



ADJUSTMENT TO COLOSTOMY: STOMA ACCEPTANCE, STOMA CARE SELF-EFFICACY AND INTER-PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Journal:	<i>Journal of Advanced Nursing</i>
Manuscript ID:	JAN-2006-0774.R2
Manuscript Type:	Manuscript/Short Report
Keywords:	Quality of Life, Stoma care



Copy

1
2
3 **ADJUSTMENT TO COLOSTOMY: STOMA ACCEPTANCE,**
4
5 **STOMA CARE SELF-EFFICACY AND INTER-PERSONAL**
6
7 **RELATIONSHIPS**
8
9

10
11
12 **Short title**

13
14
15 Adjustment in Patients with a Colostomy
16
17

18
19
20 **Authors**

21
22 Kingsley L. Simmons, PhD, MSc, BSc (Hons), RGN, RMN, PGCE
23

24
25 Principal Lecturer, University of Hertfordshire, UK
26

27
28 Tel: 01707285925; email: k.simmons@herts.ac.uk
29
30

31
32 Jane A. Smith, MA, RGN, Cert. Ed
33

34
35 Senior Lecturer, University of Hertfordshire, UK
36

37
38 Tel: 01707284060; email: j.6.smith@herts.ac.uk
39
40

41
42 Karen-Ann Bobb, RGN
43

44
45 Stoma Care Clinical Nurse Specialist, East and North Herts NHS Trust, UK
46

47
48 Tel: 01438 781133; email: karen.bobb@nhs.net
49
50

51
52 Laura L. M. Liles, RGN
53

54
55 Stoma Care Clinical Nurse Specialist, West Herts. NHS Trust, UK
56

57
58 Tel: 01727 897152; email: laura.liles@whht.nhs.co.uk
59

60
Accepted: 27-07-07

Category: Original Research

ABSTRACT max 250 words**Aim:**

This paper is a report of a study examining adjustment and its relationship with stoma acceptance and social interaction and the link between stoma care self-efficacy and adjustment in the presence of acceptance and social interactions.

Background: There have been significant advances in stoma appliances and an increase in nurses specialising in stoma care. Despite this, a large proportion of patients continue to experience adjustment problems, which suggests that improvements in the management of the stoma are by themselves not enough to enhance psychosocial functioning. Illness acceptance and interpersonal relationships are widely reported as correlates of adjustment to chronic illness, but these have not been specifically examined in patients with a colostomy. Evidence of their association could offer stoma therapists alternative ways of aiding adjustment.

Method: Between 2000 and 2002, 51 patients with colostomies provided demographic and clinical data and completed validated questionnaires to measure acceptance of the stoma, relationship with others and stoma care self-efficacy six months after surgery.

Findings: Multiple regression analysis showed that stoma care self-efficacy, stoma acceptance, interpersonal relationship and location of the stoma were strongly associated with adjustment. The model explained 77% of the variance. Stoma-care self-efficacy accounted for 57.5%, the psychosocial

1
2
3 variables 13% and location of the stoma 4.6%. The addition of gender,
4
5 which was not statistically significant ($p>.05$), explained a further 1.9% of
6
7 the variance.
8
9

10 **Conclusion:** Addressing psychosocial concerns should become part of the
11
12 care routinely given to stoma patients. We recommend more emphasis on
13
14 dispelling negative thoughts and encouraging social interactions.
15
16
17

18 19 20 **KEY WORDS**

21
22 Stoma care, adjustment, acceptance, nursing, self-efficacy, questionnaire,
23
24 interpersonal relationships
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 **SUMMARY STATEMENT**

59 **What is already known on this topic**
60

- Technical advances in stoma appliances and increasing numbers of stoma therapists have resulted in improvements in colostomy management
- Psychosocial problems are prevalent and have not decreased in line with improvements in stoma management
- Patients having a colostomy undergo profound changes in life-style habits and negative beliefs about body image

What this study adds

- The competence of people to manage their colostomies is not sufficient to foster psychosocial adjustment and aid return to a full and active life.
- People who fail to accept their colostomy and who experience poor interpersonal relationships are less likely to report improvements in adjustment to stoma surgery.
- Colostomy care should involve strategies that encourage people to accept their stoma and engage in social activities.

INTRODUCTION

1
2
3 The latest published worldwide estimate of colorectal cancers (IARC
4 GLOBOCAN, 2005), the diagnoses most likely to end with a colostomy
5 following surgery, suggested that one million new cases occur annually. In
6 Europe, new cases totalled 412,900 in 2006 (Ferlay *et al.*, 2007). However,
7 probably because of a combination of the publicity given to the benefits of
8 screening and improvements in surgical techniques and adjuvant therapy,
9 recent years have seen a gradual but steady decrease in the number of
10 patients dying within 5 years of diagnosis (American Cancer Society, 2007;
11 ISD Online, 2006). This suggests that patients with a colostomy as a result
12 of cancer would be expected to live with the associated consequences for
13 longer, a factor which has stimulated a number of studies examining quality
14 of life in stoma patients (Brown & Jacqueline, 2005; Karadag *et al.*, 2003).

