



OCCUPATIONAL STRESS AMONG NURSES IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOSPITALS

Dr. GATREDDI SURIBABU

Dept. of Social Work, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam.

sureshgatreddy@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Stress is not inherently deleterious, however. Each individual's cognitive appraisal, their perceptions and interpretations, gives meaning to events and determines whether events are viewed as threatening or positive. Personality traits also influence the stress equation because what may be overtaxing to one person may be exhilarating to another. The profession of nursing involves night-shifts during which time the nurse on duty needs some amount of security. In many hospitals, this aspect of the nurses personal safety is not given much importance.



Dr. GATREDDI SURIBABU

Introduction

Nursing exists to serve society. As the conditions and needs of society changes, the health care services also alter in response to the changes. The family is the oldest and the most used health service in the world. Industrialization and urbanization has slowly replaced the 'family' by trained staff who carry out specific treatments associated with the deceased conditions. These trained staff have been nomenclatured as nurse. Thus nursing and health care has come into existence with the inception of specialized and trained staff i.e. 'Nurse'.

As the nurse has become increasingly involved with the curative, technical treatments provided by medical staff, she has come to occupy a strategic position. She is the

link between what are often stressful, complicated, technical procedures associated with the diseased condition and the maintenance of everyday bodily and mental functions which are so critical to the patient's comfort.

Nursing is associated with the people who are ill and with sickness services. The method of providing-care by the nurse to the sick can be mainly of the following types: Disease - based, hospital - based, and medical - based. This forms the crux of health care services. Hence the health care system revolves mainly around three personnels. They are : the nurse, the specialist and the patient.

In certain specified cases the term specialized doctor may be replaced by the

following : 'The health team'. In such a health care system the nurse has an independent role. She also has an inter-dependent collaborative role as one of the members of the health team. The other members of the health team may be doctors, physiotherapists, occupational therapists, speech therapists, dieticians, social workers, health visitors, voluntary organization workers, employment officers, housing personnel, psychologists, medical consultants, general practitioners and maker in relation to health care but with the introduction of team concept in the provision of health care, it is recognized that there are occasions when other members of the team take the initiative, it may be the nurse or even the patient.

It is now being to be accepted that among all the members of the health team, it is usually the nurse who is in most constant contact with the patient. Especially in the community, the nurse is in a strategic position to identify the changing patient/family needs and to assess the home environment and initiate the use of community support services, both professional and voluntary. Particularly in the care plan for patients with long term illness, some professionals even consider that the nurse has an important role as leader of the health team, undertaking a co-ordinating and integrating function.

The core of the health care system revolves round two important factors: the input and the output. The input mainly deals with the patient unwell or seeking to maintain the health, while the output deals with the patient's well or is coping with disability. However, the nucleus of the health care system is the health care process. Diagrammatically, this may be represented as: Patient unwell or Health care Patient's well or seeking to maintain health Process coping with disability friends and neighbours. Nursing has become the domain of women, though there

are also male nurses. Women tend to taking up nursing because of the natural tendencies of a humanistic approach, taking care of the sick and the injured and the sympathetic feelings that are to be found more predominant in a woman. Hence women are often considered best suited to become nurses.

Stress has been categorized as an antecedent or stimulus, as a consequence or response, and as an interaction. It has been studied from many different frameworks (or perspectives?). For example, Selye proposed a physiological assessment that supports considering the association between stress and illness. Conversely, Lazarus (p. 19) advocated a psychological view in which stress is "a particular relationship between the person and the environment that is appraised by the person as taxing or exceeding his or her resources and endangering his or her well-being."

Stress is not inherently deleterious, however. Each individual's cognitive appraisal, their perceptions and interpretations, gives meaning to events and determines whether events are viewed as threatening or positive. Personality traits also influence the stress equation because what may be overtaxing to one person may be exhilarating to another.

