Original Research Article

PREDICTORS OF GLYCAEMIC CONTROL AMONG GHANAIAN TYPE 2 DIABETES PATIENTS USING DIABETES SELF-MANAGEMENT APPROACH

ABSTRACT

Aims: Management of a complex metabolic disease like diabetes can be very challenging since it involves a careful combination of medication, exercise, diet and regular monitoring of blood glucose in order to achieve good glucose control. The study aimed at determining predictors of glycaemic control of type 2 diabetics using diabetes self-management approach.
Study design: Cross-sectional study.
Place and Duration of Study: Diabetes clinic at two selected district hospitals in Ashanti region of Ghana.
Methodology: A structured questionnaire was used to collect demographic, clinical and dietary information. A validated Diabetes Self-Management Questionnaire was also used. Serum Glycated haemoglobin (HbA_{1c}) was used as the standard for glycaemic control.
Results: Mean glycated hemoglobin level for study participants was 7.2%±0.2. Optimal glycemic control was significantly associated with diabetes self-management (r= -.428), diabetes-related distress (r= .381) and acceptance and action on diabetes (r= .316). In. addition to the above associations, diabetes self-management (β= -.297, p=0.007) and diabetes-related distress (β= .219, p=0.028) could significantly predict glycated haemoglobin but not acceptance and action on diabetes (β= .046, p=0.665).
Conclusion: All the three study variables correlated with glycated hemoglobin of study participants but only diabetes self-management and diabetes-related distress had predictive value. Further epidemiological study is needed to ascertain strength of effects. Various health stakeholders should encourage diabetes patients to understand the importance of diabetes self-management which may help in better glycaemic control, disease management and better quality of life.

Keywords: Predictors, glycemic control, Ghana, diabetes, diabetes self-management.

1. INTRODUCTION

Diabetes is a significant global health problem because it affects a large proportion of the world's population, which is estimated at approximately 48.8 million people, or 18.3% of the population. Of the types, type 2 diabetes, or non-insulin dependent diabetes mellitus (NIDDM), accounts for 90 to 95% of all diagnosed cases of diabetes in adults [1]. The prevalence of diabetes has reached a nearly epidemic level with about 425 million people between age 20 and 79 years in the world having the disease in 2017. The number is estimated to rise to 629 million by 2040 [2]. The developing world is not left out in this epidemic as it has been reported that the prevalence is increasing considerably in developing countries [3].

In Ghana, the International Diabetes Federation reports that a total of 266,200 representing 1.9% of adult age 20 years to 79 years were estimated to have diabetes in 2015 [4]. Ghana also recorded 8,529 diabetes-related deaths in the same year. These figures are expected to double over the next two decades, thereby threatening most of the development success attained by Ghana and Africa at large [4].

Diabetes mellitus management aims at glycemic control, prevention of acute chronic complications and enhancing quality of life for patients [5] and currently, programs to educate people about diabetes self-management have become the focus of attention among health care professionals especially for people with type 2 diabetes [6]. Management of a complex metabolic disease like diabetes can be very challenging since it involves a careful combination of medication, exercise, diet and regular monitoring of blood glucose in order to achieve good glucose control [7]. Diabetes as in the case of other chronic disease requires that the patient takes control of a greater part of the treatment responsibilities. This includes making some lifestyle modifications in terms of diet and exercise and also adherence to medication regimen. Even though proper management of diabetes improves glycemia, some studies have reported that the association between non-compliances of treatment schedules and poor glycaemic control in some patients [8, 9]. A study involving 276 diabetes patients in Ethiopia reported 24.3% prevalence of non-adherence of treatment schedules [10]. Low adherence rates among diabetes patients should be taken seriously since the consequences of poor management are devastating [11].

Programs to support diabetes patients to manage their conditions over the years have produced encouraging results and so have been considered as a requirement for successful diabetes management notwithstanding the individual's specific needs [12]. The outmoded system whereby patients are given information with the aim of improving their knowledge on their conditions is gradually being taken over by current systems that focus on changing the behaviour of patients and empower them with adequate skills to be able to manage their condition (also known as self-care) [13]. As a result of this, a number of national guidelines on management of diabetes including that of the American Diabetes Association consider self-management as major part of good diabetes management [14, 15].

There are contradictions in diabetes patients' capabilities to undertake self-management activities [16]. In one study, 0.8% of diabetes patients reported that they did not practice self-monitoring of blood glucose weekly and 21.1% said they did not monitor their blood glucose monthly [16]. Also, in some other study, there were low adherence to medication, exercise and diet plans. Patients were not also committed to taking care of their feet and monitoring their blood glucose [17]. However, a study reported that diabetic patients followed diet and exercise plans, took their medication, took care of their feet and monitored their blood glucose [18]. A study by [19] showed, self-efficacy was high (62.0%) but few patients (30.8%) practiced good self-care behaviours [19]. These studies together suggest that diabetics practice various levels of self-management and care.

However, the ability of a patient to practice adequate self-management of the condition may be associated with levels of knowledge and understanding of the disease. Studies carried out on knowledge of diabetics about their disease condition have reported knowledge deficits in the areas of medication administration, glucose testing, diet planning and appropriate foot care among diabetic adults and children [20, 21]. Moreover, the likelihood that diabetics will put their knowledge and understanding of the disease into appropriate self-management practices is also dependent on their level of self-efficacy.