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 More than 13, 000 patients undergo stoma surgery each year in the United
35 Kingdom (UK) (Baxter & Salter, 2000), a high proportion of which ends
36 with a colostomy. Although in the majority of cases the surgery is a life-
37 saving procedure, it nonetheless represents a threat to both physical and
38 psychological functioning (Bekkers *et al.*, 1995; Brown & Jacqueline, 2005;
39 Sprangers *et al.*, 1995). How people adjust to these challenges has become
40 a focus of much research. Results so far suggest that perceived personal
41 control (Mc Vey *et al.*, 2001; White & Unwin, 1998) and stoma care self-
42 efficacy (Bekkers *et al.*, 1996), which form the theoretical base for the
43 present approach to stoma care, are influencing factors. However, despite
44 the best efforts of an increasing number of stoma therapists and
45 corresponding advances in stoma appliance technology, levels of
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

maladjustment has changed little over the years (Brown & Jacqueline, 2005). This suggests that competence in self-care management is, by itself, insufficient to promote adjustment.

Studies of patients with chronic diseases suggest that adaptation is better in those who accept their diagnosis (Abraido-Lanza *et al.*, 2004) and have access to good supportive relationships (Giesse-Davis *et al.*, 2000), and worse in those with limited social activity (Bloom & Spiegel, 1984). The effects of these on adjustment to a colostomy have not been explicitly examined before, but we suspect their effects could be similar. Therefore, we evaluated their associations with adjustment in a survey of patients with colostomies six months after surgery. If associations are confirmed it would be necessary to review the care now provided by stoma therapists.

BACKGROUND

There are consistent reports of psychological and social dysfunction in patients whose surgery end with a colostomy. According to a review of studies published between 1969 and 1992 (Sprangers *et al.*, 1995), depression, loneliness, suicidal thoughts, and low self-esteem are prevalent, and significantly more so than in non-stoma patients. Sexual impairment, as shown in a follow-up evaluation of Finnish men who underwent rectal surgery a year earlier (Vironen *et al.*, 2006) and negative beliefs about body image (Brown & Jacqueline, 2005) are no less common. The major impact, however, is on social functioning, with patients reporting a decrease in

1
2
3 social and leisure activities, an increase in marital problems and less contact
4 with relatives and friends (Sprangers *et al.*, 1995; Vironen *et al.*, 2006).
5
6
7

8
9
10 There have been notable advances in the appliances used by patients with a
11 colostomy. The stoma plug is unobtrusive and effective in controlling
12 faecal leakage, gas emission and odour (Cazador *et al.*, 1993; Soliani *et al.*,
13 1992); the two-piece pouch or plug reduces the risk of skin excoriation; and
14 the flushable pouch assists with easy hygienic disposal of faecal contents
15 (McKenzie *et al.*, 2006) . In theory at least, these advances should help
16 patients regain the confidence to resume social and leisure pursuits.
17
18
19

20 However, the continually high proportion who adjust poorly to the stoma
21 (Vironen *et al.*, 2006) suggests that technological improvements in the
22 appliances are not enough. Indeed, reports that patients who are competent
23 (Bekkers *et al.*, 1996; Piwonka & Merino, 1999) and those who believe in
24 taking personal control over the management of their stoma (Mc Vey *et al.*,
25 2001; White & Unwin, 1998) show better adjustment, reinforces the
26 argument that advances in technology *per se* have a limited impact on
27 adjustment.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 The current approach to colostomy care, which has changed little over the
49 years, takes account of patients' need to be self-sufficient and their desire
50 for personal control. Central to that care is training by specialist nurses in
51 the appropriate use of stoma appliances and the offer of advice on dietary
52 behaviours related to bowel control. So far there has been only limited
53 evaluation of the impact of that care on psychological outcomes and
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 important improvements have been reported in the few studies that have
4
5 evaluated this. Wade (1990) found lower levels of affective disorders in
6
7 Welsh patients who had access to a stoma therapist. Karadag et al (2003),
8
9 in an investigation with Turkish patients, found that those who received care
10
11 from a stoma therapy nurse had substantially better quality of life than those
12
13 who did not receive such care.
14
15
16

17
18
19 However, flaws in the methodology of those studies leave their results open
20
21 to question. For instance, there were no baseline assessments of emotional
22
23 disorder in Wade's study. Therefore it would have been difficult to estimate
24
25 how much patients had improved after receiving care from the stoma
26
27 therapist. Quality of life is a concept which is variably defined, and it can
28
29 be influenced by many factors, some of which could be inter-related. Yet
30
31 Karadag and her colleagues used only univariate tests to unravel such
32
33 complex relationships, without regard for *Type I* statistical error. Therefore
34
35 the strength of the relationship between stoma therapy and quality of life,
36
37 independent of other variables, is not clear. Furthermore, neither study can
38
39 explain why in countries such as the UK, where there is almost universal
40
41 access to a stoma therapist (Diversey Lever, 2006), psychological distress
42
43 and social interaction remain problems for many patients.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51
52 Many people with a disability use disengagement as a way of coping by, for
53
54 example, avoiding situations that could arouse fear and distress (Livneh *et*
55
56 *al.*, 2004), or because of concerns that they may not be accepted socially.
57
58 Regarding the latter, the literature on chronic illness suggests that such
59
60

