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1. Introduction and background

Coronary artery disease (CAD) was the primary cause of death, accounting for approximately 37% of cardiovascular deaths and 15% of total deaths in Jordan in 2012. Myocardial infarction (MI) is the leading cause of death globally and is a worldwide health problem. Diagnosis of acute myocardial infarction (AMI) is based on the type of electrocardiography changes, which are of two types: ST-segment elevation MI (STEMI) and non-ST-segment elevation MI (NSTEMI).
The management of patients with STEMI includes either sending them directly to the cardiac catheterization laboratory to re-open the occluded vessels using a procedure called primary percutaneous coronary intervention (PPCI) or emergency administration of fibrinolysis if the facility of PPCI is not available. Indeed, PPCI is considered a superior treatment for patients with STEMI when it is available within the necessary time period \( \text{http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352013216301879} \) [3], and patients may be discharged within 48 h, leaving little time for secondary prevention to be established.

Patients with AMI who presented with NSTEMI are treated initially by medication rather than with a fibrinolytic agent. For both NSTEMI and patients with AMI treated with fibrinolytic, they frequently require coronary angiography before hospital discharge with possible percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) by opening the occluded vessel through stent or percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty by opening the occluded vessel through balloon \( \text{http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352013216301879} \) [4]. As a result, each one of the three AMI treatment modalities is exposed to different experiences during hospitalization in terms of treatment urgency and length of stay. Literature claims that this may influence patients’ understanding of their diagnosis \( \text{http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352013216301879} \) [5] and motivation for secondary prevention, and this study seeks to address this gap.

All patients with either STEMI or NSTEMI will be told that they have had a heart attack and, where appropriate, are advised to make behavioral changes \( \text{http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352013216301879} \) [6]. However, given the very different experiences in terms of urgency of treatment initiation and hospital stay length, it is understandable that it can be difficult for all patients with an AMI diagnosis to understand this fully \( \text{http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352013216301879} \) [5]. Research has shown that some patients who had PPCI perceived a mismatch between their expectations of treatment urgency and recuperation and their actual experience, which led them to question the seriousness of their illness, and to consider it as acute rather than as a chronic condition \( \text{http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352013216301879} \) [5]. Such perceptions may make it more difficult for patients to understand the chronicity of their illness and undertake the lifestyle changes necessary to prevent further disease progression \( \text{http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352013216301879} \) [7]. Less evidence is found in terms of patients’ understanding of an NSTEMI diagnosis, but qualitative data would suggest that their experience of a protracted and sometimes ambiguous diagnosis may also cause patients to question the seriousness of the event and the need for behavioral change \( \text{http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352013216301879} \) [8].

Illness perception (IP) is the organized cognitive representation or views that patients develop to make sense of their illness experience \( \text{http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352013216301879} \) [9]. The Self-Regulation Model (SRM) of Leventhal et al. (1984) provides a theoretical explanation of the concept of IP and the factors that influence individual’s coping behavior and outcomes. The model postulates that when an individual is facing a health problem, he or she will be motivated to regulate the health-related risk consistent with his or her perception of an illness. According to the SRM, outcomes of behavioral changes are a reflection of patients’ coping strategies that, in turn, are affected by their illness beliefs.

Secondary prevention is the second level of health care that includes measures to control and limit the negative impact of an illness. Among patients diagnosed with MI, secondary prevention measures are highly recommended to avoid further disease progression and complications. These measures mainly include physical activity, smoking cessation, blood pressure and lipid management, and weight control \( \text{http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352013216301879} \) [10].

The IP of patients with AMI has been considered a predictor of their functional status, returning to work, depressive symptoms, and attendance at cardiac rehabilitation clinics \( \text{http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352013216301879} \) [11]. Although IPs are an important determinant of individual behavioral changes in CAD \( \text{http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352013216301879} \) [12], sparse evidence is found regarding the implication of the fast track services of PPCI on patients’ psychological and health behavior changes, and little is known about AMI patients’ experiences and perceptions during and after PPCI \( \text{http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352013216301879} \) [13]. To our knowledge, this is the first study to compare IP and associated outcomes among patients with AMI receiving different treatment modalities. This study aims to evaluate if treatment modality influences IP and the outcomes of behavioral change (obesity, smoking status, blood lipids, physical activity, and blood pressure) among patients with AMI. Hence, the present study aims to answer the following question: Do patients with AMI differ in IP and secondary prevention outcomes (SPO) depending on the treatment they received?

