Condom use with casual partners in heterosexual men: extending the theory of planned behaviour by adding the socio-cultural variable somatic culture
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Background

The theory of planned behaviour (TPB) has been tested in numerous studies on HIV-protection behaviour

- it is considered to have sufficient predictive validity (Albarracin et al., 2001; Bennet & Bozionelos, 2000)

The theory of planned behaviour meets with the criticism

- individualistic approach built on purely cognitive variables
- based on the assumption that condom use is a rational choice by an individual faced with the danger of HIV-infection
- emotional, social and socio-cultural factors are left unconsidered (Bengel, 1993)

Potential for further development of the TPB and advancement in explaining HIV-protection behaviour
Somatic culture and HIV-protection behaviour

Somatic culture as a predictor of HIV-protection behaviour in a earlier qualitative study (Gredig, Parpan, Nideröst 2002)

Somatic culture

– describes permanent dispositions of perception, thinking and acting with regard to one’s own body.
– is that part of a person’s habitus, that structures how he or she deals with his or her own body (Boltanski, 1976)
– it is generated in an individual’s socialization process
– individuals who share the same social conditions of existence develop a system of dispositions which generates similar modes of practice (Bourdieu, 1999).
Types of somatic culture

We had identified four types of somatic culture in heterosexual men:

– Visionary type
– Ambivalent type
– Functionalistic type
– Easy-going type
The visionary type of somatic culture

The body is the subject of continuous conscious reflection

Are guided by a vision describing a self-defined ideal relationship between body and spirit (e.g. harmony of body and spirit)

Have very clear, well-reflected ideas with regard to their own body

Have a strong personal autonomy while, at the same time, they are sensitive of their body and aware of their physical sensations

See themselves as self-confident and self-determined individuals who take responsibility for their body and their health
The ambivalent type of somatic culture

Tension between compliance with socially transmitted internalized norms and casual, happy-go-lucky approach

Are of a controlling nature, so they subject their body to repeated critical tests on a regular basis to check whether it is fulfilling the norms

If the body does not fulfil such norms anymore, measures are taken to bring the body back to conformity (e.g. the withdrawal of nutrition). As soon as the body is back to conformity, men of this type lose interest again and control is replaced by body-related behaviour determined by careless enjoyment, comfort and the avoidance of efforts

No balance between opposite orientations can be found

Oscillating movement between control and happy-go-lucky, the body is held in low esteem
The functionalistic type of somatic culture

The body is experienced in the context of the working situation and body-related behaviour is determined by work.

The body is getting no more attention than necessary for the maintenance of fitness and for the fulfilment of one’s duty in everyday life. The only take care not to exhaust their body unnecessarily, to minimize „wear and tear“ and to avoid risks perceived as imminent.

The first signs of a physical troubles are often ignored. In their present-day orientation, the future, and thus any future consequences of their present physical neglect are ignored.

They shared idea that a state of good or poor health is largely a question of coincidence and does not fall within the responsibility or the power of the individual.
The easy-going type of somatic culture

Carelessness and negligence characterize the body-related pattern of this type of somatic culture

Show a calm indifference and tend to forget their body quite easily. They only become aware of it if there is an urgent reason.

Only make a minimal effort to take care of themselves in order to comply with social norms of cleanliness and appearance.

Conceptions of a healthy/healthier life are of almost no importance for the practical everyday issues. Often, motivated by lust or laziness, they redefine these conceptions to justify a slackening of the reigns on their part.

Guided by the motto „be satisfied with what you have“, there are also allusions to the fact that one’s physical condition is basically unchangeable, and that to accept it is the most natural attitude to adopt.
Objectives of the study

1. To test whether the theory of planned behaviour provides a suitable explanatory model for condom use with casual partners of heterosexual men between the ages of 25 and 65 living in the German-speaking part of Switzerland

2. To determine, whether the explanatory power of the theory of planned behaviour can be increased by adding the variable of somatic culture

We hypothesized, that the integration of the variable „somatic culture“ as an additional predictor of intention into the theory of planned behaviour will increase the proportion of explained variance of intention to use a condom with casual partners.
Participants and procedures

Participants were 982 Swiss men between the ages of 25 and 65 of heterosexual orientation.