1
2
3 concerns could be misplaced. Li & Moore (1998) have argued that if
4
5 patients accept their own disabilities, they are more likely to be accepted by
6
7 society at large. Studies have confirmed that such people receive more
8
9 emotional support, perceive less discrimination, are higher in self-esteem
10
11 (Li & Moore, 1998) and more satisfied with life (Livneh *et al.*, 2004). The
12
13 growing body of evidence from acceptance-based intervention studies
14
15 showing statistically significant improvements in patients with pain (Dahl *et*
16
17 *al.*, 2004; Gutterrez *et al.*, 2004) epilepsy (Lundgren *et al.*, 2006) and
18
19 newly-fitted dentures (McGuire *et al.*, In press) offers further confirmation
20
21 of the role of acceptance in the adaptation process. Yet no study seems to
22
23 have explicitly examined links between acceptance and psychosocial
24
25 adjustment in patients with colostomies, although these patients hold fears
26
27 of public embarrassment and rejection, among other negative thoughts
28
29 (Brown & Jacqueline, 2005),
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Talking about stressful life events in a supportive context is a key
40
41 component of successful coping (Lepore *et al.*, 2000) and a positive
42
43 adjustment behaviour (Pennebaker, 1993). Talking helps individuals to
44
45 make sense of their experience (Lepore *et al.*, 1996) and achieve emotional
46
47 resolution (Smyth, 1998). It is associated with psychological well-being
48
49 (Arora *et al.*, In press; Mallinger *et al.*, 2006) and role and social
50
51 functioning, as Kerr (2003) found in her prospective investigation of
52
53 patients with rectal cancer. As the primary sources of support, patients are
54
55 most likely to talk about health-related concerns with family and friends and
56
57 healthcare professionals, and there can be little doubt of the benefits of
58
59
60

1
2
3 doing so (Arora *et al.*, In press; Mallinger *et al.*, 2006; Piwonka & Merino,
4
5
6 1999). However, it is doubtful whether all patients have the capacity to seek
7
8 or mobilize the support available to them. People characterised by
9
10 dispositional pessimism (Friedman *et al.*, 2006) might feel that they would
11
12 derive little benefit from social engagement, and those burdened with
13
14 intrusive thoughts about the adverse effects of the event (Lepore *et al.*,
15
16 1996) could be inhibited. For example, patients who cognitively suppress
17
18 thoughts about the adverse consequences of their illness might avoid
19
20 interactions which could act as a reminder, thus restricting access to sources
21
22 of both informational and emotional support. Given the volume of evidence
23
24 confirming the predictive effect of social support on adaptation to chronic
25
26 illness (Friedman *et al.*, 2006; Han *et al.*, 2005; Kerr *et al.*, 2003; Piwonka
27
28 & Merino, 1999), we suggest that people with a colostomy who find it
29
30 difficult to engage with family and friends are more likely to be poorly
31
32 adjusted.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 In summary, like other patients with a chronic illness, adjustment in those
42
43 with a colostomy could be much improved if they access the support which
44
45 is available to them. This is more likely in patients who accept the
46
47 limitations of their surgery and perceive less discomfort in their interactions
48
49 with other people. It seems plausible that patients who are more accepting
50
51 of their colostomy would be more likely to take control of their care,
52
53 become better at managing it and less reluctant to interact socially. This
54
55 suggests a complex relationship between acceptance, social interaction and
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 stoma care self-efficacy which needs to be unravelled if we are to find other
4
5 ways of delivering effective care to patients with colostomies.
6
7
8
9

10 **THE STUDY**

11 **Aim**

12
13 The aim of the study was to examine adjustment and its relationship with
14
15 stoma acceptance and social interaction and the link between stoma care
16
17 self-efficacy and adjustment in the presence of acceptance and social
18
19 interactions.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 We predicted that:

- 28 - the more patients accept and come to terms with the limitations of
- 29 their colostomy, the higher will be their level of adjustment.
- 30
- 31 - the more patients avoid social encounters the least likely they are to
- 32 be adjusted.
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39

40 **Participants**

41
42 People who underwent colostomy surgery in one of two district hospitals in
43
44 the UK were invited to take part in the study if they could read and write
45
46 English. We excluded those who were clinically diagnosed with mental
47
48 illness. Those conditions are characterised by feelings of loneliness, social
49
50 isolation and cognitive impairment (Murray *et al.*, 2006; Smith *et al.*, 2006).
51
52 Therefore the responses of such patients afflicted may not truly reflect
53
54 stoma-related concerns. We used an upper limit of 80 years as a criterion
55
56 for inclusion because discussions with stoma therapists suggested that
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 beyond that age patients with colostomies are less socially active, and the
4
5 creation of the stoma makes little difference in that regard.
6
7

8
9
10 During the study period (2000-2002), 70 patients were approached. Seven
11
12 refused to take part. Eleven did not complete the investigation due to death
13
14 (3), reversal surgery (2) migration (2) or drop-out (4). One respondent was
15
16 excluded on grounds of age. Therefore, 51 patients provided assessable data.
17
18 All had access to a stoma therapist before surgery and after discharge from
19
20 hospital.
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Measures**