2. Methods

2.1. Design

A quantitative repeated-measure design was used to assess the influence of the three selected treatment modalities on IP and the outcomes of behavioral change among patients with AMI. This design was appropriate to collect and examine changes in study measures during patients’ hospitalization and after 6 months.

2.2. Sample and setting

This study was conducted in the International Heart Institute in Amman. As the largest heart institute in Jordan and having patients admitted from across Jordan, we choose this institute and assume that the Jordanian population will be fairly represented. In addition, this institute is a specialized heart institute with a total of 170-bed capacity and performs cardiac surgery in addition to more than 12,000 cardiac catheterization procedures annually, including PPCI. This heart institute provides care for patients from Jordan, the region, and worldwide.

A convenience sampling technique was used to recruit the participants in the current study. The inclusion criteria were as follows: first-time AMI, over 18 years of age, physically and mentally competent, pain free and hemodynamically stable in which they have stable vital signs for more than 8 h, and agreed to participate in the study. The exclusion criteria were as follows: patients had previous MI and refused to participate in the study.

The power analysis calculation indicated that a sample of 186 patients was required, with confidence interval of 5%, 95% confidence level, and estimated number of 365 patients admitted annually to the hospital presented with first-time AMI. To account for attrition in the follow-up time, 10% was added to the calculated sample size; consequently, 206 patients were recruited to meet the target sample of 186 patients.

2.3. Data collection procedure

Approval for the study was sought and obtained from one of the Universities in the United Kingdom and from the hospital research
ethics board in Jordan. The primary researcher provided verbal and written explanations about the study. All participants’ files were reviewed by the primary researcher to ensure the eligibility of the participants to participate in the study. After that, the written informed consent was obtained from each participant. Then, baseline data were collected using the revised IP questionnaire and the short form of physical activity questionnaire. All patients were interviewed after they were transferred from the Intensive Cardiac Care Unit to the General Care Unit. All participants were pain free and have had stable vital signs.

The follow-up data collection took place at 6 months via a telephone interview. Patients’ hospital medical records were reviewed again at this stage, which was 6 months following hospitalization. Different measures were applied to minimize potential bias; these measures include the following: data were collected from one trained researcher, standardized information was provided to all study participants, and all possible patients who were admitted to the hospital were screened for their eligibility. The time spent for each patient to complete the baseline interview ranged from 15 min to 20 min, and for the follow-up telephone interview, time spent ranged from 12 min to 15 min. The data were collected by the primary investigator for this research study.

2.4. Instrumentation

Questionnaire for data collection consisted of three parts: demographical and clinical data, the Revised Illness Perception Questionnaire (IPQ-R), and the International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ). The medical records were examined at both the baseline and follow-up data time points to gather the required data on lipid profile results, blood pressure, height and weight, coronary angiography result, and hospital length of stay. The outcomes of secondary prevention were operationally defined in this study by BMI, lipid profiles, blood pressure, smoking behavior, and physical activity.

The second part of the questionnaire is the Revised Illness Perception Questionnaire (IPQ-R): the IPQ-R was developed by http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352013216301879 [14]. The IPQ-R sub-scales used in this study were “Timeline Acute/Chronic” (six items); “Timeline Cyclical” (four items); “Consequences” (six items); “Personal Control” (six items); “Treatment Control” (five items); “Illness Coherence” (five items), and “Emotional Representation” (six items). It contains 38 items, which were measured on a Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Higher score of each sub-scale indicates higher perception of chronicity, cycle nature, consequences, personal control, treatment control, perception of their understanding, and emotions related to patient's illness.

Translation and backtranslation were performed and the process involved two teams of translators. The first team consisted of two nurses, both of whom held a master’s degree in nursing and had clinical experience; they were also asked to independently translate the source. The two translators and the researcher then synthesized the translations to produce one version of translation. The second team consisted of two people, both of whom hold a master’s degree in English language; they were also asked to independently translate back into English the translated Arabic version.

Following the back translation of the Arabic version, the translators and the researcher met as a committee to review all the translations and to compare the original version and back translation versions. As a result, a consensus was made within the team as to the appropriateness of the translation. The appropriateness of the final Arabic translated version of the instruments was tested during the pilot study: 15 participants were asked to comment on the clarity of the questions, and these participants were not included in the final sample. Patients reported that the questionnaire instruction, questions, and choices were clear. In addition, pilot testing indicated that no problems were encountered during the process of data collection, coding, and analysis. The IPQ-R has been widely used with different clinical populations with adequate reliability (Cronbach’s α ranged from 0.79 to 0.89) and internal validity http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352013216301879 [14].