If better knowledge and understanding of diabetes lead to higher self-efficacy of self-management then adequate self-management should lead to better glycaemic control. This expectation is confirmed by available literature. A recent study in Jordan reported a mean score of 62% for self-management and concluded that diabetes self-care correlated with but did not predict HbA1c levels [17] whereas a previous study reported an overall mean score of 80% for self-management of type 2 diabetes patients in Toronto, Canada [22]. Another study involving 223 subjects with type 2 diabetes concluded that self-management was a better predictor of HbA1c [23]. Also, a study involving 266 type 2 diabetics revealed that 30.8% had good self-management behaviour and self-management emanating from exercise was found to significantly predict glycaemic control [19].

Diabetes-related distress among type 2 diabetes patients is a prevalent emotional state as a result of lifelong daily demands in terms of adherence to medication, diet and physical activity, and frequent monitoring of blood glucose [24, 25]. These emotional conditions are related to a situation of high morbidity and deaths [26]. Most studies conducted usually consider diabetes-related distress in relation to diabetes management and metabolic disorders and somehow with regards to social support [24]. A prospective study involving depression and glycemic control among type 2 diabetics reported that depression was significantly related to high blood glucose or poor glycemic control [27].

Another study that investigated the association between diabetes-related distress and glycemic control revealed a significant relationship [28]. Also, a study that assessed diabetes-related distress among diabetes patients identified that more than half of the patients reported to have distress relating to at least one of the diabetes-related activities [29]. Also, a cross-sectional study of 165 type 2 diabetics concluded that there was a significant relationship between distress and HbA1c in type 2 diabetes [30].

The exigencies of diabetes self-care (adherence to medication, exercise, diet and self-monitoring of blood glucose) cause diabetics to avoid, deny or take their minds of any fears or worries that they have diabetes and they consider the routine diabetes self-management as reminders that they have the condition. This could lead to good glycaemic control and subsequently reduce risk of diabetic complications. For instance, a randomized control trial involving 81 type 2 diabetes patients showed a positive impact of changes in diabetes acceptance on HbA1c [31]. A recent study conducted by Schmitt and colleagues, concluded that higher diabetes non-acceptance had a significant correlation with decreased self-care and higher HbA1c, and higher diabetes-related distress [32]. Also, non-acceptance had a higher correlation with diabetes self-care and glycaemic control and could predict the above better than diabetes distress [32].

Notwithstanding the above, other factors such as duration of diabetes, gender, age, total cholesterol, Body Mass Index (BMI), and HDL levels, have been found to influence glycaemic control [33]. This study therefore sought to ascertain the diabetes self-management knowledge, skills and practices among type two diabetes patients attending some selected diabetes clinics and how that is reflected in their glycaemic control, especially in Ghanaian setting where information on diabetes self-management is lacking. It therefore bridges the gap between knowledge, policy and practices for diabetes and provides some information that will contribute to ensure that future national guidelines and programs for diabetes management in Ghana include self-management.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1 Study design and period

A cross-sectional study design was employed in 2015 to ascertain diabetes non-acceptance, self-management and related distress and how these impact on diabetics' glycaemic control. Data collection was done through face-to-face interview and medical records review between July and September, 2015 at Ejisu government hospital and Kumasi South hospital.

2.2 Study population and Eligibility

The study population included outpatient diabetics attending diabetic clinics of the two hospitals. The outpatient diabetic clinic registers of the two hospitals were used as the sample frame after the inclusion criteria was applied. The inclusion criteria included: 1) an adult (18 years and above), 2) known type 2 diabetic patients, 3) duration of diabetes should be at least year, and 4) accept to participate in the research. Exclusion criteria included: 1) diabetic pregnant women, 2) Gestational diabetics and type 1 diabetics, 3) Inpatient diabetics, 4) Newly diagnosed diabetics, and 5) diabetics with some form of severe mental or cognitive retardation.

2.3 Ethical consideration

Approval from the Committee on Human Research, Publication and Ethics at School of Medical Sciences and Komfo Anokye Teaching Hospital and the selected hospitals was obtained. Then participant information leaflet was given to study subjects who could read after which the consent form was signed. However, for subjects who could not read, the participant information leaflet was translated to them in a language that they understood and their consent sought by a thumbprint before participating in the study. Participants were informed that participation in this study was voluntary and would not affect their medical treatment, and that withdrawal from the research was without any consequences.

2.4 Sampling method

Random sampling was used to recruit participants at the two health facilities and this done by randomly selecting patience to be recruited from the diabetes clinic records. Patience who declined to participate after being selected were replaced through another random selection process.

2.5 Data collection tools

The questionnaire that was used in the data collection during this study had four sections. The first part solicited demographic information such as age, sex, ethnic background, marital status, number of household members, educational background, occupation, duration and type of diabetes and patient understands of diabetes. The second section collected clinical data which included; systolic and diastolic blood pressure, a 24-hour dietary recall and fasting blood glucose levels recorded in the morning of the data collection. Frequency of urination during day and night, other medication conditions (co-morbidities), and anti-diabetes medication formed the third section.