28 *Adjustment to a stoma*

29
30
31
32
33 Adjustment to a stoma is defined here as the overall impact of the stoma on
34
35 psychological, social and sexual functioning, as perceived by patients. The
36
37 Ostomy Adjustment Scale (Olbrisch, 1983), which takes account of these
38
39 variables, was designed specifically to assess the responses of patients with
40
41 a stoma. It has 34 items, some in the negative direction, and each measured
42
43 on a 6-point Likert scale. Higher scores indicate better adjustment. The
44
45 reported reliability (Cronbach's alpha = 0.85; test-retest $r = .72$) was later
46
47 confirmed in a study of Swedish patients with stomas (Brydolf *et al.*, 1994).
48
49
50 Based on a factor analysis, Olbrisch produced two shortened 17-item
51
52 versions (Short Form 1 and Short Form 2) and indicated that each could be
53
54 used independently without impairing the reliability or validity of the
55
56 original questionnaire. In this study we used Short Form 2.
57
58
59
60

Acceptance of the stoma

Based on previous work by Felton (1984), we conceptualize stoma acceptance as the extent to which patients with colostomies accept the limitations of their surgery without experiencing negative feelings. We used the Acceptance of Illness Scale (AIS) (Felton, 1984) as the measure of acceptance. That scale has a high internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha =.081). However, because it measures acceptance of illness in general and we wanted respondents to focus on their stoma rather than on other pathologies, the word "illness" on the questionnaire items was substituted by the word "stoma". Using the responses from our sample, tests showed that the internal consistency of the scale had improved (Cronbach's alpha = 0.90). The AIS consists of 8 items, each measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly agree" to "Strongly disagree". All but one of the items measure a negative attribute of the illness and are therefore scored in the negative direction (Strongly disagree = 5; strongly agree = 1.) Thus, higher scores indicate high acceptance.

Stoma Care Self-Efficacy

Stoma care self-efficacy refers to the conviction by patients that they can successfully manage their stoma to minimise adverse outcomes. Bekkers (1996) developed the Stoma Self-Efficacy Scale, which has two components, each assessing different concepts. One component, Stoma

Care Self-Efficacy (Cronbach's alpha = 0.94, 13 items), assesses expected self-efficacy regarding capability to care for one's stoma. The other, Social Self-Efficacy (Cronbach's alpha = 0.95), assesses self-efficacy regarding social functioning with the stoma. The two scales are highly correlated ($r = .73$). Therefore, if used in the same analysis, they can lead to unstable regression coefficients (Gordon, 1968). Bekkers (1996) has suggested that they be used separately. Because our focus was on patients' ability to care for their stoma, we used the Stoma Care Self-Efficacy subscale; respondents choose one of five categories, ranging from "not at all confident" to "extremely confident". Higher scores correspond to higher levels of confidence.

Interpersonal Relationships

Interpersonal relationships are defined as the ease with which one relates and interacts with other people. We measured this using the Sociable subscale of the Horowitz et al (1988) Inventory of Interpersonal Problems (test-retest = .82). This has 13 items, each prefixed by "It is hard for me to" and measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all" (0) to "Extremely" (4). Therefore, higher scores indicate more problems with social relationships.

Data collection

On admission, consecutive patients fitting the study criteria were invited to participate, having had the study explained (orally and in writing) by the resident stoma therapist. They were told that we were investigating the

1
2
3 impact of stoma surgery on people's lives. If they consented, they were
4
5 asked to provide standard demographic data. Their medical records were
6
7 the source of clinical data, including type of admission (planned or
8
9 unplanned), type of stoma (colon or rectal), status of the disease (malignant
10
11 or non-malignant) and post-surgical oncology treatment (chemotherapy and
12
13 radiotherapy). Patients were given a choice between the conventional stoma
14
15 pouch and the stoma plug, which is used interchangeably with the pouch.
16
17 None of the patients in the study irrigated their stoma as this was not
18
19 routinely offered in the source hospitals. Six months after surgery, when
20
21 improvements in adjustment would have reached a plateau (Bekkers *et al.*,
22
23 1996; Wade, 1990), participants received the battery of questionnaires,
24
25 together with a stamped, self-addressed envelope for their return.
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Ethical considerations**

32
33 The Local Research Ethics Committees approved the study. In responding
34
35 to our questionnaires, participants would be expected to recall experiences
36
37 which could be stressful. Those receiving post-surgical treatment such as
38
39 chemotherapy and radiotherapy could find participation an extra burden.
40
41 These issues were discussed with people before they were asked to
42
43 participate in the study. Those who had concerns after giving consent were
44
45 encouraged to use the telephone service which, as part of normal practice at
46
47 the source hospital, gives all patients with colostomies access to the resident
48
49 stoma therapist.
50
51
52

53 **Data analysis**

54
55 The data were analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
56
57 (*SPSS, 12*). Multiple regression analysis was the main statistical approach.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

As suggested by Hosmer and Lemeshow (2000), all variables were first screened for their association with adjustment. Those with a statistically significant relationship ($p \leq .05$) were entered in a multiple regression analysis.

RESULTS

Demographics

Of the 51 participants (male = 27, female = 24) ranging in age from 30 to 78 years (mean = 57.2, sd = 10.96), 92% were married or co-habiting, 70% had planned surgery, 62.7% a rectal stoma, 68.6% a malignant tumour and 47.1% had chemotherapy or radiotherapy or a combination of these. Thirty patients (58.8%) chose to use the stoma plug. Table 1 shows the means and standard deviation of these variables on the adjustment scale. Participants who refused, or whose data were not analysed for other reasons, were older than the others (mean = 62yrs, sd = 11.02) and fewer had planned surgery (55.6%) and rectal stoma (50%). In all other respects the two groups were similar. Scores on the questionnaire measuring adjustment were skewed, indicating that most participants had adjusted to their stoma.