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to examine the fitting participants’ responses to the IPQ-R with the latent construct of the questionnaire and examine the reliability of the questionnaire. The data collected at baseline were used to test the factor structure of IPQ-R using the MPLUS statistical package (version 6.1). Established criteria of fit statistics [Chi-square, root mean square estimate of approximate (RMSEA), and CFI] were used to examine the appropriateness of the measurement model in explaining the data.

Recommendation of the standardized RMSEA was used to indicate the overall fit between the specific model and the data set with 0.08 or below, and CFI with 0.90 or greater. If the original model measurement model was deemed not to fit the data, the following criteria of modification were introduced: items with factor loading less than 0.4 were removed. This process continued to an acceptable model and was identified to have acceptable factor loading scores. The original IPQ-R seven-structure model was tested following the fit process and was deemed to fit to data. As a result, the final model fit with the data, and 32 items represented the original seven construct of IPQ-R with RMSEA at 0.074 and CFI at 0.97.

The third part of the questionnaire is the Short Form of the IPAQ. To assess the patients’ activity, the short form IPAQ-7-days-recall telephone interview version was used http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352013216301879 [15]. Following IPAQ scoring protocol, patients were categorized into three different activity levels: low, moderate, and high physical activity. The validity and reliability of the IPAQ were tested in 12 countries and showed that the short form of IPAQ has acceptable validity and reliability, with criterion validity of a median of 0.3 http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352013216301879 [15].

2.5. Ethical consideration

The ethical issues were considered carefully, given the clinical condition of the patient group. Approval for the study was sought and obtained. The ethical approval number was 10/2015. Written informed consent was obtained from all the participants who agreed to participate in the study. Confidentiality of participants was assured by offering a code number for each participant at the point of data collection and analysis. Participation was completely voluntary, and participants had the right to withdraw from the study at any time. No physical or psychological harm affected the participants because the data collection relied on noninvasive questionnaire.

2.6. Data analysis

Descriptive, inferential, and multivariate statistical methods were used to analyze the data. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the sample characteristics. Confirmatory factor analysis was used to test data fitting to the scale factors. At baseline, Chi-square, Fisher’s exact test, and ANOVA were used to examine the differences between the selected treatment modalities and the study measures. Changes between the groups’ baseline and follow-up time’s outcome measures were analyzed using McNemar’s test,
Wilcoxon, and repeated ANOVA. No data were missed as the researcher reviews each question after patients filled the form and encourages them to fill it without keeping any missing data.

3. Results

At baseline time point (i.e., during hospitalization), 263 patients were assessed for eligibility. However, 36 patients were not eligible (i.e., 29 were not first-time AMI and 7 were not medically stable to be part of the study) and 21 refused to participate in the study. As a result, 206 patients participated in the baseline data point. Six months later, 186 patients completed the questionnaire at the baseline, and 186 completed the study at follow-up. Two-hundred and six participants completed the follow-up data). Two-hundred and six participants completed the follow-up at the baseline, and 186 completed the study at follow-up.

More than two-thirds of the participants were aged between 51 and 80 years old (n = 131, 70%). A total of 79% of the samples were male (n = 147), and 84% of the sample were married. Approximately half of the samples were employed and have a bachelor's degree or higher. Differences were examined between the three selected treatment modalities using Chi-square and Fisher exact test; results show no significant difference in personal demographic details, as shown in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 2 shows the examined differences between the three selected treatment modalities using Chi-square and Fisher exact test; results show significant differences in all of the clinical demographic details except the previous history of illness. Patients treated with thrombolytic therapy (THROMB) had higher rate of PCI in comparison with NSTEMI patients. In addition, results show significant differences in hospital length of stay (i.e., THROMB had higher length of stay (1) = 35.50, P = 0.001; PPCI patients had shorter length of stay and stayed for 48 h or less as in comparison with THROMB patients and NSTEMI patients.

One-way ANOVA was performed to examine the differences in IP based on treatment modality. The results indicated that no significant difference exists across the treatment modalities in IP at baseline, as shown in Table 3. To examine the differences in change between the three treatment modalities, a repeated measure of ANOVA was performed. The results indicated that significant changes exist between the baseline and follow-up times in four of seven IP factors, i.e., timeline acute/chronic, personal control, treatment control, illness coherence.

