

## DEVELOPMENT OF PSYCHOSOMATIC DISORDERS AS RELATED TO THE NATURE OF EMPLOYMENT

Pushp Lata Rajpoot\*

Pushpa Vaishnav\*\*

### ABSTRACT

The aim of present investigation is to study the “Development of psychosomatic disorders as related to nature of employment (Running staff: persons who work out of doors and go one place to another place to do their work or service such as Guard, Driver, Policeman, T.T.E. & Salesman etc and Office staff: persons who work in office such as Teacher, Clerk & Shopkeepers etc).” The data has been collected from railway organization at Chandausi, Moradabad division, Uttar Pradesh-India. The total sample of 80 males (40 Running Staff males and 40 Office staff males) of same grade (C grade), age ranging from 30-50 years has been drawn through stratified sampling. For this study, C.M.I Health Questionnaire has been administered on each subject of the sample. It contains 195 items in informal language and divided in three sections – A to L, M to R and A to R. Findings of this study indicates that the level of psychosomatic symptoms in running staff is more than office staff. It means running staff is more vulnerable to psychosomatic disorders in comparison to office staff. Thus, development of psychosomatic disorders is related to nature of employment.

**Key Words-** Psychosomatic Disorders, Running staff and Office staff

---

\* Department of Rehabilitation Psychology, National Institute for the Mentally Handicapped  
Secunderabad, India

\*\* Madhya Pradesh Viklang Sahayata Samiti, Jawahar Nagar, Ujjain, MP, India

**Introduction:**

Health is a complete physical, mental, social well being and spiritual and not merely an absence of disease of infirmity and ability to lead a socially and economically productive life. Today here life is a continuous battle. It is never ending inventory. Every person is suffering from psychological, physical and psychosomatic problems. The pressures of overtime and long working hours create a work–personal life imbalance, which begins to affect the health of the employees. Other factors such as long commuting hours and chaotic traffic conditions adding to their stress affect the employee's efficiency and effectiveness. It can undermine the employee's relationship at home as well as on the job. This can have a negative influence on their physical and emotional health. Economic loss to the organization due to errors, wrong decisions, wrong choice, lack of attention, and injury are some of the serious effects of chronic stress.

Stress is experienced when demands made on us outweigh our resources. A moderate level of stress or “Eustress” is an important motivating factor and is considered normal and necessary. If stress is intense, continuous, and repeated, it becomes a negative phenomenon or “Distress,” which can lead to physical illness and psychological disorders (McVicar 2003). Psychosomatic illnesses are disorders that involve both the body and the mind. These illnesses are mental or emotional in origin and have physical symptoms (Baum, Gatchel & Schaeffer, 1983). Psychological problems included job dissatisfaction, tension, irritability, boredom and procrastination. The physiological symptoms include blood pressure, ulcers loss of appetite, coronary heart disease, headache, backache and intestinal problems. In a 1997 survey, 33% of Americans believed that their job was more stressful than it had been just a year previously, and over two thirds of Americans believed their jobs had become more stressful over the previous five years (Cohen, 1997).

A study of more than 400,000 employees conducted by International Survey Research of Chicago reported that about 40% of these peoples say that their work loads are excessive and that they have too much “pressure” at work. Poor working conditions like, temperature extremes, loud noise, too much or too little lighting, radiation, air pollution can cause stress in employees. Heavy travel demands or long distance commuting are also aspects of job that employee may find stressful.

A person, who is far away from home and works in two or three shifts, is always disturbed. Due to this type of daily working schedule he is unable to take proper food, rest at proper time and perplexed due to fatigue which generate a mental stress to him. The responsibilities of family also create a stress and anxiety. Person wants to progress in the society, if he does not obtain progress than conflict developed in his mind and he became stressful and depressed. These psychological symptoms stress anxiety, anger, fear and depression affected physically and person is caught from psychosomatic disorders. Psychosomatic disorder is a popular problem of this age, so the researcher has been worked on this topic “Development of psychosomatic disorders as related to nature of employment.”