Adjustment

The results of the screening analysis (Table 2) showed that of the socio-demographic and clinical variables, only type of stoma ($t = -2.56, p = .005$) and gender ($t = -1.98, p = .04$) correlated significantly with adjustment. Stoma care self-efficacy ($t = 3.36, p = .002$), stoma acceptance ($t = 4.16, p$

1
2
3 = $<.001$) and interpersonal problems ($t = -2.25, p = .03$) correlated with
4
5 adjustment.
6
7

8
9 The variables with statistically significant relationships in the screening
10 analysis were entered in a multiple regression. The model resulting from
11 that explained 77% of the variance in adjustment (Table 3). Of that, stoma
12 care self-efficacy accounted for 57.5%, psychosocial variables (acceptance
13 and interpersonal relationships) for 13 % and type of stoma for 4.6%.
14
15

16
17 Although gender was not statistically significant ($p > .05$), its contribution to
18 the model added a further 1.9% to the explained variance.
19
20

21
22 Stoma acceptance and interpersonal relationships were strongly correlated (r
23 = $-.55, p < .01$), and each correlated with stoma care self-efficacy ($r = .69$
24 and $-.43$ respectively, $p < .01$). However, according to the tolerance
25 statistics (range: $.54 - .82$) problems with collinearity are unlikely.
26
27

28
29 Therefore, independent of each other, stoma care self-efficacy, stoma
30 acceptance and interpersonal relationships are statistically significantly
31 associated with adjustment. Thus, patients who accepted their stoma, were
32 able to manage it effectively and who experienced little or no distress in
33 social interactions were more likely to be adjusted six months after having
34 surgery. Adjustment was better in patients with a colon stoma.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 DISCUSSION

54
55 People with a colostomy have to contend with substantial changes in bowel
56 functions, dietary habits and body image. Adjusting to these changes could
57 be challenging, but our results suggest that effective management of the
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

stoma aids the process. Therefore, ensuring that people have the skills to manage their colostomy, as is currently the case, is important. However, as the results also show, psychosocial and to a lesser extent, disease factors also aid adjustment, which suggest that addressing these should also form part of the patient's care.

One of our main interests in this study was the role of acceptance of the stoma. Consistent with our prediction, those who accepted their colostomy were better adjusted. They expressed fewer fears of public embarrassment and inadequacy, lower levels of functional limitations and feelings of more control over their colostomy. This suggests that people who are more accepting of their colostomy would be less fearful of social rejection and more inclined to be proactive in seeking support. The public at large are sympathetic to the plight of people with long-term functional disabilities and readily offer the support requested of them (Li & Moore, 1998). Therefore, people who seek support outside the home are likely to receive it, not only from healthcare professionals but also from their wider social network. We suggest that patients with colostomies who accept their surgery are better able to use these sources of support. Given the benefits of social support on psychological functioning in people experiencing traumatic life events (Abraido-Lanza *et al.*, 2004; Pennebaker, 1993; Piwonka & Merino, 1999), it is not surprising that patients who accepted their stoma recorded higher levels of adjustment.

1
2
3 Our other interest was the role of social interaction. As we predicted, scores
4 on the adjustment scale declined with increasing distress in social
5 interaction, as measured on the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems. Those
6 who adjusted poorly found it difficult to disclose their feelings and to
7 socialize, suggesting reluctance to engage in activities that could arouse
8 suppressed emotions associated with the colostomy. Alternatively, they
9 could have limited their contact with other people because they were
10 burdened with intrusive thoughts. Intrusive thoughts are common in
11 patients with distressing diagnoses (Lutgendork *et al.*, 1997) and hinder
12 social interaction (Lepore *et al.*, 1996). Therefore, the patients in our
13 sample who experienced problems with interpersonal relationships, whether
14 due to intrusive thoughts or fears of arousing suppressed emotions, would
15 have limited their opportunities for emotional disclosure and, as Lepore *et al*
16 (2000) suggested, this could have had a negative impact on their adjustment.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Although there was a tendency for men to report higher levels of
40 adjustment, the anatomical site of the stoma was the only statistically
41 significant predictor among the demographic and clinical variables.
42 Participants with a rectal stoma reported more adjustment problems. They
43 were no more likely than the others to have post-surgical oncology
44 treatment ($\chi^2 = 3.3$, $df = 1$, $p = .09$), were younger ($p < .05$) and more had
45 planned surgery ($\chi^2 = 16.6$, $df =$, $p < .001$). However, none of this explains
46 why they should experience more problems, because neither age nor type of
47 admission predicted adjustment. Discussions with stoma specialists also
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 offered no obvious explanation for the observation. Therefore, more work
4
5 is needed to clarify this relationship.
6
7
8
9

