseline outcome, age, sex, Māori, and exercise history.

\(^b\) Mediator: change in self-efficacy at 24 weeks.
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