

Consultation and communication with complementary medicine practitioners by those with chronic health conditions: An analysis of population- and practice-based datasets

by Hope Maree Foley

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy (Public Health)

under the supervision of Distinguished Professor Jon Adams and Doctor Amie Steel

University of Technology Sydney
Faculty of Health
Australian Research Centre in Complementary and
Integrative Medicine

July 2021

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP

I, Hope Maree Foley, declare that this thesis, is submitted in fulfilment of the

requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy (Public Health), in the Faculty of

Health at the University of Technology Sydney.

This thesis is wholly my own work unless otherwise referenced or acknowledged. In

addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the

thesis.

This document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic

institution.

This research is supported by the Australian Government Research Training Program.

Signature:

Production Note:

Signature removed prior to publication.

Date: 30th November 2020

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I acknowledge and thank all those who guided, supported or encouraged me throughout my candidature. First and foremost, my deepest gratitude to my supervisors, Distinguished Professor Jon Adams and Doctor Amie Steel, whose insight, expertise, faith and formidable wisdom have provided the shelter of my intellectual home during my PhD process. My confidence in the quality of my present and future work is due to the exceptional mentoring provided by my supervisors, which was truly person-centred – they gave me tools to grow professionally as a researcher while also nurturing and empowering the person I am in this world. It has truly been a blessing to have my process held by these incredible individuals.

I am thankful to all the other researchers I have worked with and learnt from on this journey. The ARCCIM team especially have been welcoming, helpful and kind. Their contributions to my learning have been deeply appreciated. I feel lucky to have had the opportunity to collaborate with such an impressive and inspiring group of people. Special thanks to Doctor Erica McIntyre, for her practical help and pragmatic wisdom.

I extend my sincerest gratitude to those who gave time to this project as participants and recruiting practitioners. Your patience and contributions have been invaluable.

My love and thanks to my family, for caring and for making sure we always get through together, whether in one piece or not. Thanks to my Dad, who showed me what courage looks like in the face of worldy death; what is remembered, lives.

My warmest, fullest, heartiest thanks to Liz Woods for feeding me and making sure I laugh. To the whole Growing Forward team, to the Social Space, and to Margie Pestorius for holding onto me. The concept of gratitude fails to express the thanks I offer to my community. Thank-you to my Kurilpa crew for being staunchly real, for loving this planet, and for shining unrelenting light upon our power.

Finally, thank-you to my Ancestors, for weaving me into being and never leaving me alone. And thank-you to Yuggera country, for holding me and giving me breath.

FORMAT OF THIS THESIS

This thesis is structured in the format of Thesis by Compilation. It presents a single, cohesive body of work comprising a combination of traditional thesis chapters and published/publishable articles. In keeping with the format of Thesis by Compilation, content from articles resulting from the project which have been published or submitted for publication have been embedded within the relevant chapters of this thesis unabridged. Where this applies, a chapter preamble and relevant notes are included to indicate publication details. For published articles, journal-formatted copies of each work are included in the Appendices. A list of these articles and details on authorship contributions are provided below.

PUBLISHED WORKS INCLUDED IN THIS THESIS

Of the five manuscripts incorporated into this thesis, four have been published or accepted for publication (in press) and one is under review. The manuscripts are as follows:

- Chapter 2.3. Foley H, Steel A, Cramer, H, Wardle J & Adams J. Disclosure of complementary medicine use to medical providers: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Scientific Reports. 2019. 9:1
- Chapter 4. Foley H, Steel A, McIntyre E, Harnett J, Sibbritt D, Wardle J & Adams
 J. Complementary medicine practitioner consultations amongst 1,314 individuals
 with chronic conditions: Characteristics of users, reasons for and predictors of
 use. Complementary Therapies in Clinical Practice. 2020. 40:101194
- Chapter 5. Foley H, Steel A & Adams J. Consultation with complementary medicine practitioners by individuals with chronic conditions: Characteristics and reasons for consultation in Australian clinical settings. Health and Social Care in the Community. 2020. In press.
- 4. **Chapter 6.** Foley H, Steel A & Adams J. Perceptions of person-centred care amongst individuals with chronic conditions who consult complementary medicine practitioners. Complementary Therapies in Medicine. 2020. 52:102518
- Chapter 7. Foley H, Steel A, McIntyre, E, Harnett, J, Sibbritt, D & Adams J.
 Disclosure of conventional and complementary medicine use to medical doctors and complementary medicine practitioners: A survey of rates and reasons amongst those with chronic conditions. BMJ Open. (Under review). Submitted 18th May 2021.