10 A diagnosis of cancer generates considerable psychological distress (Couper
11 *et al.*, 2006). Therefore a difference might have been expected between
12
13 patients with malignant and non-malignant disease. However, of our 36
14
15 with a cancerous tumour, 25 attended for chemotherapy and/or radiotherapy
16
17 post-surgery, and therefore they could have benefited from the regular
18
19 contact with health care professionals. The lack of a stoma appliance effect
20
21 is also surprising because the plug has been shown to be better at controlling
22
23 faecal leakage and gas emission (Cazador *et al.*, 1993; Soliani *et al.*, 1992),
24
25 and in our sample most participants favoured it ($\chi^2 = 4.2$, $df=1$, $p < .05$).
26
27 However, for ethical reasons, participants chose between the pouch and the
28
29 plug and so were not randomly selected for the appliance they used.
30
31 Therefore failure to show an effect in favour of the plug could be the result
32
33 of selection bias.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Study limitations**

44
45 We are unable to confirm a causal relationship between adjustment and the
46
47 psychosocial variables because they were all assessed at the same time.
48
49 There was also overlap between the measure of adjustment and those of the
50
51 psychosocial variables. Each, for example, assesses reaction to social
52
53 gatherings. The very close association between these scales could explain
54
55 the high level of variance explained by the model. These results cannot be
56
57 extrapolated to people with a mental illness or those over 80 years of age
58
59
60

1
2
3 because these people were excluded from the study. Finally, as a result of
4 the screening analysis, 5 variables were entered in the final model and rule
5 of thumb, often quoted by statisticians (Field, 2005), suggest the results
6 would be repeated in other samples. However, because the rule of thumb
7 approach is not the most scientific method for conducting sample size
8 calculations (Rashidian *et al.*, 2006), the power of the study could be open
9 to question.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 CONCLUSION

23
24 Enhancing adjustment in people with a colostomy surgery is a prime focus
25 of care. However, the present approach to care is insufficient to do that
26 because it does not take account of cognitive and behavioural responses to
27 the colostomy. Our study suggests a better outcome for people if they can
28 be encouraged to accept their stoma and engage in social activities. The
29 challenge for stoma clinicians is to find ways of achieving this.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 The finding that people with a rectal stoma experience more adjustment
42 problems need to be confirmed in future studies. However, in the meantime
43 stoma therapists could consider offering them extra support.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 These findings challenge current practice in colostomy care, which fails to
51 address psychological responses to the surgery. This failure may be due, in
52 part, to present educational curricula which do not equip students with the
53 appropriate skills. A shift is therefore needed to a programme specifically
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 designed to enable them to address patients' social and psychological
4
5 concerns.
6
7

8 **Author Contributions**

9
10 KS, JS and KB were responsible for the study conception and design and
11
12 KS was responsible for the drafting of the manuscript.
13

14
15 KB, LL and JS performed the data collection and KS performed the data
16
17 analysis.
18

19
20 KS, JS, KB and LL made critical revisions to the paper.
21

22
23 KS provided statistical expertise.
24

25
26 KS supervised the study
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

REFERENCES

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Abraido-Lanza A., Vasquez E. & Echverria S. (2004): Religious and other
9 forms of coping among Latinos with arthritis. *Journal of*
10 *Counselling and Clinical Psychology* **72**, 91-102.
11
- 12 American Cancer Society (2007) Cancer Facts & Figures 2007. American
13 Cancer Society, Atlanta.
14
- 15
16 Arora N.K., Rutten F.L.J., Gustafson D.H., Moser R. & Hawkins R.P. (In
17 press): Perceived helpfulness and impact of social support provided
18 by family, friends, and health care providers to women newly
19 diagnosed with breast cancer. *Psycho-oncology*.
20
- 21
22 Baxter A. & Salter M. (2000): Stoma care nursing *Nursing Standard* **14**, 59.
23
- 24 Bekkers M., van Knippenberg F., van den Borne H., Poen H., Bergsma J. &
25 van Berge Henegouwen G. (1995): Psychosocial Adaption to Stoma
26 Surgery: A Review. *Journal of Behavioural Medicine* **18**, 1-29.
27
- 28
29 Bekkers M.J.T.M., Van Knippenberg F.C.E., Van den Borne H.W. & Van
30 Berge-Henegouwen G.P. (1996): Prospective Evaluation of
31 Psychosocial Adaptation to Stoma Surgery: The Role of Self-
32 Efficacy. *Psychosomatic Medicine* **58**, 183-191.
33
- 34
35 Bloom J.R. & Spiegel D. (1984): The Relationship of two Dimensions of
36 Social Support to the Psychological Well-Being and Social
37 Functioning of Women with Advanced Breast Cancer. *Soc. Sci.*
38 *Med.* **Vol. 19**, 831 - 837.
39
- 40
41 Brown H. & Jacqueline R. (2005): Living with a stoma: a review of the
42 literature. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* **14**, 74-81.
43
- 44
45 Brydolf M., Berndtsson I., Lindholm E. & Berglund B. (1994): Evaluation
46 of a Swedish Version of the Ostomy Adjustment Scale. *Scand. J.*
47 *Caring Sciences* **8**, 179-183.
48
- 49
50 Cazador C., Pinol M., Montane J., Nogueras F. & Sunol J. (1993):
51 Multicentre study of a continent colostomy plug. *British Journal of*
52 *Surgeons* **80**, 930-932.
53
- 54
55 Couper J.W., Bloch S., Love A., Duchesne G., Macvean M. & Kissane
56 D.W. (2006): Psychological impact of prostate cancer in patients and
57 their partners. *Med. J. Aust* **185**, 428-32.
58
- 59
60 Dahl J.A., Wilson K. & Nilsson A. (2004): Acceptance and Commitment
Therapy and the Treatment of Persons at Risk for Long-Term
Disability Resulting From Stress and Pain Symptoms: A preliminary
Randomized Trial. *Behaviour Therapy* **35**, 785-801.