2.5.1 Diabetes Self-Management Questionnaire

The final section of the questionnaire used for this study was the Diabetes Self-Management Questionnaire (DSMQ) developed by Schmitt et al. [34] at the Research Institute of the Diabetes Academy Mergentheim to aid the collection of appropriate data that can be used to evaluate self-care behaviours and relate them to glycated hemoglobin levels. The validated scale for full psychometric assessment regarding diabetes has 16 items and 4 subscales: healthcare patronage (3 items; 3,7,14), glucose management (5 items; 1,4,6,10,12), physical activity (3 items; 8,11,15) and dietary control (4 items; 2,5,9,13) and item 16 is the patient's overall rating of his/her diabetes self-management and it is added to the 'Sum Scale' score. In terms of what is regarded as effective diabetes self-care, seven items are formulated positively and the remaining nine negatively. The DSMQ has a four-point Likert scale that starts from 0= does not apply to me, 1= applies to me to some degree, 2= applies to me to a considerable degree and 3=applies to me very much. For individual analysis to be possible, a box is put below each item for ticking if that item is not required in their treatment.

During the scoring, all negative word items were reversed such that higher score indicated more effective self-care. Sums of item scores were calculated to give scale scores and then converted into a scale that ranges from 0 to 100 (raw score/theoretical maximum score *100). In a situation where 'it is not required as part of my treatment' is marked, that item is excluded from the calculation and the theoretical maximum scores reduces accordingly. At the end of the data collection, all responses were converted so that the higher the scores, the more effective one's self-care. Schmitt et al. [34] reported the Cronbach's alpha for DSMQ as 0.84 while this research had 0.71 as its Cronbach's alpha.

The section of the questionnaire employed the use of The Diabetes-related Distress Scale (DDS) which was developed by Polonsky et al. [35]. DDS contains 17-items with four subscales: physician-related distress (4 items), emotional burden (5 items), family distress relating to diabetes care (3 items) and regimen distress (5 items). This scale has six point Likert scale that starts from 1= not a problem to 6=A very serious problem and the scores for each patient were calculated by summing all the scores and dividing by the number of items the participant responded to. It therefore gives a sum score range from 1 to 6. A higher sum score indicates great distress and the cut-off point that require clinical attention is ≥ 3 [35]. For diabetes distress scale, the Cronbach's alpha was 0.95 [35] but this study recorded a Cronbach's alpha of 0.925 indicating good internal consistency and reliability.

Another section of the study questionnaire was on diabetes non-acceptance where the Acceptance and Action Diabetes Questionnaire developed by Gregg et al. [31] and validated and evaluated by Schmitt et al. [32] was used. The questionnaire has a seven-point Likert scale (1= never true to 7=Always true) on which study subjects indicated the extent to which they go through a number of diabetes non-acceptance behaviours. The sum score was calculated by adding the eleven items score and then dividing by eleven (number of items) which produced sum scores ranging from 1 to 7. Higher values after adding up item scores showed greater non-acceptance and sum score greater than 3 indicated non-acceptance [32].

2.6 Glycated haemoglobin assessment

Three ml of blood samples of patients were collected and their glycated haemoglobin determined using Fast Ion-Exchange Resin Separation Method. HbA1c < 6.5% was referred as normoglycaemia and HbA1c ≥ 6.5% was termed as hyperglycaemia [36].

2.7 Data analysis

Data collected from the study participants were entered into Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS version 20) for analysis. Outliers and missing data were checked by screening and cleaning the data. No outlier was identified but there was one missing data on HbA1c for one participant. This occurred as a result of phlebotomist inability to draw blood from the patient after several attempts due to collapsed veins. Characteristics of study participants and scales were described by using descriptive analyses that indicated percentages, frequencies, means, standard error of means and standard deviations. Means of variables for various groups were compared by deploying the use of ANOVA and any comparison with a p-value <0.05 was referred to as statistically significant. To measure the correlation between DSM, AAD, DDS and HbA1c, Pearson correlation analyses was done. Pearson analysis was also done to evaluate the association between subscales of the various instruments as well as relationship between age, BMI, duration of diabetes, DSM and HbA1c. Reliability test was also conducted to check the internal consistency and reliability of the DMSQ, AAD and DDS tools. In order to ascertain the predictors of good glycemic control or HbA1c, standard multiple linear regression analysis was done.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Sociodemographic characteristics of study Participants

A total of 115 were involved in the study and as shown in Table 1, female patients represented 71.3% of the patients sampled. In terms of education, 68.7% of respondents had senior high school and below education whilst 13.9% never had any education at all. The mean number of people living in the households of respondents was 6.1±0.31 and 50.4% of them lived with their immediate family members. Also, out of the 115 respondents, 20.0% widowed, 12.2% divorced and then 0.8% were single. Majority (55.7%) had hypertension and 50.4% had lost usual weight due to diabetes, while 52.2%, 29.6% showed symptoms of high blood glucose and frequent urination/thirst respectively (Table 1).

This cross-sectional study explored predictors of glycemic control among Ghanaian type 2 diabetics using diabetes self-management approach. A mean age of 58.4 years was higher as compared to the results reported in two previous studies [37, 38]. Majority of the respondents were women which is consistent with two recent studies involving type 2 diabetes patients [16, 39]. Women tend to seek health care more than men and since the study was carried at the out-patient diabetes clinic, they represented greater proportion of the sampling frame [39]. The result also conforms to the report by Wild et al. [40], which states that although diabetes prevalence in men is high, there are fewer men with diabetes than women. The illiteracy rate was lower than the national average of 23.5% and this could be attributed to the fact that the study areas were urban in nature. Moreover, the prevalence of diabetes has been found to be linked to increasing educational level [41].