STATEMENT OF CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUTHORS TO CO-AUTHORED WORKS **INCLUDED IN THIS THESIS**

As the author of this thesis and candidate for award, I have been the primary author of each article included within this thesis. For each of these articles, I have been principally responsible for determining the research question, performing analysis, drafting the full manuscript, overseeing the submission process and responding to peer-review. Support in all of these areas was provided by my supervisors, Distinguished Professor Jon Adams and Doctor Amie Steel.

During development of the published review article in Chapter 2.3, guidance in the conduct and interpretation of meta-analysis was provided by Associate Professor Holger Cramer, and additional support in interpretation of findings was provided by Professor Jon Wardle. All authors contributed to editing of the finalised manuscript.

Regarding articles published from this project's Phase One data (Chapters 4 and 7), additional support in the planning and interpretation of data analysis was provided by Doctor Erica McIntyre and Professor David Sibbritt. All co-authors for these two works contributed to the design and conduct of the broader project from which Phase One data was drawn, as well as final editing of the associated manuscripts.

Signed:

Thesis author and PhD candidate **Supervisors** Prof Jon Adams Dr Amie Steel Hope Foley Production Note: Production Note: **Production Note:** Signature removed prior to Signature removed prior to Signature removed prior to publication. publication. publication.

Production Note:

publication.

Signature removed prior to

| Co-authors Adj. Assoc. Prof Holger Cramer | Prof Jon Wardle | Dr Erica McIntyre |
|---|---|--|
| Production Note: Signature removed prior to publication. Dr Joanna Harnett | Production Note: Signature removed prior to publication. Prof David Sibbritt | Production Note: Signature removed prior to publication. |

Production Note:

Page intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Certificate of original authorship | ii |
|--|-----|
| Acknowledgements | i |
| Format of this thesis | ii |
| Published works included in this thesis | ii |
| Statement of contributions of authors to co-authored works included in this thesis | iii |
| Figures and tables | xi |
| Abstract | xv |
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 Background | 1 |
| 1.2 Significance and scope of thesis | 1 |
| 1.2.1 Research aim | 2 |
| 1.2.2 Research questions | 2 |
| 1.2.3 Research objectives | 2 |
| 1.2.4 Thesis structure | 3 |
| 1.3 Chronic conditions and contemporary health care provision | 4 |
| 1.3.1 The nature and burden of chronic conditions | 4 |
| 1.3.2 Contemporary provision of health services for management of chronic conditions | 5 |
| 1.4 The significance of complementary medicine as a health service resource | 7 |
| 1.4.1 Defining complementary medicine | 7 |
| 1.4.2 Complementary medicine in Australia | 8 |
| 1.4.3 Complementary medicine clinical practice in Australia | 9 |
| 1.4.4 Complementary medicine in the chronic illness care landscape | 10 |
| 1.5 The role of consultation and communication in chronic illness care | 12 |
| 1.5.1 The paradigm of person-centred care | 13 |
| 1.5.2 Person-centred care for individuals with chronic conditions | 14 |
| 1.5.3 Person-centred care in complementary medicine clinical practice | 15 |

| 1.6 | 6 Chapter summary | 16 |
|-----|--|--------------------------|
| 2. | LITERATURE REVIEW | 17 |
| 2.1 | 1 CM use and utilisation of CM practitioner services by individuals with chro | nic conditions18 |
| | 2.1.1 Prevalence of CM use amongst those with chronic conditions | 18 |
| | 2.1.2 Characteristics of CM users with chronic conditions | 20 |
| | 2.1.3 Type of CM used for Chronic Conditions | 21 |
| | 2.1.4 Motivations for using CM | 22 |
| | 2.1.5 Missing pieces: gaps in the literature | 24 |
| | 2.1.6 Conclusion | 24 |
| 2.2 | 2 Patient experiences of person-centred care during consultation for individu | uals with chronic health |
| COI | onditions: A meta-ethnography | 25 |
| | 2.2.1 Meta-ethnographic approach | 26 |
| | 2.2.2 Methods of search and synthesis | 27 |
| | 2.2.3 Findings | 34 |
| | 2.2.4 Discussion | 53 |
| | 2.2.5 Conclusion | 57 |
| 2.3 | 3 Disclosure of complementary medicine use to medical providers: a systematic | atic review and meta- |
| an | nalysis | 58 |
| | 2.3.1 Publication of review | 58 |
| | 2.3.2 Introduction | 59 |
| | 2.3.3 Methods | 60 |
| | 2.3.4 Results | 64 |
| | 2.3.5 Discussion | 79 |
| | 2.3.6 Conclusion | 82 |
| 2.5 | 5 Chapter summary | 83 |
| 3. | . METHODOLOGY | 84 |
| 3.1 | 1 Chapter introduction | 84 |
| | 3.1.1 Phase One overview | 84 |
| | 3.1.2 Phase Two overview | 84 |
| | 3 1 3 Survey research design | 86 |