Table -1: indicates the role of experience on Occupational Stress Index among the nurses. The individuals were having below 3 years of experience show no significant role over load with the mean value of 22.6. There is a significant role ambiguity among the individual with above 5 years of experience with the mean value of 12.71 which is having an f value of 6.06 showing higher significance at 0.01 levels. Individuals with 3to 5 years of experience show higher powerlessness with the mean value of 8.6 and

f value of 3.02 which is significant at 0.05 level.

Table No. 1: Descriptive statistics and summary of Analysis of variance between domains of OSI and number of years of experience groups

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F
Role overload	Below 3 years	153	22.60	3.38	.983
	3 to 5 years	130	22.43	3.80	
	Above 5 years	38	21.68	3.79	
Role Ambiguity	Below 3 years	153	11.12	2.20	6.063**
	3 to 5 years	130	11.37	2.86	
	Above 5 years	38	12.71	2.43	
Role Conflict	Below 3 years	153	15.80	2.46	2.618
	3 to 5 years	130	15.15	2.32	
	Above 5 years	38	15.31	2.65	
Unreasonable-group and political pressure	Below 3 years	153	12.93	2.94	2.554
	3 to 5 years	130	12.52	3.04	
	Above 5 years	38	11.78	1.91	
Responsibility for Persons	Below 3 years	153	11.24	1.74	1.797
	3 to 5 years	130	10.83	2.03	
	Above 5 years	38	10.818	2.63	
Under Participation	Below 3 years	153	8.825	3.51	2.113
	3 to 5 years	130	9.538	3.21	
	Above 5 years	38	9.738	2.874	
Powerlessness	Below 3 years	153	8.566	2.119	3.025*
	3 to 5 years	130	8.686	2.361	
	Above 5 years	38	7.682	2.30	
Poor peer Relations	Below 3 years	153	11.92	2.46	6.190**
	3 to 5 years	130	11.65	2.51	
	Above 5 years	38	10.34	2.43	
Intrinsic impoverishment	Below 3 years	153	11.86	1.85	1.965
	3 to 5 years	130	11.68	2.05	
	Above 5 years	38	11.18	1.44	
Low status	Below 3 years	153	8.15	1.62	.464
	3 to 5 years	130	7.96	1.96	
	Above 5 years	38	8.18	1.13	
Strenuous working conditions	Below 3 years	153	10.81	2.98	10.173**
	3 to 5 years	130	11.67	3.47	
	Above 5 years	38	13.26	1.86	
unprofitability	Below 3 years	153	6.71	1.49	.225
	3 to 5 years	130	6.78	1.74	
	Above 5 years	38	6.57	2.13	

**p<0.01 significant level

*p<0.05 significant level

In relationship, individuals with below 3 years of experience show significant higher Peer relationship with a mean value of 11.9 and f value of 6.19 which is significant at 0.01 level. Individuals with above 5 years of experience show highest strenuous working

conditions with the mean value of 13.26 and f value 10.17 which is significant at 0.01 level. There are no significant differences found in the other domains of Occupational Stress Index.

Table No. - 2: Descriptive statistics and summary of Analysis of variance between domains of OSI and number of Languages Known

	Number of Languages known	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t
Role overload	one language	103	22.46	3.54	.134
	more than two language	218	22.40	3.64	
Role Ambiguity	one language	103	10.28	2.08	5.717**
	more than two language	218	11.945	2.58	
Role Conflict	one language	103	15.44	2.28	-.183
	more than two language	218	15.50	2.51	
unreasonable group and political pressure	one language	103	13.03	3.04	1.732
Responsibility for Persons	one language	103	11.108	2.041	.486
	more than two language	218	10.99	1.96	
Under Participation	one language	103	9.26	4.03	.162
	more than two language	218	9.19	2.95	
Powerlessness	one language	103	9.192	2.22	3.808**
	more than two language	218	8.181	2.20	
Poor peer Relations	one language	103	11.955	2.10	1.594
	more than two language	218	11.47	2.68	
Intrinsic impoverishment	one language	103	11.585	1.65	.826
	more than two language	218	11.77	2.00	
Low status	one language	103	8.28	1.34	1.436
	more than two language	218	7.98	1.87	
Strenuous working conditions	one language	103	10.50	3.27	3.745**
	more than two language	218	11.89	3.03	
unprofitability	one language	103	6.33	1.47	2.962**
	more than two language	218	6.91	1.73	