238 **Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics of subjects**

Variable	Number of participants (%)
Gender	
Male	33 (28.7)
Female	82 (71.3)
Marital status	
Married	77 (67.0)
Widowed	23 (20.0)
Single	1 (0.8)
Divorced	14 (12.2)
Educational level	
Primary	22 (19.1)
Junior high	31 (27.0)
Senior high	26 (22.6)
Tertiary	15 (13.0)
Informal	5 (4.3)
None	16 (13.9)
Patients living with;	
Immediate family members	58 (50.4)
Both immediate and external relations	57 (49.6)
Symptoms and co-morbidities	
Gained weight	39 (33.9)
Lost weight	58 (50.4)
High Blood glucose (HbA_{1c})	60 (52.2)
Frequent Urination/Thirst	34 (29.6)
Fatigue, dizziness and Hunger	7 (6.1)
At least two of the above	4 (3.5)
No idea	10 (8.7)
Co-morbidities	
Hypertension	64 (55.7)
Ulcers	5 (4.3)
Neuropathy	5 (4.3)
At least two of the above	7 (6.1)
No co-morbidity	34 (29.6)

239
240
241 **3.2 Anthropometric and biochemical parameters of participants**

Participant's mean age was 58.4 years but the mean age for males was 0.8 years higher than that of females. Their mean BMI was 27.1±0.58kg/m2, 1.7% were below 18.5 kg/m2, 35.7% were within the normal range (18.5-24.9 kg/m2) and majority (62.6%) were overweight or obese. The mean duration of diabetes was 6.7±0.57 years, HbA1c, 7.2%±0.2 and mean fasting blood glucose (FBG) was 9.9 mmol/L and Systolic Blood Pressure 135.4±1.9 mmHg. There was no significant difference between males and females with regards to duration of diabetes, age, HbA1c, fasting blood glucose, systolic and diastolic blood pressure and weight. However, a significant (p=0.004) difference existed between male and female patients in terms of their body mass index (BMI), with females having a higher BMI than males (Table 2).

A greater proportion of study participants (52.2%) had poor glycaemic control; HbA1c above 6.5% and that does not conform to International Diabetes Federation recommendation that stipulates that HbA1c less than 6.5% is a desirable goal for diabetes management. This finding is lower to that reported by Asamoah-Boakye et al. [42] in Ghana, and Ahmad et al. [43] where 64.6% and 76.7% respectively of diabetes patients respectively had poor glycemic control. The relatively high poor glycemic control among study participants could be attributed to the fact that 62.6% of them were either overweight or obese since people in this group have been associated with poor glycemic control.

All participants were on anti-diabetes medication and greater proportion of them (89.6%) were on metformin either as a single drug or in combination with other anti-diabetes medication.

Table 2: Clinical characteristics of Study participants

Variable	N	Mean (SEM)	Males	Females	P value
Duration of Diabetes	115	6.7 (0.57)	7.9	6.2	0.175
Age (years)	115	58.4 (1.10)	59.0	58.2	0.725
HbA_{1c} (%)	114	7.2 (0.20)	7.7	7.0	0.080
Fasting Blood Glucose (mmol/L)	115	9.9 (0.40)	9.2	10.1	0.323
Systolic Blood Pressure (mmHg)	115	135.4 (1.87)	133.8	136.1	0.579
Diastolic Blood Pressure (mmHg)	115	83.3 (0.97)	83.7	83.1	0.785
Body Mass Index (kg/m^2)	115	27.1 (0.58)	24.6	28.2	0.004
Weight (Kg)	115	68.1 (1.40)	67.0	68.5	0.614
No. of household members	115	6.1 (0.31)	5.9(0.58)	6.1(0.37)	0.807

P-value is significant at $p \leq 0.05$

3.3 Diabetes self-management score and its association with glycaemia

Table 3 presents principal component analysis of diabetes self-management score (DSM). The principal component analysis showed six components with eigenvalues exceeding 1; explained as percentage of variances: 31.6%, 10.6%, 10.0%, 8.2 %, 6.9% and 6.6%. Also, six patterns were developed which consisted excellent self-management (pattern 1), poor diet, healthcare and poor glucose control (pattern 2), good glucose management and poor physical activity (pattern 3), good dietary management (pattern 4), poor diet, good health, admitted poor overall self-management (pattern 5) and good diet but poor healthcare (pattern 6). The patterns were grouped according to correlation coefficient factor ≥ 0.3 for positive and negative values. Prior to performing principal component analysis, the suitability of the data for factor analysis was assessed (Table 3).

Table 3: Principal Component Analysis of Diabetes Self-management scores

Component Matrix[a]						
Variable	Component pattern					
	Component 1 Excellent self mgt	Component 2 Poor diet, poor healthcare	Component 3 Good glucose mgt, poor	Component 4 Good dietary mgt	Component 5 Poor diet, good health care,	Component 6 Good diet but poor health care