| 3.2 Phase One: The Complementary and Alternative Medicine Use, H | ealth Literacy and Disclosure |
|---|-------------------------------|
| (CAMUHLD) survey | 86 |
| 3.2.1 CAMUHLD sample and Phase One chronic conditions sub-set | 87 |
| 3.2.2 CAMUHLD instrument | 87 |
| 3.2.3 CAMUHLD data handling and analysis | 96 |
| 3.3 Phase Two: Patient Experiences of the Complementary Medicine | Consultation (PECMC) survey98 |
| 3.3.1 PECMC setting and sampling | 99 |
| 3.3.2 PECMC instrument | 102 |
| 3.3.3 PECMC data handling and analysis | 109 |
| 3.4 Ethical considerations | 110 |
| 3.5 Chapter summary | 111 |
| 4. INDIVIDUALS WITH CHRONIC CONDITIONS WHO CONS | SULT CM PRACTITIONERS: |
| RESULTS FROM A NATIONAL POPULATION-BASED SURVEY. | 112 |
| 4.1 Rationale for this analysis | 112 |
| 4.2 Publication of results | 112 |
| 4.3 Complementary medicine practitioner consultations amongst 1,3 | 14 individuals with chronic |
| conditions: Characteristics of users, reasons for and predictors of use | 113 |
| 4.3.1 Introduction | 113 |
| 4.3.2 Materials and methods | 114 |
| 4.3.3 Results | 117 |
| 4.3.4. Discussion | 126 |
| 4.3.5. Conclusion | 128 |
| 4.4 Chapter summary | 129 |
| 5. INDIVIDUALS WITH CHRONIC CONDITIONS WHO CONS | ULT CM PRACTITIONERS: |
| RESULTS FROM THREE NATIONAL PRACTICE-BASED RESEAR | CH NETWORKS130 |
| 5.1 Rationale for this analysis | 130 |
| 5.2 Publication of results | 121 |

| 5.3 Consultation with complementary medicine practitioners by individuals with c | hronic conditions: |
|---|--------------------|
| Characteristics and reasons for consultation in Australian clinical settings | 131 |
| 5.3.1 Introduction | 131 |
| 5.3.2 Methods | 133 |
| 5.3.3 Results | 135 |
| 5.3.4 Discussion | 146 |
| 5.3.5 Conclusion and implications | 149 |
| 5.4 Chapter summary | 150 |
| 6. PATIENT EXPERIENCES OF PERSON-CENTRED CARE | 151 |
| 6.1 Rationale for this analysis | 151 |
| 6.2 Publication of results | 152 |
| 6.3 Perceptions of person-centred care amongst individuals with chronic condition | ns who consult |
| complementary medicine practitioners | 152 |
| 6.3.1 Introduction | 152 |
| 6.3.2 Methods | 153 |
| 6.3.3 Results | 156 |
| 6.3.4 Discussion | 171 |
| 6.3.5 Conclusion | 173 |
| 6.4 Chapter summary | 174 |
| 7. PATIENT-PROVIDER COMMUNICATION BEHAVIOURS REGARDING | TREATMENTS |
| USED: RESULTS FROM A NATIONAL POPULATION-BASED SURVEY | 175 |
| 7.1 Rationale for this analysis | 175 |
| 7.2 Publication of results | 176 |
| 7.3 Disclosure of conventional and complementary medicine use to medical docto | rs and |
| complementary medicine practitioners: A survey of rates and reasons amongst th | ose with chronic |
| conditions | 176 |
| 7.3.1 Introduction | 177 |
| 7.3.2 Materials and methods | 178 |
| 7.3.3 Results | 181 |
| 7 3 4 Discussion | 195 |