**p<0.01 significant level

*p<0.05 significant level

Table No. - 3: Descriptive statistics and summary of Analysis of variance between domains of OSI and Religion

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F
Role overload	Hindu	248	22.13	3.71	4.797**
	Muslim	15	25.46	2.58	
	Christians	57	22.82	2.97	
	others	1	26.00		
Role Ambiguity	Hindu	248	11.47	2.57	3.188*
	Muslim	15	9.46	.99	
	Christians	57	11.64	2.62	
	others	1	12.00	.	
Role Conflict	Hindu	248	15.53	2.39	1.277
	Muslim	15	14.46	1.55	
	Christians	57	15.57	2.77	
	others	1	13.00		
Unreasonable group And political pressure	Hindu	248	12.75	2.791	2.387*
	Muslim	15	13.73	2.15	
	Christians	57	11.82	3.38	
	others	1	12.00	.	
nder Participation	Hindu	248	9.21	3.39	1.747
	Muslims	15	10.26	3.88	
	Christians	57	8.841	2.82	
	others	1	15.00	.	
Powerlessness	Hindu	248	8.60	2.2742	1.431
	Muslim	15	9.00	1.51	
	Christians	57	8.015	2.31	
	others	1	7.000	.	
Poor peer Relations	Hindu	248	11.54	2.48	2.471*
	Muslim	15	12.46	1.50	
	Christians	57	11.84	2.75	
	others	1	6.0000	.	
Intrinsic impoverishment	Hindu	248	11.65	1.93	1.125
	Muslim	15	11.867	1.99	
	Christians	57	11.96	1.75	
	others	1	9.00	.	
Low status	Hindu	248	8.11	1.60	.366
	Muslim	15	7.73	.88	
	Christians	57	8.056	2.31	
	others	1	7.00	.	
Strenuous working conditions	Hindu	248	11.53	3.27	1.803
	Muslim	15	9.60	2.47	
	Christians	57	11.56	2.80	
	others	1	12.00	.	
unprofitability	Hindu	248	6.65	1.69	.682
	Muslim	15	7.06	1.86	
	Christians	57	6.94	1.58	
	others	1	7.00	.	

**p<0.01 significant level

*p<0.05 significant level

Table -2 indicates the relationship between languages known and Occupational Stress Index. Individuals who know more than 2 languages showed role ambiguity with a mean value of 11.94 and then t value of 5.71 which is significant at 0.01 levels. In powerlessness individuals who know one language shown less the power with the mean value of 9.19 and t value of 3.80 which is significant at 0.01 level. In strenuous working conditions people with more than two languages sure higher mean value of 11.89 with the t value of 3.74 which is significant at 0.01 level. In unprofitably individuals so no more than 2 languages show the mean value of 6.9 with a t value of 2.9 which is significant at 0.01 level. There are no significant differences found in other domains of Occupational Stress Index.

Table -3 shows the effect of religion on Occupational Stress Index among the nursing staff. From the results it is observed that individuals from Muslim community exhibit more occupational overload than the other three groups with the mean score of 25.46 with an f value 4.79 which is significant at 0.01 level.

Role ambiguity was found to be high among individuals belong to Christianity who is mean value is 11.64 with f value of 3.18 which is significant set at 0.05 level. Unreasonable group and political pressure was found to be high among Muslims with mean value of 13.73 with an f value 2.38 which is significant at 0.05 level. Relationships were found among Muslims individuals with the mean value of 12.46 written up value 2.47 which is significant at 0.05 level. No other significant value were found in the other domains.