		, poor glucose control	PA		admitted poor overall Self-mgt	
% Variance	31.6	10.6	10.0	8.2	6.9	6.6
I check my blood sugar levels with care and attention. Blood sugar measurement is not required as a part of my treatment.	.791		.310			
The food I choose to eat makes it easy to achieve optimal blood sugar levels.	.649			.378		.359
I keep all doctors' appointments recommended for my diabetes treatment.	.657					-.385
I take my diabetes medication (e. g. insulin, tablets) as prescribed.	.723					
Occasionally I eat lots of sweets or other foods rich in carbohydrates.		.585		-.362	.316	
I record my blood sugar levels regularly (or analyse the value chart with my blood glucose meter).	.781					
I tend to avoid diabetes-related doctors' appointments.	-.407				-.401	.662
I do regular physical activity to achieve optimal blood sugar levels.	.651		-.485			
I strictly follow the dietary recommendations given by my doctor or diabetes specialist.	.597		-.338			
I do not check my blood sugar levels frequently enough as would be required for achieving good blood glucose control.	-.413		-.505	.528		
I avoid physical activity, although it would improve my diabetes.	-.540		.514	.425		
I tend to forget to	-.362	.438	-.494			

take or skip my diabetes medication (e. g. insulin, tablets).						
Sometimes I have real 'food binges' (not triggered by hypoglycaemia).		.819				
Regarding my diabetes care, I should see my medical practitioner(s) more often.		-.337			.713	
I tend to skip planned physical activity.	-.592		.408	.311		
My diabetes self-care is poor.	-.658				.403	

PA-Physical activity

Among the six patterns, only excellent self-management had significant inverse correlation with HbA_{1c} (r= -0.495, p-value= 0.000) (Table 4).

Table 4: Association between PCA components and HbA_{1c}

Component pattern		HbA_{1c} (%)
Excellent self mgt	Pearson Correlation	-.495**
	P value	.000
Poor diet, poor healthcare, poor glucose mgt	Pearson Correlation	-.012
	P value	.903
Good glucose mgt, poor PA	Pearson Correlation	-.067
	P value	.477
Good dietary mgt	Pearson Correlation	-.057
	P value	.546
Poor diet, good health care, admitted poor overall Self-mgt	Pearson Correlation	-.031
	P value	.743
Good diet but poor health care	Pearson Correlation	-.039
	P value	.683

**P-value is significant at p<0.05 (sig. 2-tailed)

3.4 Association between study variables

When the correlation was controlled for age, gender, duration of DM, BMI and metformin use the association between HbA1c and other study variables in descending order were as follow; diabetes self-management (r= -0.419), diabetes-related distress (r= 0.368) and acceptance and action on diabetes scores (r= 0.342) with statistical significance (p<0.001) (Table 5).

Pearson Correlation analysis adjusted for age & gender & duration of diabetes & BMI & metformin use revealed a statistically significant negative relationship between HbA1c and diabetes self-management (r= -0.419, p< 0.001) which is consistent with the result of Schmitt et al. [34]. Patients'

healthcare seeking behaviour was the second strongest correlation with HbA1c and this could be linked to the fact that patients who are regular at diabetes related appointment stand a higher chance of receiving adequate information on how to manage their condition and this could translate into good self-care and subsequently good glycaemic control. Also, diabetes-related distress (r= 0.368, p< 0.001) and acceptance and action on diabetes scores (r= 0.342, p< 0.001) had weak, positive correlation with HbA1c. This means diabetes-related distress and acceptance and action on diabetes may influence poor glycemic control.

Diabetes Self-management has been observed to have positive correlation with good glycemic control, reduced possibility of complication and improved quality of life [44]. Good diabetes self-management has to do with a patient taking control of his condition and adhering to the four thematic areas (dietary control, glucose management, physical activity and seeking care from health professionals) in diabetes management. Our correlation analysis showed a negative significant correlation (adjusted for age & gender & duration of diabetes & BMI (kg/m2) & metformin use) between overall DSM and HbA1c (r=-0.428, p<0.001). When analyzed individually, glucose management score had weak, inverse correlation (r=-0.415, p<0.000) with HbA1c. This implies that a good glucose management practice may influence decreased glycated haemoglobin. Additionally, healthcare seeking score (r= -0.386, p<0.000), physical activity score (r= -0.328, p<0.000) and dietary control score (r=-0.167, p=0.076) showed weak, inverse correlation with HbA1c. This also explain that seeking good health care, increasing physical activity and good dietary practices may influence in reduction in glycated haemoglobin. Hence, advocating for diabetes self-management practices can be considered necessary counselling tool to help participants and diabetics as a whole manage the condition. The fact that the 4 subscales were inter-correlated suggests that practicing one self-management component led practicing the other. For example, patients who seek healthcare, keeping to medical appointment are likely to receive adequate information on how to manage their condition and this could translate into good self-care (glucose management, dietary control and physical activity) and subsequently good glycemic control.

Table 5: Summary of inter-correlation among study variables (adjusted)

	1	2	3
HbA1C (%)			
Self-management	-.419**		
Diabetes-related distress	.368**	-.431**	
Acceptance and action on diabetes	.342**	-.584**	.428**

*** - Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*

Control Variables: Age & Gender & Duration of Diabetes & BMI (kg/m) & Metformin

Findings of correlation analysis revealed total score DSM had strong, positive correlation with dietary score (r= 0.799, p-value= 0.000), glucose management score (r= 0.671, p-value= 0.000), healthcare score (r= 0.675, p= 0.000) and physical activity score (r= 0.669, p-value= 0.000). HbA1c had inverse correlation with total score DSM (r= -0.428, p-value= 0.000), glucose management score (r= -0.415, p-value= 0.000), healthcare score (r= -0.386, p-value= 0.000) and physical activity score (r= -0.328, p-value= 0.000) (Table 6)