| 7.3.5 Conclusion | 198 |
|---|------------------------|
| 7.4 Chapter summary | 198 |
| 8. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERSON-CENTRED CARE AND PAT | IENT DISCLOSURE |
| BEHAVIOURS | 200 |
| 8.1 Rationale for this analysis | 200 |
| 8.2 Notes on analyses | 201 |
| 8.2.1 Participants and setting | 201 |
| 8.2.2 Variables and statistical methods | 201 |
| 8.3 Results | 202 |
| 8.3.1 Participant characteristics | 202 |
| 8.3.2 Rates of disclosure of conventional medicine use to CM practitioners | 204 |
| 8.3.3 Rates of disclosure of CM use to medical doctors | 204 |
| 8.3.4 Reasons for non-disclosure and disclosure of conventional medicine use t | o a CM practitioner206 |
| 8.3.5 Reasons for non-disclosure and disclosure of CM use to a medical doctor | 208 |
| 8.3.6 Relationship between disclosure rates and perceived person-centredness | |
| 8.4 Chapter summary | |
| 9. DISCUSSION | 213 |
| 9.1 CM practitioners provide PCC tailored to chronic illness needs | 213 |
| 9.2 CM practitioner services offer wholeness to chronic condition management | by providing |
| complementary care | 216 |
| 9.3 PCC predicts patient communication regarding disclosure of treatment use t | o care providers217 |
| 9.4 Coordination and Integration of CM practitioner services responds to public | health policy219 |
| 9.5 Summary of significance to stakeholders | 221 |
| 9.5.1 Patients | 221 |
| 9.5.2 Care providers | 221 |
| 9.5.3 Policymakers and health systems | 222 |
| 9.6 Limitations | 223 |

| 9.7 Fu | uture directions in research | 225 |
|--------|---|--------|
| 9.7 | 7.1 PCC in CM for quality of life outcomes | 225 |
| 9.7 | 7.2 Patient education and preventive care in CM clinical practice | 226 |
| 9.7 | 7.3 PCC in CM for clinical and health outcomes | 226 |
| 9.7 | 7.4 Integrative health care research | 226 |
| 9.7 | 7.5 Influence of gender dynamics on patient-practitioner communication and patient experie | nce of |
| PC | CC | 227 |
| 10. | CONCLUSION | 228 |
| 11. | APPENDICES | 230 |
| Appe | endix 2.1 Published manuscript associated with review reported in Chapter 2, section 2.3 | 230 |
| | endix 3.1 The complementary and alternative medicine use, health literacy and disclosure | 247 |
| (CAIVI | nonLD) project survey | 247 |
| Appe | endix 3.2 Phase Two survey: Patient experiences of the Complementary Medicine Consultat | ion |
| (PECN | MC) | 264 |
| | endix 3.3 Phase Two practitioner invitation, information sheet, expression of interest and co | |
| | endix 3.4 Phase Two PECMC survey patient information sheet | |
| Appe | endix 3.5 Practitioner recruitment guide and script | 288 |
| Appe | endix 3.6 Phase One UTS HREC ethics approval | 291 |
| Appe | endix 3.7 Phase One ECNH HREC ethics approval | 292 |
| Appe | endix 3.8 Phase One CSU HREC ethics approval | 293 |
| Appe | endix 3.9 Phase Two UTS HREC ethics approval | 294 |
| Appe | endix 4. Published manuscript associated with results reported in Chapter 4 | 296 |
| Appe | endix 5. Published manuscript associated with results reported in Chapter 5 | 305 |
| Appe | endix 6.1 Published manuscript associated with results reported in Chapter 6 | 318 |
| Appe | endix 6.2 Supplementary tables associated with publication reporting results from Chapter | 5 330 |