- 1
2
3 Diversey Lever (2006) *Infection Control & Wound Care Yearbook 2006*.
4 CMA Medical Data. Cambridge.
5
6
7 Felton e.a. (1984) Acceptance of Illness Scale. In *Measures in Health*
8 *Psychology*, Berkshire.
9
10 Ferlay J., Autier P., Boniol M., Heanue M., Colombet M. & Boyle P.
11 (2007): Estimates of the cancer incidence and mortality in Europe in
12 2006. *Annals of Oncology* **18**, 581-592.
13
14
15 Field A. (2005) *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. SAGE Publications.
16 London.
17
18 Friedman L.C., Kalidas M., Elledge R., Chang J., Romero C., Husain I.,
19 Dulay M.F. & Liscum K.R. (2006): Optimism, social support and
20 psychological functioning among women with breast cancer.
21 *Psycho-oncology* **15**, 595-603.
22
23
24 Giesse-Davis J., Hermanson K., Koopman C., Weibel D. & Spiegel D.
25 (2000): Quality of couple relationship and adjustment t metasttic
26 breast cancer. *Journal of Family Psychology* **14**, 251-266.
27
28
29 Gordon R. (1968): Issues in multiple regression. *American Journal of*
30 *Sociology* **79**, 592-616.
31
32
33 Gutterrez O., Luciano C., Rodriguez M. & Fink B.C. (2004): Comparison
34 between an Acceptance-based and a Cognitive-Control-based
35 Protocol for Coping With Pain. *Behaviour Therapy* **35**, 767-783.
36
37
38 Han W.T., Collie K., Koopman C., Azarow J., Classen C., Morrow G.R.,
39 Michel B., Brennan-O'Neil E. & Spiegel D. (2005): Breast cancer
40 and problems with medical interactions: relationships with traumatic
41 stress, emotional self-efficacy, and social support. *Psycho-oncology*
42 **14**, 318-330.
43
44
45 Horowitz L.M., Rosenberg S.E., Baer B.A. & Ureno G. (1988): Inventory of
46 Interpersonal problems: Psychometric properties and clinical
47 applications. *Journal of Counselling and Clinical Psychology* **56**,
48 885-892.
49
50
51 Hosmer D.W. & Lemeshow (2000) *Applied Regression Analysis*. Wiley.
52 New York.
53
54
55 IARC GLOBOCAN (2005): Cancer Incidence, Mortality and Prevalence
56 Worldwide (2002 estimates).
57
58
59
60 ISD Online (2006) Cancer Incidence and mortality data. Cancer Research
UK.
Karadag A., Menten B.B., Uner A., Irkorucu O., Ayaz S. & Ozkan S.
(2003): Impact of stomatherapy on quality of life in patients with

1
2
3 permanent colostomies and ileostomies. *Int J Colorectal Dis* **18**,
4 234-238.

5
6
7 Kerr J., Engel J., Schlesinger-Raab, Sauer H. & Holzel D. (2003): Doctor-
8 Patient Communication: Results of a four-year prospective study in
9 rectal cancer patients. *Dis Colon Rectum*
10 **46**, 1038-1046.

11
12 Lepore S., JD R. & Jones S. (2000): Talking facilitates cognitive-emotional
13 processes of adaptation to an acute stressor:. *Journal of Personality*
14 *and Social Psychology* **78**, 499-508.

15
16
17 Lepore S., Silver R., Wortman C. & Wayment H. (1996): Social constraints,
18 intrusive thoughts, and depressive symptoms among bereaved
19 mothers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **70**, 271-282.

20
21
22 Li L. & Moore D. (1998): Acceptance of disability and its correlates.
23 *Journal of Social Psychology* **138**, 13-25.

24
25
26 Livneh H., Lott S.M. & Antonak R.F. (2004): Pattern to psychosocial
27 adaption to chronic illness and disability: a cluster analytic approach.
28 *Psychology, Health and Medicine* **9**, 411-430.

29
30
31 Lundgren T., Dahl J.A., Melin L. & Kies B. (2006): Evaluation of
32 Acceptance and Commitment Therapy for Drug Refractory
33 Epilepsy: A Randomized Controlled Trial in South Africa- A Pilot
34 Study. *Epilepsy* **47**, 2173-2179.

35
36
37 Lutgendork S., Antoni M., Ironson G., Schneiderman N. & Fletcher M.
38 (1997): Cognitive processing style, affective status, and immune
39 function following HIV seropositivity notification. *Cognitive*
40 *Therapy and Research* **21**, 157-184.

41
42
43 Mallinger J., Griggs J. & Shields C. (2006): Family communication and
44 mental health after breast cancer. *European Journal of Cancer Care*
45 **15**, 335-361.

46
47
48 Mc Vey J., Madill A. & Fielding D. (2001): The relevance of lowered
49 personal control for patients who have stoma surgery to treat cancer.
50 *British Journal of Clinical Psychology* **40**, 337 - 360.