Table 6: Association between glycemic control (HbA1c) and Diabetes Self-Management and subscales score (adjusted)

Variable		1	2	3	4	5
HbA_{1c} (%)	Pearson Correlation					
	Sig. (2-tailed)					
Total Score DSM	Pearson Correlation	-.428**				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000				

Glucose Management Score	Pearson Correlation	-.415**	.799**			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000			
Dietary Control Score	Pearson Correlation	-.167	.671**	.259**		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.076	.000	.005		
HealthCare Score	Pearson Correlation	-.386**	.675**	.544**	.263**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.004	
Physical Activity Score	Pearson Correlation	-.328**	.669**	.429**	.269**	.273**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.004	.003

**- Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), DSM-Diabetes Self-Management, Control Variables: Age & Gender & Duration of Diabetes & BMI (kg/m) & Metformin

3.5 Predictors of HbA1c (Glycemic control)

The prediction model was statistically significant (F=10.63, p<0.001, R2=0.225) and explains 22.5% of variability in HbA1c level. The level of HbA1c or glycaemic control was predicted by diabetes self-management and diabetes-related distress with diabetes self-management being the strongest predictor (β=-0.297, p=0.007) and then diabetes-related distress (β=0.219, p=0.028). However, acceptance and action on diabetes could not predict glycaemic control in the study participants (Table 7).

Table 7: Predictors of glycated hemoglobin

Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	t value	p value
Constant	10.091	1.954		5.164	.000
Self-management	-.053	.019	-.297	-2.745	.007
Diabetes-related distress	.781	.352	.219	2.222	.028
Acceptance and action on diabetes	.077	.176	.046	.434	.665

The PCA analyses identified 6 components, which explained a very higher percent variability of 73.9% in the study population, higher than in similar a study, which used PCA analysis of DSMQ responses and explained 61% of variability (39). This implies that the 6 DSM patterns observed were adequate to explain the reported behaviour of majority of the study participants. Also, the first pattern revealed in the PCA had strong positive association with positive self-management practices and strong negative association with negative self-management behaviour in all the four subscales. The strong negative correlation between this pattern of diabetes self-care and HbA1c indicates that a combination of all the four parts of diabetes self-management is the best way to ensure that diabetes patients have their blood glucose under control. All positive co-efficient values in the component matrix shows participants were likely to practice responses given on diabetes self-management questions and negative co-efficient values means participants were unlikely to follow/practice responses given on diabetes self-management questions. Likewise, the PCA component (pattern) reflecting excellent DSM showed a negative correlation with HbA1c (r=-0.495, p<0.001). This means that whichever way things are looked at, good overall diabetes self-management is associated with good glycaemic control. Now, the other PCA component only reflected good or poor management in

specific areas of DSM scale and not on all four areas. Our analysis did not show any significant association between these patterns, reflecting specific areas of diabetes management and glycaemic control. This goes to confirm that good overall management in all the four areas of diabetes self-management and not just some areas is needed to control glycaemia among the study participants. Because the PCA takes into account any inter-correlations between variables in the model (in this case 16 variables of the DSMQ), the patterns observed may reflect the true patterns of DSM practices in the population. So, the findings of the correlations between the PCA patterns and HbA1c may be truer than that of the mere mean scores for the four areas of the DSMQ. Thus, our logical explanation above may hold.

Our findings revealed that level of HbA1c was predicted by diabetes self-management (β= -0.297, p=0.007) and diabetes-related distress (β=0.219, p=0.028). This means that, for every one percentage increase in diabetes self-management score, one can expect a 0.053 reduction in HbA1c and for every point increase in diabetes-related distress, one can expect 0.781 increase in HbA1c. The regression model predicts HbA1c better than the mean HbA1c because p-value for F-test is statistically significant. The findings suggest that good diabetes self-management is essential for the diabetics to ensure good glycemic control. This explains the fact that diabetics can enjoy good glycemic control and prevent early complications when all-inclusive diabetes self-management activities; good dietary behavior, physical activity, healthcare seeking behavior and good glucose management with medication, are properly and carefully followed.

The study revealed that more than half of patients attending diabetes clinic at the two hospitals have poor glycemic control despite a high mean score for diabetes self-management, and good management of all four areas (dietary control, glucose management, healthcare seeking behaviour and physical activity) was associated with good HbA1c, indicating good glycemic control. Further studies are needed to better understand the diabetes management and its effect, especially among non-hospital-based participants. However, the current findings support the need to empower diabetics with adequate knowledge and skills to self-manage their condition.

4.0 CONCLUSION

More than half of the patients attending diabetes clinic at the two hospitals have poor glycemic control despite high mean score for diabetes self-management. In addition, very few patients were distressed as a result of their diabetes condition. Though a few patients had difficulty in accepting their condition, the effect on their glycaemic control was devastating. Diabetes self-management showed the strongest association with glycemic control after adjusting for age, gender, BMI, duration of DM and treatment. All the three study variables correlated with glycated hemoglobin of study participants but only diabetes self-management and diabetes-related distress had predictive values.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATION

Approval from the Committee on Human Research, Publication and Ethics at the School of Medical Sciences and Komfo Anokye Teaching Hospital and the selected hospitals was obtained.

REFERENCES

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National diabetes fact sheet: national estimates and general information on diabetes and prediabetes in the United States. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2011.