| FIGURES AND TABLES | |
|---|---------|
| Figure 2.1 Intersecting topic areas for literature review | 17 |
| Figure 2.2 The process for conducting meta-ethnography | 26 |
| Figure 2.3 The translation and synthesis process | 31 |
| Figure 2.4 The study selection process | 35 |
| Figure 2.5 Literature search and study selection flow chart: Prisma flowchart out | tlining |
| process of literature search and selection of articles for review | 68 |
| Figure 2.6 Meta-analysis results: disclosure rates for biologically-based compler | nentary |
| medicine. Results of meta-analysis assessing rates of disclosure of biologically- | based |
| complementary medicine use to medical providers | 76 |
| Figure 3.1 Sequential outline of project phases | 85 |
| Figure 3.2 Items relating to socio-demographics in the CAMUHLD survey | 89 |
| Figure 3.3 Health status item identifying chronic condition diagnoses in the CAM | MUHLD |
| survey | 90 |
| Figure 3.4 Health status items for the SF-20 in the CAMUHLD survey | 91 |
| Figure 3.5 Health service utilisation items and response options for the CAMUH | łLD |
| survey, detailing health care professions consulted, and reasons for consultation | n92 |
| Figure 3.6 Health communication items and response options for the CAMUHLE |) |
| survey, detailing Complementary Medicine Disclosure Index (CMDI) | 94 |
| Figure 3.7 Health communication items and response options for the CAMUHLE |) |
| survey, detailing Conventional Medicine Disclosure Index (CONMED-DI) | 95 |
| Figure 3.8 Items relating to socio-demographics in the PECMC survey | 104 |
| Figure 3.9. Health status item identifying chronic condition diagnoses in the PE | CMC |
| survey | 104 |
| Figure 3.10 Clinical care-seeking items in the PECMC survey | 105 |
| Figure 3.11 Interdependent measures of patient experiences of care | 107 |
| Figure 3.12 Patient Assessment of Chronic Illness Care (PACIC) Measure | 108 |
| Table 2.1 Associations between chronic condition diagnosis and CM profession | s most |
| commonly consulted | 22 |
| Table 2.2 Search strategy for literature review of meta-ethnography | 28 |
| Table 2.3 Characteristics of studies included in synthesis | 37 |

12.

| naturopathy) and conventional medicine providers consulted by the same respo | |
|---|-------|
| total sample (any CM practitioner), whole-system CM professions (acupuncture, | |
| Table 6.4 Patient Assessment of Chronic Illness Care (PACIC) Measure results | |
| consulted by the same respondents | |
| (chiropractic, massage therapy, osteopathy) and conventional medicine provide | |
| support scale, and Empowerment scale results for manual therapy professions | |
| Table 6.3 Interdependent measures. Patient-centred care scale, Perceived prov | vider |
| providers consulted by the same respondents. | |
| whole-system CM professions (acupuncture, naturopathy) and conventional me | |
| support scale, and Empowerment scale results for total sample (any CM practiti | , |
| Table 6.2 Interdependent measures. Patient-centred care scale, Perceived pro- | |
| consulted | |
| Table 6.1 Socio-demographics of respondents with chronic conditions, by profes | |
| Table 5.4 Reasons for consultation | |
| Table 5.3 Service utilisation frequency and chronic condition diagnoses | |
| consulted | |
| Table 5.2 Socio-demographics of respondents with chronic conditions, by profes | |
| Table 5.1 Socio-demographics of full sample | |
| Results of Reverse Stepwise Logistic Regression | |
| Table 4.5 Predictors of Consulting with Complementary Medicine (CM) Practitio | |
| Table 4.4 Health Professions Consulted and Reasons for Consultation | |
| Consult with CM Practitioners | |
| Table 4.3 Health Status and Personal Wellbeing of Participants who did and did | |
| Table 4.2 Socio-demographics of Participants with Chronic Conditions | |
| Analysis | |
| Table 4.1 Chronic Conditions Presented in Survey and Categorisation of Condit | |
| Table 3.1 Categorisation of Chronic Conditions into Collapsed Variables for Ana | • |
| Table 2.10 Reasons for non-disclosure and disclosure | |
| Table 2.9 Study characteristics and details of disclosure | |
| T.I. 000 I. I | |
| Table 2.8 Risk of bias assessment for meta-analysis selection (selected papers | , |
| Table 2.7 Studies excluded at full text appraisal with reasons for exclusion | |
| Table 2.6 Search strategy for systematic review | |
| Table 2.5 Results of critical appraisal | |
| Table 2.4 Principles of person-centred care reported on in selected studies | |
| Table 2.4 Principles of person-centred care reported on in selected studies | 41 |