Significant difference exist in timeline acute/chronic based on patients treatment modalities (F = 3.43, P = 0.034). Post hoc test showed that PPCI patients had significant higher perception of acuteness of their illness in comparison with both THROMB and NSTEMI patients. No significant difference exists between THROMB and NSTEMI groups. In addition, significant difference is observed in mean scores of personal control (F = 8.43, P = 0.032). Post hoc test showed that PPCI patients had significant lower mean score for perception of personal control over their illness in comparison with THROMB patients. No significant difference is observed between PPCI and NSTEMI and between THROMB and NSTEMI groups.

Perception of treatment control significantly differed based on patient's group (F = 3.75, P = 0.025). Post hoc test showed that PPCI patients had significant higher perception of treatment control over their illness in comparison with both THROMB and NSTEMI groups. No significant difference was observed between THROMB and NSTEMI groups. Moreover, perception of illness coherence significantly differed based on patient's group (F = 4.90, P = 0.022). Post hoc test showed that PPCI patients had significant higher mean score for perception of illness coherence in comparison with NSTEMI group. No significant difference is observed between PPCI and THROMB and between THROMB and NSTEMI.

In the differences across the treatment modalities for behavioral measures in the baseline time, Chi-square results indicated no significant difference based on treatment modalities, as shown in Tables 4 and 5. In addition, the changes between the baseline and follow-up time in terms of SPO, McNemar's test, and Wilcoxon test were used and results show no significant change in BMI and LDL. However, significant changes exist between the baseline and follow-up times in cholesterol (i.e., THROMB group had significant higher control of cholesterol), BP (i.e., PPCI had significant lower control of BP), activity level (i.e., THROMB had significant higher activity level), and smoking (i.e., each group showed lower smoking).

4. Discussion

This study aimed to examine the differences in IP and associated behavioral outcomes among patients with AMI receiving different treatment modalities. The current study showed that PPCI group perceived their illness as acute rather than chronic 6 months after hospitalization in comparison with other treatment modalities. Previous study showed that the patients' perception of their illness

Table 1

| Categories                        | Total No. (%) | PPCI No. (%) | THROMB No. (%) | NSTEMI No. (%) | χ²     | P     |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|--------|-------|
| **Age**                           |               |              |                |               |        |       |
| 18–30                             | 2 (1.1)       | 1 (1.5)      | 0              | 1 (1.7)       | 1.90   | 0.06  |
| 31–40                             | 10 (5.4)      | 2 (3.1)      | 7 (10.8)       | 1 (1.7)       |        |       |
| 41–50                             | 36 (19.4)     | 13 (21.0)    | 16 (25.8)      | 7 (11.9)      |        |       |
| 51–80                             | 131 (70.4)    | 45 (69.2)    | 38 (61.3)      | 48 (81.4)     |        |       |
| 81–100                            | 7 (3.8)       | 4 (6.2)      | 1 (1.6)        | 2 (3.4)       |        |       |
| **Gender**                        |               |              |                |               |        |       |
| Female                            | 39 (21.0)     | 16 (24.6)    | 11 (17.7)      | 12 (20.3)     | 0.51   | 0.63  |
| Male                              | 147 (79.0)    | 49 (75.4)    | 51 (82.3)      | 47 (79.7)     |        |       |
| **Marital status**                |               |              |                |               |        |       |
| Single                            | 21 (11.3)     | 9 (13.8)     | 3 (4.8)        | 9 (13.9)      | 1.20   | 0.08  |
| Married                           | 158 (84.8)    | 51 (78.5)    | 59 (95.2)      | 48 (81.4)     |        |       |
| Divorced or widowed               | 7 (3.8)       | 5 (7.7)      | 0              | 2 (3.4)       |        |       |
| **Education level**               |               |              |                |               |        |       |
| Secondary school or lower level   | 90 (48.4)     | 30 (45.9)    | 31 (50.0)      | 29 (49.2)     | 0.73   | 0.93  |
| Or higher                         | 96 (51.6)     | 35 (53.9)    | 31 (50.0)      | 30 (50.8)     |        |       |
| **Employment**                    |               |              |                |               |        |       |
| Working                           | 90 (48.4)     | 26 (40.0)    | 36 (58.1)      | 28 (47.5)     | 0.92   | 0.12  |
| Not working                       | 96 (51.6)     | 39 (60.0)    | 26 (42.0)      | 31 (52.5)     |        |       |
Indeed, these studies measure control as one factor rather than two distinct factors: personal and treatment control, which were measured in the current study that may affect the generalizability of their results. Lower perception of personal control and higher treatment control over PPCI group may limit their behavioral changes, as shown in the current study.