2. Lee EH, van der Bijl J, Shortridge-Baggett LM, Han SJ, Moon SH. Psychometric Properties of the Diabetes Management Self-Efficacy Scale in Korean Patients with Type 2 Diabetes. International Journal of Endocrinology. 2015; 1- 9.

3. Wynn NS, Howteerakul N, Suwannapong N, Rajatanun T. Self-efficacy, self-care behaviors and glycaemic control among type-2 diabetes patients attending two private clinics in Yangon, Myanmar. Southeast Asian J Trop Med Public Health. 2010; 41:943–51.

406 4. International Diabetes Federation. Diabetes Atlas eighth edition, IDF 2018: Retrieved March
407 22, 2018 from http://www.idf.org.diabetesatlas, 2017.

408 5. Wattana C, Srisuphan W, Pothiban L, Upchurch SL. Effects of a diabetes self –management
409 program on glycaemic control, coronary heart disease risk, and quality of life among Thai patients with
410 type 2 diabetes. Nurse Health Science. 2007;9: 135-14

411 6. Khunti K, Gray LJ, Skinner T, Carey ME, Realf K, Dallosso H, Davies MJ. Effectiveness of a
412 diabetes education and self-management program (DESMOND) for people with newly diagnosed
413 people with type 2 diabetes: three years follow-up of a cluster randomize control trial in primary care.
414 British Medical Journal, 2012; 344, e2333. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.e2333

415 7. Cramer JA. A systematic review of adherence with medications for diabetes. Diabetes care.
416 2004; 27:1218-1224.

417 8. Hernández-Ronquillo L, Téllez-Zenteno JF, Garduño-Espinosa J, et al. Factors associated
418 with therapy noncompliance in type-2 diabetes patients. Salud Publica Mex. 2003; 45(3):191–197

419 9. Kirk A, Mutrie N, MacIntyre P, et al. Increasing physical activity in people with type 2 diabetes.
420 Diabetes Care. 2003;26 (4):1186–1192.

421 10. Teklay G, Hussein J, Tesfaye D. Non-adherence and Associated Factors among Type 2
422 Diabetic Patients at Jimma University Specialized Hospital, Southwest Ethiopia. J. Med. Sci. 2013;
423 13(7): 758-584.

424 11. Ho PM, Rumsfeld JS, Masoudi FA, et al. Effect of medication non-adherence on
425 hospitalization and mortality among patients with diabetes mellitus. Arch Intern Med. 2006; 166
426 (17):1836–1841.

427 12. Franek J. Self-management support interventions for persons with chronic disease: an
428 evidence-based analysis. Ont Health Technol Assess Ser. 2013; 13:1-60

429 13. Medical Advisory Secretariat. Behavioural interventions for type 2 diabetes: an evidence-
430 based analysis. Ontario Health Technology Assessment Series. 2009; 9:22.

431 14. American Diabetes Association. Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes. Available at:
432 www.diabetesjournals.org. 2014. [Accessed on: 03/03/2016]

433 15. Handelsman Y, Mechanick JI, Blonde L, Grunberger G, Bloomgarden ZT, Bray GA, Dagogo-
434 Jack S, Davidson JA, et al. American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists Medical Guidelines for
435 Clinical Practice for developing a diabetes mellitus comprehensive care plan. Endocr Pract 2011; 17
436 Suppl 2: 1-53.

437 16. Hammad S, Darawad M, Hourani E, Demeh W. Predictors of glycated hemoglobin among
438 Jordanian diabetic patients. Iran Journal of Public Health. 2015; 44(11): 1482-1491.

439 17. Atak N, Gurkan T, Kose K. The Effects of Education on Knowledge, Self-management
440 Behaviours and Self-efficacy of Patients with Type Two Diabetes. Australian Journal of Advanced
441 Nursing. 2008; 26 (2): 66-74.

442 18. Arcury T, Grzvwacz J, Saldana S, Nguyen H, Bell R, et al. Social Inte-gration and diabetes
443 management among rural older adults. Journal of Aging Health. 2012; 24 (6): 899-922.

444 19. Nyunt SW, Howteerakul N, Suwannapong N, Rajatanun T. Self-efficacy, Self-care behaviours
445 and glycaemic control among type 2 diabetes patients attending two private clinics in Yangon,
446 Myanmar. Southeast Asian J Trop Med Public Health. 2010; 41(4): 943-951.

20. Fatema K, Hossain S, Natasha K, Chowdhury HA, et al. Knowledge attitude and practices regarding diabetes mellitus among nondiabetic and diabetic study participants in Bangladesh. 2017; 17: 364.

21. Kheir N, Greer W, Youssif A, Al Geed H, Al Okkah R. Knowledge, attitude and practices of Qatari patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. International J Pharm Pract. 2011; 19: 185-191.

22. Gucciardi E, Wang SC, DeMelo M, Amaral L, Stewart DE. Characteristics of men and women with diabetes: Observations during patients' initial visit to a diabetes education centre. Can Fam Physician. 2008; 54: 219-227

23. Al-Khawaldeh OA, Al-Hassan MA, Froelicher ES. Self-efficacy, Self-management, and glycaemic control in adults with type 2 diabetes. Journal of Diabetes Complications. 2012; 26(1): 10-16.

24. Karlsen B, Bru E. The relationship between diabetes-related distress and clinical variables and perceived support among adult with type 2 diabetes: A prospective study. International Journal of Nursing Studies. 2014; 51:438-447.