| Table 6.5 Patient Assessment of Chronic Illness Care (PACIC) Measure results for |
|--|
| manual therapy professions (chiropractic, massage therapy, osteopathy) and |
| conventional medicine providers consulted by the same respondents169 |
| Table 7.1 Socio-demographic characteristics of participants and associations with CM |
| orofessional consulted182 |
| Table 7.2 Rates of disclosure behaviour types to CM practitioners, GPs and specialist |
| doctors, including differences in type of disclosure to GPs and specialist doctors |
| petween CM professions consulted185 |
| Table 7.3 Results of independent t-test showing differences in reasons for disclosure of |
| CM use to medical doctors for each type of CM professional consulted187 |
| Table 7.4 Results of independent t-test showing differences in reasons for non- |
| disclosure of CM use to medical doctors for each type of CM professional consulted190 |
| Table 7.5 Results of independent t-test showing differences in reasons for disclosure of |
| conventional medicine use to CM practitioners for each type of CM professional |
| consulted192 |
| Table 7.6 Results of independent t-test showing differences in reasons for non- |
| disclosure of conventional medicine use to CM practitioners for each type of CM |
| orofessional consulted194 |
| Table 8.1 Participant characteristics. Socio-demographics of participants who |
| responded to disclosure indices, by CM profession consulted |
| Table 8.2 Disclosure Rates. Rates of full disclosure, partial disclosure and non- |
| disclosure of conventional medicines to CM practitioners and of CM to GPs and |
| specialist doctors, by CM profession consulted |
| Table 8.3 Disclosure and non-disclosure of conventional medicines to CM practitioners. |
| Average scores of reasons for disclosure and non-disclosure of conventional medicines |
| to CM practitioners (Conventional Medicine Disclosure Index – CONMED-DI) 207 |
| Table 8.4 Disclosure and non-disclosure of complementary medicine (CM) to GPs, |
| specialists. Average scores of reasons for disclosure and non-disclosure of CM to |
| medical doctors (Complementary Medicine Disclosure Index - CMDI)209 |
| Table 8.5 One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) of PACIC scores by disclosure rate. |
| Difference between total mean scores of Patient Assessment of Chronic Illness Care |
| ov rates of disclosure 210 |

Page intentionally left blank

ABSTRACT

Background: Chronic conditions contribute an increasing burden to health systems. The complexity and duration of chronic conditions create substantial challenges for patients and care providers, requiring ongoing, multi-disciplinary, person-centred care (PCC). While evidence suggests high utilisation of complementary medicine (CM) practitioner services by those with chronic conditions, research is limited regarding the role of CM consultations for these individuals. Methods: A cross-sectional survey design was employed across two phases at a national population level (Phase One, n=2,019), and a multi-profession CM clinical practice-based setting (Phase Two n=191). Analyses focussed on participants with chronic conditions (Phase One n=1,314, Phase Two n=153). Data were collected on socio-demographics, health status, CM and conventional medicine service utilisation behaviours, and patient communication regarding disclosure of treatment use to CM practitioners and medical doctors. Phase Two also examined patient perceptions of PCC during consultation with CM practitioners as compared with medical doctors. Results: Phase One found a substantial rate of CM practitioner consultation by those with chronic conditions (38%) and Phase Two found a high prevalence of chronic conditions amongst those consulting CM practitioners (80%). CM consultation by those with chronic conditions was motivated by a desire for improved wellbeing and supportive, compassionate care, alongside treatment of chronic conditions. Patient perceptions of PCC during CM consultation were consistently high, and were higher than perceptions of PCC during consultation with medical doctors. The Phase One and Phase Two datasets differed regarding rates of disclosure of treatment use to providers. However, the reasons reported for disclosing or not disclosing were similar across both datasets and for all professions; disclosure predominantly related to patient desires to have their health status fully understood, while non-disclosure related to a lack of provider inquiry. Disclosure was found to be associated with higher perceptions of PCC, regarding both CM (p=0.0118) and conventional medicine (p=0.0033) settings. **Conclusion:** This thesis maps a landscape of the role CM practitioners play for individuals with chronic conditions in Australia by exploring the characteristics, care-seeking and communication behaviours, and perceptions of care of these individuals regarding the CM consultation experience. This thesis describes the context of CM consultation for chronic condition management within the wider field of chronic illness care in Australia, highlighting a need for more pragmatic coordination of care. The results presented here call for further research that considers the potential utility of greater integration of CM in Australia for optimal, PCC for those with chronic conditions.

Page intentionally left blank