The study design was prospective
- First wave of interviews between October and December 2002
- Second wave of interviews followed after an interval of 6 months.

Two standardized computer assisted telephone interviews (CATI)
Measures of TPB

Attitude ($\Sigma b_i * e_i$) and subjective Norm ($\Sigma n b_j * m_j$)
- 15 Items ranging from 0-10

Perceived behavioural control
- 2 Items ranging from 0-10

Intention (1 Item) ranging from 0-10

Condom use last time when having sex with a casual partner during the six month under investigation (1 Item), yes/no
Measures of somatic culture

For measuring somatic culture, a 25 item-somatic culture index was developed. It based on the results of the qualitative study.

Four subscales of somatic culture
- Visionary type (8 Items, $\alpha=.71$)
- Ambivalent type (4 Items, $\alpha=.58$)
- Functionalistic type (6 Items, $\alpha=.63$)
- Easy-going type (7 Items, $\alpha=.62$)
Data analysis

1. Bivariate correlation analysis to establish the relationship between the two variables „intention“ and „condom use“

2. Standard multiple regression analysis to determine predictors of intention and the proportion of explained variance in intention

3. An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to test whether the variable „somatic culture“ was a predictive variable of „intention“ and in order to determine the proportion of explained variance in intention and by how much the explanatory power of the TPB can be increased

4. Hierarchical logistic regression analysis in order to check that the predictor variables of intention had no effect on condom use when the effect of intention was controlled for
Sample description (N=81)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 65 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living situation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With partner</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With children, relatives or other persons</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship status at last sexual encounter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a steady relationship</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sample description (N=81)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory school (8-9 years of school)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, maturity, teacher's training</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational high school</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University, specialised high school</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work-situation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular full-time employment</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular part-time employment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In retirement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Netincome per month in EURO</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1666</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667-2333</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2334-3000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001-3666</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3667-4333</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4334-5000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001-5666</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5667-6333</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6334-7000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7001-7666</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 7667</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean and standard deviation of the variables of TPB (N=81)

Attitude (0-100): 61.9
Subjective norm (0-100): 52.8
Perceived behavioural control (0-100): 87.5
Intention (0-100): 88.4
Distribution of the types of somatic culture (in %, N=81)

- Visionary type: 32.1%
- Ambivalent type: 21.0%
- Functionalistic type: 25.9%
- Easy-going type: 18.5%
- Unknown: 2.5%
Did you have used a condom last time you had sex with a casual partner during the past six months? (in %, N=81)

- Yes: 79.0 (64)
- No: 21.0 (17)
Regression analysis of intention on variables of TPB (N=75)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Univariate Analysis</th>
<th>Multivariate analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 1: TPB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>0.45***</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norm</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived behavioural control</td>
<td>0.53***</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 2: extended TPB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>0.45***</td>
<td>0.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norm</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived behavioural control</td>
<td>0.53***</td>
<td>0.45***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatic culture</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.36**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beta-Weights ($\beta$), correlation coefficients ($r$) and $R^2$ of TPB (N=75)

- **Attitude**: $\beta = .25^*$
- **Subjective Norm**: $\beta = .07$
- **Perceived Behavioural Control**: $\beta = .41^{***}$

Correlation coefficients:
- $r = .12$
- $r = .52^{**}$
- $r = .05$

Intention:
- $R^2 = .36^{**}$
Eta-values ($\eta$), correlation coefficient ($r_s$) and $R^2$ of the extended TPB

- **Attitude**: $\eta = 0.27^*$
- **Subjective norm**: $\eta = 0.08$
- **Perceived behavioural control**: $\eta = 0.45^{***}$
- **Somatic culture**: $\eta = 0.33^*$

$R^2 = 0.45^{**}$

- **Intention**
- **Condom use**: $r_s = 0.23^*$
Conclusion

The factor of somatic culture has proved to be worthwhile
– it increased the model’s explanatory power from 36% to 45%.

The critics of the theory of planned behaviour can thus be countered with an extension by somatic culture

Advantages:
– Do not transform the theory into an overly complex multi-factorial model
– Because somatic culture as internalized social structure still remains on one’s individual level. Therefore it corresponds with the theoretical background of TPB

Limitations:
– Only been tested in explaining condom use
– Only suitable for behaviours with regard to the body
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