Table - 4 shows the relationship between the reason of choosing profession and the Occupational Stress Index. Roll over load was high among the individuals who chose this profession buy interest and the mean value of 22.71 with an f value of 2.63 was found to be significant at 0.05 level. In Role ambiguity service oriented people phone to be more ambiguous then the other groups within mean value of 12.00 and F value 4.52 which is significant act 0.01 level. Unreasonable group and political pressure was found to be high in individuals with choice of livelihood with the mean value of 13.79 and f value of 6.32 which is significant at 0.01 level. Under participation was found to be high among service oriented people with a mean value of 9.97 added value of 4.54 which is significant at 0.01 level. People who chose service are found to be at strenuous work conditions with a mean value of 12.25 or hand and F value of 5.33 which is significant at 0.01 level. The Other domain had found no significant differences.

Table- 5 indicates the relationship between the sector of choice and the Occupational Stress Index in which role ambiguity was found to be more in private sector employees where as unreasonable group political pressure was found to be high in public sector employees with respect to mean values of 12.18 and 13.26 which are showing at t value of 5.80 and 3.91 respectively and significant at 0.01 level. In the domain of responsibility for persons public sector employees you are more responsible with the mean value of 11.27 and t value of 2.17 which is significant at 0.05 level. Under participation was found to be high in private sector employees with the mean value of 9.93 and t value of 4.04 which is significant at 0.01 level. Powerlessness was exhibited by public sector employees with the mean value

Table No. - 4: Descriptive statistics and summary of Analysis of variance between domains of OSI and Reason of choosing this profession

	Reason	N	Mean	F
Role overload	Interest	136	22.7132	2.632*
	Livelihood	24	22.7500	
	Service	136	21.8456	
	Others	25	23.7200	
Role Ambiguity	Interest	136	10.9706	4.524**
	Livelihood	24	11.2500	
	Service	136	12.0074	
	Others	25	10.7600	
Role Conflict	Interest	136	15.8382	2.172
	Livelihood	24	15.7500	
	Service	136	15.1103	
	Others	25	15.3200	
Unreasonable-group and political pressure	Interest	136	13.2059	6.321**
	Livelihood	24	13.7917	
	Service	136	11.8971	
	Others	25	12.4000	
Responsibility for Persons	Interest	136	10.7794	2.986*
	Livelyhood	24	11.3750	
	Service	136	11.0368	
	Others	25	12.0000	
Under Participation	Interest	136	8.5147	4.546**
	Livelyhood	24	9.0833	
	Service	136	9.9779	
	Others	25	9.0400	
	Total	321	9.2181	
Powerlessness	Interest	136	8.5515	1.158
	Livelyhood	24	9.1667	
	Service	136	8.3088	
	Others	25	8.7600	
Poor peer Relations	Interest	136	11.7500	1.090
	Livelyhood	24	12.0000	
	Service	136	11.3529	
	Others	25	12.0800	
Intrinsic impoverishment	Interest	136	11.6250	2.413
	Livelyhood	24	11.7500	
	Service	136	11.6103	
	Others	25	12.6800	
Low status	Interest	136	8.0809	1.110
	Livelyhood	24	8.1667	
	Service	136	7.9632	
	Others	25	8.6400	
Strenuous working conditions	Interest	136	10.8971	5.337**
	Livelyhood	24	10.5833	
	Service	136	12.2574	
	Others	25	10.9200	
unprofitability	Interest	136	6.9485	2.440
	Livelyhood	24	6.7083	
	Service	136	6.4485	
	Others	25	7.0800	

**p<0.01 significant level

*p<0.05 significant level

Table- 5 indicates the relationship between the sector of choice and the Occupational Stress Index in which role ambiguity was found to be more in private sector employees where as unreasonable group political pressure was found to be high in public sector employees with respect to mean values of 12.18 and 13.26 which are showing at t value of 5.80 and 3.91 respectively and significant at 0.01 level. In the domain of responsibility for persons public sector employees you are more responsible with the mean value of 11.27 and t value of 2.17 which is significant at 0.05 level. Under participation was found to be high in private sector employees with the mean value of 9.93 and t value of 4.04 which is significant at 0.01 level. Powerlessness was exhibited by public sector employees with the mean value

of 9.35 and it value of 6.96 which is significant 0.01 level. In peer relationships public sector employees showed poor relationships with the mean value of 12.57 and t value of 7.00 which is significant at 0.01 level. Strenuous working conditions private sector employees sure higher mean value of 12.83 with at t value of 8.92 which is significant at 0.01 level. unprofitability was more among public sector employees with the mean value of 6.99 and t value of 2.77 which is significant at 0.01 level. Intrinsic improvement was higher among public sector employees with the mean value of 11.94 which is significant at 0.05 level with at t value of 2.13. The Other domains show no significant differences.