25. Gupta N, Bahdada SK, Shah VN, Mattoo SK. Psychological Aspects Related to Diabetes Mellitus. Journal of Diabetes Research. 2016: 1-3.

26. Fisher L, Mullan JT, Arean P, Glasgow RE, Hessler D, Masharani U. Diabetes distress but not clinical depression or depressive symptoms is associated with glycaemic control in both cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses. Diabetes Care. 2010; 33(1): 23-28.

27. Abuhegzy H, Elkeshishi H, Saleh N, Sherra K, Ismail A, et al. Longitudinal effect of depression on glycaemic control in patients with type 2 diabetes: a 3-year prospective study. Egyptian Journal of Psychiatry. 2017; 38: 27-34.

28. Aikens JE, Perkins DW, Piette J.D, Lipton B. Association between depression and concurrent type 2 diabetes outcome varies by diabetes regimen. Journal of Diabetes Medicine. 2008; 25: 1324-1329.

29. Aljaud MO, Almutairi AM, Asiri MA, Almanki DM, Alswat K. Diabtes-related distress assessment among type 2 diabetes patients. Journal of Diabetes Research. 2018: https;//doi.org/10.1155/2018/7328128.

30. Islam MR, Karim MR, Habib SH, Yesmin K. Diabetes distress among type 2 diabetes patients. International Journal of Medicine and Biomedical Research. 2013; 2(2): 113-124.

31. Gregg JA, Callaghan GM, Hayes SC, Glenn-Lawson JL. Improving diabetes self-management through acceptance, mindfulness, and values: a randomized controlled trial. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 2007; 75(2): 336-343.

32. Schmitt A, Reimer A, Haak T, Gahr A, Hermanns N. Short Report: Educational and Psychological Issues. Assessment of diabetes acceptance can help identify patients with ineffective diabetes self-care and poor diabetes control. Diabet. Med. 2014; 31, 1446-1451.

33. Tengey J. Factors that affect glycemic control among type 2 diabetes mellitus patients in Kwaku South District, Eastern Region, Ghana. Available at http://ugspace.ug.edu.gh/bitstream/handle/123456789/5340/John%20Tengey_Factors%20that%20affect%20Glycaemic%20Control%20among%20Type%202%20Diabetes%20Mellitus%20Patients%20in%20Kwahu%20South%20District%20Eastern%20Region%2c%20Ghana_2012.pdf?sequence=1. 2012; [Accessed on: 06/03/16].

34. Schmitt A, Gahr A, Hermanns N, Kulzer B, Huber J, Haak T. Diabetes Self-Management Questionnaire (DSMQ): development and evaluation of an instrument to assess diabetes self-care activities associated with glycemic control. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2013; 11: 138.

35. Chew BH, Vos R, Mohd-Sidik S, Rutten GEH. Diabetes-related distress, depression and distress-depression among adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus in Malaysia. PLOS One. 2016; 11(3): article e0152095.

36. American Diabetes Association. Standard of Medical Care in Diabetes-2013, Diabetes Care, 2013; vol 36, suppl 1, 28.

37. Amoah AG, Owusu SK.,and Adjei, S. Diabetes in Ghana: a community-based prevalence study in Greater Accra. Diabetes Res Clin Pract. 2002; 56:197-205

38. Obirikorang Y, Obirikorang C, Anto EO, Acheampong E, Dzah N, Akosah CN, Nsenbah EB. (2016). Knowledge and lifestyle associated prevalence of obesity among newly-diagnosed type 2 diabetes mellitus patients attending diabetic clinic at Komfo Anokye Teaching Hospital, Kumasi, Ghana: A hospital-based cross-sectional study. Journal of Diabetes Research. 2016; 1-10.

39. CDC. Men's Health Network synopsis. 2001; Available at: http://www.menshealthnetwork.org/library/MvWhealthuse072501CDC.pdf [Accessed on: 07/03/2016]

40. Wild S, Sicree R, Roglic G, King H, Green A. Global Prevalence of Diabetes: Estimates for the year 2000 and projections for 2030. Diabetes Care. 2004; 27(5): 1047-1053.

41. Hosseinpoor AR, Bergen N, Mendis S, Harper S, Verdes E, Kunst A, Chatterji S. Socioeconomic inequality in the prevalence of non-communicable diseases in low- and middle-income countries: Results from the World Health Survey. 2012; Available at: http://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2458-12-474 [accessed on 23/03/2016].

42. Asamoah-Boakye O, Apprey C, Annan R. Prevalence of dyslipidaemia and atherogenic risk among type 2 diabetic outpatients in Ghana. International Journal of Public Health and Clinical Sciences, 2017; 4(3):152-163.

43. Ahmad NS, Islahudin F, Paraidathathu T. Factors associated with good glycaemic control among patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. Journal of Diabetes Investigation. 2014; 5: 563-569.

44. American Diabetes Association. Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes - 2009. Diabetes Care. 2009; 32 (Suppl 1):S13-S61.

ABBREVIATIONS

DSM- Diabetes Self-Management
BMI- Body Mass Index
HbA_{1c}- Glycated Haemoglobin
DSMQ- Diabetes Self-Management Questionnaire
PCA- Principal Component Analysis
DDS- Diabetes Distress Scale
AAD- Acceptance and Action on Diabetes