Patients who had PPCI in the current study were found to have higher perception of illness coherence; this refers to their perception of understanding their illness 6 months after hospitalization. An earlier study found that patients with AMI who had a good understanding of their illness were more likely to change their health-related behavior [12]. Such perception of chronicity of illness may limit behavioral changes shown in this study as blood lipids and physical activity.

Moreover, result indicates that PPCI group had lower personal control and higher treatment control over their illness in comparison with the THROMB and NSTEMI groups. Previous studies showed inconsistent findings with regard to the effect of perception of control over the illness has an effect on patients' behavioral changes. A greater perception of higher control over the illness among patients with AMI has led them to be highly motivated to change their behavior [12]. However, another study reported that patients who felt that they had a high degree of control over their illness were less likely to show motivation for behavioral changes [12]. Indeed, these studies measure control as one factor rather than two distinct factors: personal and treatment control, which were measured in the current study that may affect the generalizability of their results. Lower perception of personal control and higher treatment control over PPCI group may limit their behavioral changes, as shown in the current study.

| Categories            | Total No. | PPCI | THROMB | NSTEMI | χ² | P  |
|-----------------------|-----------|------|--------|--------|----|----|
| Coronary angiography result |           |      |        |        |    |    |
| PPCI                  | 65        | 65   | 0      | 0      | 3.21 | 0.001 |
| PCI                   | 85        | 0    | 48     | 37     |     |    |
| Treated by medications only | 31       | 0    | 11     | 20     |     |    |
| PTCA                  | 3         | 0    | 2      | 1      |     |    |
| Normal Coronary       | 1         | 0    | 1      | 0      |     |    |
| No Angiography done   | 1         | 0    | 0      | 1      |     |    |
| Length of Stay        |           |      |        |        | 3.55 | 0.001 |
| 48 h or less          | 12        | 12   | 0      | 0      |     |    |
| 49−72 h               | 64        | 41   | 8      | 15     |     |    |
| 73−96 h               | 89        | 11   | 43     | 35     |     |    |
| 97 h or more          | 21        | 1    | 11     | 9      |     |    |
| History of illness    |           |      |        |        | 1.11 | 0.220 |
| No history            | 55        | 15   | 23     | 17     |     |    |
| History of illness    | 131       | 50   | 39     | 42     |     |    |

### Table 2

**Patients’ clinical demographics and P value to examine the significant difference between the three selected treatment modalities.**