Table No. 5: Descriptive statistics and summary of Analysis of variance between domains of OSI and sectors of work

	Sector	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t
Role overload	Public	156	22.76	4.00	1.657
	Private	165	22.10	3.17	
Role Ambiguity	Public	156	10.60	2.28	5.804**
	Private	165	12.18	2.56	
	Public	156	15.628	2.45	.991
	Private	165	15.35	2.43	
Role Conflict	Public	156	13.26	3.04	3.911**
	Private	165	12.033	2.62	
Unreasonable-group and political pressure	Public	156	11.27	1.94	2.177*
	Private	165	10.79	2.01	
Responsibility for Persons	Public	156	8.46	3.47	4.042**
	Private	165	9.933	3.04	
Powerlessness	Public	156	9.35	2.15	6.966**
	Private	165	7.71	2.05	
Poor peer Relations	Public	156	12.57	1.93	7.003**
	Private	165	10.73	2.68	
Intrinsic impoverishment	Public	156	11.94	1.66	2.135*
	Private	165	11.49	2.08	
Low status	Public	156	8.16	1.72	.801
	Private	165	8.001	1.72	
Strenuous working conditions	Public	156	9.99	3.09	8.925**
	Private	165	12.83	2.59	
unprofitability	Public	156	6.99	1.54	2.775**
	Private	165	6.47	1.76	

**p<0.01 significant level

*p<0.05 significant level

Table No.6: Descriptive statistics and summary of Analysis of variance between domains of OSI and Age groups

	Age Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F
Role overload	20 and below	43	23.65	3.36	4.770**
	21 to 25	186	22.52	3.39	
	Above 25	92	21.65	3.97	
Role Ambiguity	20 and below	43	10.39	2.34	11.731**
	21 to 25	186	11.16	2.47	
	above 25	92	12.39	2.54	
Role Conflict	20 and below	43	15.65	2.22	1.515
	21 to 25	186	15.28	2.35	
	above 25	92	15.80	2.68	
Unreasonable group and political pressure	20 and below	43	13.39	2.25	1.779
	21 to 25	186	12.55	3.16	
	above 25	92	12.43	2.56	
Responsibility for Persons	20 and below	43	11.65	1.44	6.751**
	21 to 25	186	11.17	1.81	
	above 25	92	10.44	2.39	
Under Participation	20 and below	43	8.23	3.40	5.086**
	21 to 25	186	9.03	3.26	
	above 25	92	10.04	3.309	
Powerlessness	20 and below	43	8.04	2.09	1.062
	21 to 25	186	8.56	2.32	
	above 25	92	8.60	2.18	
Poor peer Relations	20 and below	43	11.86	2.71	.217
	21 to 25	186	11.58	2.37	
	above 25	92	11.607	2.71	
Intrinsic impoverishment	20 and below	43	11.06	1.83	2.913
	21 to 25	186	11.77	1.94	
	above 25	92	11.86	1.81	
Low status	20 and below	43	8.02	1.40	1.445
	21 to 25	186	7.96	1.81	
	above 25	92	8.33	1.65	
Strenuous Working conditions	20 and below	43	10.62	3.17	12.562**
	21 to 25	186	10.97	3.24	
	above 25	92	12.79	2.61	
unprofitability	20 and below	43	6.97	1.38	.546
	21 to 25	186	6.68	1.62	
	above 25	92	6.70	1.90	

