Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

THE EVALUATION OF THE USE OF HERBAL SUBSTANCES IN THE BATHS OF LABOURING WOMEN-A randomised controlled trial

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Midwifery at Massey University

IRENE CALVERT

MARCH 1998

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to study the progress of labour following the administration of the essential oil of ginger into the bath water of multiparous women who have experienced a previous vaginal birth. The woman's perception of pain and the amount of analgesia used were also assessed.

The method used for the study was a Randomised Controlled Double Blind Clinical Trial. The women in the experimental group received the essential oil of ginger and the women in the control group the essential oil of lemongrass. On admission in labour to delivery suite the consenting women were randomly allocated to either the experimental or the control group. The data were collected using three instruments: 1) a structured questionnaire for demographic data, 2) the visual analogue scale used to measure the intensity of the pain when the woman was in the bath, 3) the McGill Pain Questionnaire used 24 hours postpartum to describe and measure the individual's pain experience.

The results were analysed using the SAS PROC NPARIWAY programme and interpreted using the heading of cervical dilatation, contractions, the length of time in labour, pain and safety. There was no significant statistical difference between the two groups of women for all categories analysed with the exception of the second stage of labour. The women in the experimental group had a shorter second stage of labour than those in the control group (P=0.0142). There were no adverse affects on the women. All of the babies had Apgar scores of 9 at one minute and remained with their mothers following birth. Both groups of women rated their labour pain as severe. Due to the sample size being greatly reduced, N=22 instead of N=116, a type two error exists thus affecting the power of the study. This research should therefore be considered as a pilot study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- 1) First and foremost I wish to thank my husband Gordon for his advice, the proof reading, and for encouraging me to "cut my caseload in half" so that I could complete my thesis. I would never have made it without his support.
- 2) I wish to thank my thesis supervisor, Dr Cheryl Benn for her support and advice.
- 3) To my colleagues, Liz, Des, Helen, Chris, Sue, Charlotte, Louise and Janet many thanks.
- 4 Throughout the time frame of this study I have received support and encouragement from many people. To each of them I wish to express my sincere thanks, particularly to the midwives that participated in the study: Estelle, Nicky, Mary-Clare, and Marie. Should any of these people one day embark on such a venture I will be only too happy to offer my assistance.
- 5)To all the women who agreed to participate I am extremely grateful for without your support this study would not have been possible.
- 6) To Dr Val Fleming thanks for giving me the original article and encouraging me to embark on this venture.
- 7) To Michael Henley, I extend my gratitude for guiding an illiterate statistician through the process.
- 8) Thank you to Grant Donnelly the chemist, for preparing the bottles and for the time that he put into his organising of the trial.
- 9) To Robert Tisserand for advice on the oil to use for the control group as well as advice on the ingredients in the preparations.
- 10) Thanks to the Hutt Hospital Midwives for their interest and to Moira and Co. for measuring the amount of water contained in the baths.

- 11) To HMC for his support and encouragement.
- 12) To the librarians at Massey who provide a fantastic service.
- 13) To the Graduate Fund, your contribution to the study is appreciated.
- 14) To Liz and David for your support and proof reading.
- 15) To my mother who has always encouraged me in my career path.
- 16) Finally to my family Sue & Ian, Ian & Karin not only for their support and encouragement but for the endless advice to upgrade my computer skill or is it my computer?

LIST OF TABLES

- 4.1 Sample description.
- 4.2 The frequency of contractions palpated before and after the bath.
- 4.3 Cervical dilatation of the subjects before and after the bath.
- 4.4 The increase between the first and second measures of cervical dilatation.
- 4.5 The number of women who delivered before the second vaginal examination.
- 4.6 Average length of first and second stages of labour.
- 4.7 Comparison of the pain perception of the subjects as indicated on the visual analogue scale.
- 4.8 Number of sensory, affective, evaluative and miscellaneous descriptors marked on the PRI.
- 4.9 Spatial distribution of pain.
- 4.10 Pharmacological methods of pain relief used after the bath.
- 4.11 Maternal pulse rate before entering the bath, then after thirty and sixty minutes in the bath.
- 4.12 Foetal Heart Rate (FHR) measurements for all subjects before the bath and the first measurement when in the bath.
- 4.13 Apgar scores at one and five minutes after birth.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| ABSTRA | CT | Í |
|--------------------------------|---|-----|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | | iii |
| LIST OF | TABLES | v |
| | | |
| СНАРТЕ | ER ONE: Background and Orientation to the Study | 1 |
| 1.1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 1.2 | The aim of the study | 3 |
| 1.2.1 | The hypotheses | 3 |
| 1.3 | Theoretical framework | 4 |
| 1.4 | Significance of the study | 6 |
| 1.5 | Evidence based practice | 6 |
| 1.6 | Overview of the study | 9. |
| 1.7 | Summary | 10 |
| | | |
| CHAPTER TWO: Literature review | | 11 |
| 2.1 | Introduction | 11 |
| 2.2 | Childbirth models | 11 |