| IPQ-R factors (Illness perception) | Overall | PPCI | THROMB | NSTEMI | ANOVA (Baseline) | Repeated ANOVA |
|------------------------------------|---------|------|--------|--------|-----------------|----------------|
| Timeline Acute/chronic            |         |      |        |        |                 |                |
| Baseline                          | 3.0 ± 0.9 | 3.0 ± 0.8 | 3.0 ± 0.8 | 3.1 ± 0.9 | 0.68 | 0.957 | 3.43 | 0.034 |
| Follow-up                         | 3.1 ± 0.8 | 2.7 ± 1.0 | 3.4 ± 0.9 | 3.3 ± 0.8 |     |     | 0.98 | 0.150 |
| Timeline cyclical                 |         |      |        |        |                 |                |
| Baseline                          | 2.8 ± 0.9 | 2.7 ± 1.0 | 2.7 ± 0.9 | 2.9 ± 0.8 | 0.91 | 0.370 | 1.12 | 0.084 |
| Follow-up                         | 2.5 ± 1.1 | 2.2 ± 1.1 | 2.7 ± 0.9 | 2.7 ± 0.9 |     |     | 0.88 | 0.588 |
| Consequences                      |         |      |        |        |                 |                |
| Baseline                          | 3.3 ± 0.9 | 3.2 ± 0.9 | 3.2 ± 1.1 | 3.4 ± 1.0 | 0.98 | 0.557 | 8.43 | 0.032 |
| Follow-up                         | 3.1 ± 0.8 | 2.8 ± 0.8 | 3.6 ± 1.0 | 3.2 ± 0.8 |     |     | 0.98 | 0.150 |
| Personal control                  |         |      |        |        |                 |                |
| Baseline                          | 3.0 ± 0.9 | 3.1 ± 1.0 | 3.0 ± 0.9 | 3.0 ± 1.0 | 0.98 | 0.557 | 8.43 | 0.032 |
| Follow-up                         | 3.0 ± 1.0 | 2.6 ± 0.8 | 3.2 ± 1.1 | 3.1 ± 0.9 |     |     | 0.98 | 0.557 |
| Treatment control                 |         |      |        |        |                 |                |
| Baseline                          | 3.7 ± 0.8 | 3.7 ± 0.9 | 3.7 ± 1.0 | 3.7 ± 1.1 | 0.81 | 0.863 | 3.75 | 0.025 |
| Follow-up                         | 4.0 ± 1.1 | 4.3 ± 0.9 | 3.8 ± 0.9 | 3.8 ± 0.8 |     |     | 0.98 | 0.339 |
| Illness coherence                 |         |      |        |        |                 |                |
| Baseline                          | 4.1 ± 0.9 | 4.0 ± 0.8 | 4.2 ± 0.8 | 4.2 ± 0.9 | 0.98 | 0.339 | 4.90 | 0.022 |
| Follow-up                         | 4.2 ± 1.0 | 4.3 ± 1.1 | 4.2 ± 0.9 | 4.0 ± 1.0 |     |     | 0.98 | 0.339 |
| Emotional representation         |         |      |        |        |                 |                |
| Baseline                          | 2.6 ± 0.9 | 2.5 ± 1.0 | 2.5 ± 0.8 | 2.6 ± 1.1 | 0.63 | 0.808 | 1.34 | 0.074 |
| Follow-up                         | 2.2 ± 0.8 | 2.0 ± 0.9 | 2.4 ± 0.8 | 2.3 ± 0.9 |     |     | 0.63 | 0.808 |

Patients who had PPCI in the current study were found to have higher perception of illness coherence; this refers to their perception of understanding their illness 6 months after hospitalization. An earlier study found that patients with AMI who had a good understanding of their illness were more likely to change their health-related behavior [12]. Such perception of chronicity of illness may limit behavioral changes shown in this study as blood lipids and physical activity.

Moreover, result indicates that PPCI group had lower personal control and higher treatment control over their illness in comparison with the THROMB and NSTEMI groups. Previous studies showed inconsistent findings with regard to the effect of perception of control over the illness has an effect on patients' behavioral changes. A greater perception of higher control over the illness among patients with AMI has led them to be highly motivated to change their behavior [12]. However, another study reported that patients who felt that they had a high degree of control over their illness were less likely to show motivation for behavioral changes [12]. Indeed, these studies measure control as one factor rather than two distinct factors: personal and treatment control, which were measured in the current study that may affect the generalizability of their results. Lower perception of personal control and higher treatment control over PPCI group may limit their behavioral changes, as shown in the current study.
The outcomes of behavioral changes between the baseline and follow-up time among the patients with AMI were limited except for smoking status. Previous studies on secondary prevention among AMI patients, though limited, were consistent with this result. A previous study conducted in Jordan found that 29.7% of patients with CAD stopped smoking after the illness, and the main motivator was physicians’ advice [22]. Previous studies have shown the effectiveness of cardiac rehabilitation programs (CRP) in increasing behavioral changes after cardiac events and in improving patients’ outcomes [23]. Unfortunately, Jordan lacks CRP, and this might limit the behavioral changes of patients with AMI in the current study.

The clinical demographic details showed some differences between the three treatment modalities. Previous studies show that patients who had PPCI had a shorter length of hospital stay [13]. The PPCI group’s hospital stay is short, which may limit the ability of patients who had PPCI to recall the information given by health care team during hospitalization [24]. This may increase the importance of follow-up visits with these patients to ensure that they understand the information that is given to them and to ensure the appropriate understanding of the nature of their illness and behavioral changes.