**p<0.01 significant level

*p<0.05 significant level

Table -6 indicates the relationship between age group and Occupational Stress Index. Between the 3 age groups, individuals in the age group of 20 and below had shown higher role overload with the mean value of 23.65 and f value of 4.77 which indicates highest significance at 0.01. In role ambiguity, individuals above the 25 age group higher mean values of 12.39 with f value of 11.73 which indicates higher significance at 0.01 level. In responsibility for persons the individual weight 25 and below show higher

responsibility with the mean value of 11.65 endemic value of 6.75 which is significant at 0.01 level. An under participation in under participation age group of about 25 had indicated high mean value of 10.04 and an f value 5.08 which is significant at 0.01 level. In strenuous work conditions individuals with 21 and 25 age group should hire mean value of 10.97 with an f value of 12.56 which indicates highest significance at 0.01 level. In the remaining domains there are no significant results found.

Table No. 7: Descriptive statistics and summary of Analysis of variance between domains of OSI and Social status

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F
Role overload	sc	74	22.44	3.22	.500
	st	82	22.29	3.94	
	bc	115	22.26	3.72	
	oc	50	22.980	3.34	
Role Ambiguity	sc	74	11.39	2.88	2.131
	st	82	12.00	2.149	
	bc	115	11.15	2.67	
	oc	50	11.08	2.29	
Role Conflict	sc	74	15.58	1.87	1.696
	st	82	14.97	2.61	
	bc	115	15.63	2.56	
	oc	50	15.82	2.54	
Unreasonable Group and political pressure	sc	74	12.13	3.32	3.510 **
	st	82	12.07	2.78	
	bc	115	13.07	2.65	
	oc	50	13.26	2.73	
Responsibility for Persons	sc	74	10.90	1.84	2.065
	st	82	11.48	1.95	
	bc	115	10.90	2.13	
	oc	50	10.74	1.86	
Under Participation	sc	74	9.16	3.12	.743
	st	82	9.32	3.14	
	bc	115	8.93	3.30	
	oc	50	9.76	4.00	
Powerlessness	sc	74	8.54	2.08	5.640**
	st	82	7.68	2.09	
	bc	115	8.92	2.36	
	oc	50	8.88	2.18	
Poor peer Relations	sc	74	11.12	2.48	3.767**
	st	82	11.17	2.42	
	bc	115	12.05	2.52	
	oc	50	12.14	2.50	
Intrinsic impoverishment	sc	74	11.60	1.96	.970
	st	82	11.91	1.93	
	bc	115	11.53	1.77	
	oc	50	11.94	2.03	
Low status	sc	74	7.85	1.36	1.462
	st	82	7.90	1.72	
	bc	115	8.30	1.97	
	oc	50	8.20	1.53	
Strenuous working conditions	sc	74	11.67	2.92	1.551
	st	82	11.91	2.79	
	bc	115	11.26	3.52	
	oc	50	10.80	3.22	
unprofitability	sc	74	6.77	1.74	.280
	st	82	6.80	1.65	
	bc	115	6.73	1.69	
	oc	50	6.54	1.61	

**p<0.01 significant level

*p<0.05 significant level

sc = scheduled caste, st = scheduled tribes, bc = backward class

oc = open category

Table - 7 indicates the relationship between the social status and the Occupational Stress Index among the nursing individuals. The OC community had indicated I mean value of 13.26 with an f value of 3.51 which indicates significance at 0.01 level in unreasonable group and political pressures. Powerlessness was indicated by BC community vitamin value of 8.92 and f value of 5.64 which is significant at 0.01 level. Poor peer relationships was exhibited by OC community with the mean value of 12.14 and f value of 3.76 which is significant at 0.01 level. There was no significant result observed in the other domains of Occupational Stress Index.

CONCLUSION

The profession of nursing involves night-shifts during which time the nurse on duty needs some amount of security. In many hospitals, this aspect of the nurses personal safety is not given much importance. Therefore, it should be made a rule that two nurses at least must go about during their work in the wards. Nurses should be protected from patients and their relatives / helpers who sometimes come in an ineberrated condition. The watch and ward staff should strictly prevent such persons from entering the hospital premises.