| 2.2 | Coming it is Form | 1.2 |
|---------|--|-----|
| 2 3 | Continuity of care | 13 |
| 2.4 | Labour | 19 |
| 2.4.1 | Initiation of labour | 19 |
| 2.4.2 | Stages of labour | 21 |
| 2.5 | Pain | 24 |
| 2.5.1 | Gate control theory of pain | 25 |
| 2.5.2 | Pain transmission | 28 |
| 2.5.3 | Endorphins | 29 |
| 2.5.4 | Catecholamines | 30 |
| 2.5.5 | Interventions that provide pain relief | 30 |
| 2.5.6 | Pain and the effects of antenatal education | 32 |
| 2.6 | The use of water in labour | 34 |
| 2.7 | Aromatherapy | 41 |
| 2.7.1 | Ginger | 44 |
| 2.7.2 | Lemongrass | 47 |
| 2.8 | The use of alternative therapies in midwifery practice | 48 |
| 2.9 | Summary | 50 |
| | | |
| CHAPTE | R THREE Methodology and methods | 52 |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 52 |
| 3.2 | Methodology | 53 |
| 3.2.1 | Method | 56 |
| 3.2.2 | Randomised clinical controlled double blind trial | 58 |
| 3.2.2.1 | Recruitment and selection of participants | 58 |

| | | X |
|-----------|----------------------------------|----|
| 3.2.2.2 | Selection criteria for the trial | 59 |
| 3.2.2.3 | Sample size and randomisation | 60 |
| 3.2.2.4 | Control | 63 |
| 3.2.2.5 | Data collection instruments | 65 |
| 3.2.2.6 | Treatment period | 68 |
| 3.2.2.7 | Statistical methods | 69 |
| 3.3 | Ethical issues | 71 |
| 3.4 | Dissemination of results | 74 |
| 3.5 | Summary | 74 |
| | | |
| CHAPTER | FOUR: Results of the Experiment | 75 |
| 4.1 | Introduction | 75 |
| 4.2 | The results of the experiment | 76 |
| 4.2.1 | The study | 76 |
| 4.2.2 | Sample description | 77 |
| 4.2.3 | Statistical analysis | 80 |
| 4.2.3.1 | Hypothesis one | 81 |
| 4.2.3.2 | Hypothesis two | 82 |
| 4.2.3.3 | Hypothesis three | 85 |
| 4.2.3.4 | Hypothesis four | 86 |
| 4.2.3.5 | Hypothesis five | 86 |
| 4.2.3.5.1 | Visual analogue scale | 87 |
| 4.2.3.6 | Hypothesis six | 88 |
| 4237 | Research objective | 91 |

| 4.2.3.7. | 1 Maternal pulse | × 92 |
|---------------|--|---------|
| 4.2.3.7.2 | 2 Foetal heart rate | 94 |
| 4.2.3.7. | 3 Apgar score | 95 |
| 4.3 | Summary | 97 |
| | | |
| СНАРТЕ | R FIVE: Discussion of the Experiment | 98 |
| 5.1 | Introduction | 98 |
| 5.2 | Hypothesis one | 98 |
| 53 | Hypothesis two | 99 |
| 5.4 | Hypothesis three | 101 |
| 5.5 | Hypothesis four | 101 |
| 5.6 | Hypothesis five | 101 |
| 5.7 | Hypothesis six | 102 |
| 5.8 | Research objective | 104 |
| 5.9 | The limitations of the study | 105 |
| 5.9.1 | The reduced number of women in the study | 106 |
| 5.9.2 | The study design | 108 |
| 5.9.3 | Generalisations of the study findings | 109 |
| 5.10 | Future research | 109 |
| 5.11 | Issues for practice | 111 |
| 5.12 | Issues for education | 112 |
| 5.13 | Summary | 112 |
| POSTSCRIPT | | 113 |
| REFERENCELIST | | 115 |