Table 4
Outcomes of secondary prevention in baseline and follow-up time (n).

| Factors     | Total No. | PPCI | THROMB | NSTEMI | Baseline | Mcnemar’s test |
|-------------|-----------|------|--------|--------|----------|----------------|
| BMI         |           |      |        |        |          |                |
| Controlled  | Baseline  | 63   | 19     | 24     | 20       | 0.86 0.474 1.34 0.219 |
|            | Follow-up | 67   | 20     | 27     | 20       |                 |
| Not controlled | Baseline | 114  | 44     | 35     | 35       |                 |
|            | Follow-up | 110  | 43     | 32     | 35       |                 |
| LDL         |           |      |        |        |          |                |
| Controlled  | Baseline  | 47   | 12     | 19     | 16       | 1.23 0.087 1.45 0.064 |
|            | Follow-up | 56   | 15     | 24     | 17       |                 |
| Not controlled | Baseline | 83   | 36     | 21     | 26       |                 |
|            | Follow-up | 74   | 33     | 16     | 25       |                 |
| Cholesterol |           |      |        |        |          |                |
| Controlled  | Baseline  | 39   | 11     | 16     | 12       | 0.76 0.249 2.45 0.02 |
|            | Follow-up | 58   | 17     | 24     | 17       |                 |
| Not controlled | Baseline | 96   | 38     | 26     | 32       |                 |
|            | Follow-up | 77   | 32     | 18     | 27       |                 |
| BP          |           |      |        |        |          |                |
| Controlled  | Baseline  | 146  | 55     | 48     | 43       | 0.78 0.368 3.56 0.013 |
|            | Follow-up | 145  | 45     | 53     | 47       |                 |
| Not controlled | Baseline | 29   | 7      | 11     | 11       |                 |
|            | Follow-up | 30   | 17     | 6      | 7        |                 |
| Smoking     |           |      |        |        |          |                |
| Non smoker  | Baseline  | 77   | 27     | 23     | 27       | 0.77 0.626 3.46 0.001 |
|            | Follow-up | 109  | 36     | 38     | 35       |                 |
| Smoker      | Baseline  | 109  | 38     | 39     | 32       |                 |
|            | Follow-up | 77   | 29     | 24     | 24       |                 |

Table 5
Physical activity results for both baseline and follow-up time.

| Activity Level Categories | Total No. | Baseline |         |         |          | Follow-up |         |         |          |
|--------------------------|-----------|----------|---------|---------|----------|-----------|---------|---------|----------|
|                          |           | PPCI     | THROMB  | NSTEMI  |          | PPCI      | THROMB  | NSTEMI  |          |
| Low                      | 138       | 46       | 49      | 43      | 43       | 124       | 50      | 33      | 41       |
| Moderate                 | 40        | 18       | 9       | 13      | 13       | 49        | 14      | 22      | 13       |
| High                     | 8         | 1        | 4       | 3       | 13       | 13        | 1       | 7       | 5        |

Note: Chi-square for baseline, \( P = 0.45 \); Wilcoxon test for the change, \( P = 0.001 \).

The findings of this study should be received cautiously, given that it has a number of limitations. First, the study was conducted in Jordan where formal CRP is not found; other countries where patients with AMI have access to CRP might have greater understanding of the nature of their illness and the ways to change their behavior. Second, a longer follow-up time might have revealed further changes in patients’ IP and behavior. A previous study showed that patients with AMI had increased their coping and experience of illness over time [25]. Third, the convenient sample and the study being conducted in one cardiac center will limit the generalizability of the study findings among Jordanian population.

5. Implication for practice

Previous studies have shown the importance of CRP after AMI [23]. Patients with AMI in Jordan do not have access to CRP. Cardiac rehabilitation has increased patients’ knowledge about the nature of their illness and increase their motivation for behavioral changes [21]. The study findings showed the importance of assessing patients’ understanding or IP after AMI, particularly patients treated with PPCI to insure appropriate understanding of their illness and to increase their...
motivation for behavioral changes http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352013216301879 [18,26]. Health care providers, such as nurses, play an important role in assessing patients’ IP, initially during hospitalization and later at the follow-up outpatient clinic.

6. Conclusion and recommendations

The results of this study revealed that patients treated with PPCI had negative IP, such as perception of acuteness of their illness, lower personal control, and limited behavioral changes 6 months after hospitalization in comparison with other treatment modalities. These differences showed in the current study, particularly among the PPCI group, should be taken in consideration, as it may impact on their behavioral changes. Educators, including nurses, have a significant role in assessing and educating PPCI to ensure appropriate understanding of their illness. Further research is recommended to explore the differences in IP and behavioral changes among different AMI groups with longer follow-up. A larger, heterogeneous randomized selected sample of patients with AMI can be used in future studies to improve generalizability of the study findings among Jordanian population. Furthermore, the authors of this study highly recommend further qualitative study that aims to explore IPs and the associated SPO among patients diagnosed with MI.
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