51
52
53 McGuire L., Millar K. & Lindsay S. (In press): A treatment trial of an
54 information package to help patients accept new dentures. *Behaviour*
55 *Research and Therapy*.

56
57
58 McKenzie F., White C.A., Kendall S., Finlayson A., Urquhart M. &
59 Williams I. (2006): Psychological impact of colostomy pouch
60 change and disposal. *british Journal of Nursing* **15**, 306-316.

Murray J., Banerjee S., Byng R., Tylee A., Bhurgra D. & Macdonald A.
(2006): Primary care professionals' perception of depression in older

- 1
2
3 people: a qualitative study. *Social Science and Medicine* **63**, 1363-
4 1373.
5
6
7 Olbrisch M.E. (1983): Development and Validation of the Ostomy
8 Adjustment Scale. *Rehabilitation Psychology* **28**, 3-12.
9
10 Pennebaker J. (1993): Putting stress into words: health, linguistics and
11 therapeutic implications
12 *Behaviour Research and Therapy* **31**, 539-548.
13
14 Piwonka A.M. & Merino J.M. (1999): A multidimensional Modelling of
15 Predictors influencing the adjustment to a colostomy. . *JWOCN* **26**,
16 298-305.
17
18
19 Rashidian A., Miles J., Russell D. & Russell I. (2006): Sample size for
20 regression analyses of theory of planned behaviour studies:Case of
21 prescribing in general practice. *British Journal of Health Psychology*
22 **11**, 581-593.
23
24
25 Smith B., Fowler D.G., Freeman D., Bebbington P., Bashforth H., Garety
26 P., Dunn G. & Kuipers E. (2006): Emotion and psychosis: links
27 between depression, self-esteem, negative schematic beliefs and
28 delusions and hallucinations. *Schizophrenia Research* **86**, 181-188.
29
30
31 Smyth J. (1998): Written emotional expression:effect sizes, outcome types,
32 and moderating variables. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical*
33 *Psychology* **66**, 174-184.
34
35
36 Soliani P., Carbognani P., Piccolo P., Sabbagh R. & Cudazzo E. (1992):
37 Colostomy Plug Devices: A possible new approach to the problem
38 of incontinence. *Disease Colon Rectum* **35**, 969-974.
39
40
41 Sprangers M., Taal B., Aaronson N. & Te Velde A. (1995): Quality of Life
42 in Colorectal Cancer: Stoma Vs Non-stoma Patients. *Disease Colon*
43 *Rectum* **35**, 361 - 369.
44
45
46 Vironen H., Kairaluoma M., Aalo A.-M. & Kellokumpu I.H. (2006): Impact
47 of functional results on quality of life after rectal cancer surgery.
48 *Disease Colon Rectum* **49**, 568-578.
49
50
51 Wade B. (1990): Psychological adjustment at 10 weeks and 1 year after
52 surgery in districts which employed stoma-care nurses and districts
53 which did not. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* **15**, 1297 - 1304.
54
55
56 White C.A. & Unwin J.C. (1998): Post-operative adjustment to surgery
57 resulting in the formation of a stoma: The importance of stoma-
58 related cognitions
59 *British Journal of Health Psychology* **3**, 85 -93.
60

Table 1: Scores (mean and standard deviation) on adjustment scale according to socio-demographic and clinical variables

Variable	No	%	mean	Std. deviation
<u>Gender</u>				
Male	27	52.9	59.37	13.37
Female	24	47.1	54.83	16.11
<u>Co-habiting</u>				
Yes	47	92.2	56.43	15.02
No	4	7.8	66.75	5.74
<u>Admission</u>				
Planned	36	70.6	56.64	16.19
Emergency	15	29.4	58.67	10.85
<u>Stoma site</u>				
Colon	19	37.3	60.16	11.34
Rectum	32	62.7	55.5	16.36
<u>Disease</u>				
Malignant	35	68.6	58.95	14.19
Benign	16	31.4	53.44	15.68
<u>Appliance</u>				
Pouch	21	41.2	59.52	15.63
Plug	30	58.8	55.63	14.15
<u>Oncology treatment</u>				
Yes	24	47.1	61	12.17
No	27	52.9	53.89	16.20

Table 2: Results of screening analysis

<i>Variable</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Gender	-5.39	-2.04	.04
Age	.003	.02	.98
Co-habiting	3.56	.77	.45
Disease	5.79	1.61	.12
Stoma site	10.04	2.96	.005
Admission	.41	.11	.91
Appliance	-2.08	.11	.37
Oncology			
treatment	-1.99	-.60	.55
Acceptance	.89	4.11	.001
Interpersonal relationship	-.24	2.25	.03
Self-efficacy	.39	3.29	.002

Table 3: Model resulting from the multiple regression analysis

<i>Model</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	<i>Beta (β)</i>	<i>P</i>
Stoma care self-efficacy	.44	.11	.38	.0001
Stoma acceptance	.81	.19	.42	.0001
Interpersonal problems	-.26	.09	-.23	.008
Type of stoma	-8.56	2.43	-.22	.001
Gender	-4.56	2.32	-.16	.055

Note: $\Delta R^2 = .575$ for Self-efficacy; $\Delta R^2 = .13$ for psychosocial variables; $\Delta R^2 = .046$ for stoma site