**Objectives:**

1. To identify the level of physiological or somatic disorders among running staff and office staff.
2. To identify the level of psychological disorders among running staff and office staff.
3. To identify the level of psychosomatic disorders among running staff and office staff.

**Null Hypotheses:**

Following null hypotheses have formulated for the study;

1. There is no significant difference in the level of physiological or somatic disorders among running staff and office staff.
2. There is no significant difference in the level of psychological disorders among running staff and office staff.
3. There is no significant difference in the level of psychosomatic disorders among running staff and office staff.
- 4.

**Methodology:****Sampling:**

The data has been collected from railway organization at Chandausi, Moradabad division, Uttar Pradesh-India. The total sample of 80 males (40 Running Staff males and 40 Office staff males) of same grade (C grade), age ranging from 30-50 years was drawn through stratified sampling.

**Measures:**

Cornell Medical Index (C.M.I.) Questionnaire translated into Hindi by Wig, Prasad and Verma (1983) was used to assess psychosomatic symptoms. This questionnaire contains 195 questions and divided in three sections – A to L, M to R and A to R.

1. A to L section considered as physical distress or somatic disorders.
2. M to R section considered as Emotional distress or psychological distress.
3. A to R section considered as total distress or psychosomatic disorders.

The responses are obtained on Yes–No categories. The physical distress includes questions on eyes and ears, respiratory system, cardiovascular system, genitourinary system, fatigability, frequency of illness, miscellaneous diseases and habits and the psychological distress includes questions on inadequacy, depression, anxiety, sensitivity, anger and tension. The reliability of the physical illness ( $r=.77$ ) and psychological illness ( $r=.85.$ ) was found significant. Each yes answered item is counted and considered as a score: category-wise scores can be obtained on this test and higher scores represent ill health of the respondents.

**Statistical Analysis:**

The collected data has been tabulated and analyzed. The mean and S.D. are calculated and t-test is used to find out the significant difference in the level of psychosomatic disorders among running staff and office staff.

**Results:**

**Table 1: Table showing Mean scores and SD of level of Physiological Disorders in Running staff and Office staff**

Staff	N	Mean	Combined SD	df	t-Value	Level of Sig.
Running Staff	40	24.83	10.99	78	3.65	at .01
Office Staff	40	15.24				

Result table 1 shows that t score is 3.65, which is more than the value 2.64 at 0.01 significant level with df 78. Thus null hypothesis is rejected at 0.01 significant level. So, it indicates that the level of physiological or somatic disorders in running staff is more than office staff.

**Table 2: Table showing Mean scores and SD of level of Psychological Disorders in Running staff and Office staff**

Staff	N	Mean	Combined SD	df	t-Value	Level of Sig.
Running Staff	40	12.78	7.04	78	3.82	at .01
Office Staff	40	6.78				

Result table 2 indicates that t score is 3.82, which is more than the value 2.64 at 0.01 significant level with df 78. Thus null hypothesis is rejected at 0.01 significant level. So, it concludes that the level of physiological or somatic disorders in running staff is more than office staff.

**Table 3: Table showing Mean scores and SD of level of Psychosomatic Disorders in Running staff and Office staff**

Staff	N	Mean	Combined SD	df	t-Value	Level of Sig.
Running Staff	40	37.60	15.93	78	4.06	at .01
Office Staff	40	22				

Result table 3 indicates that t score is 4.06, which is more than the value 2.64 at 0.01 significant level with df 78. Thus null hypothesis is rejected at 0.01 significant level. So, it concludes that the level of psychosomatic disorders in running staff is more than office staff.

**Discussion:**

Over the past two decades, there has been an increasing belief that the experience of stress necessarily has undesirable consequences for health (Leventhal and Tomarken, 1987). Physical health is affected by different kinds of psychological stress. It is a long-accepted fact that the workplace is a major source of psychological stressors, strains and subsequent ill-health (Margolis et al., 1974).

Recent researches demonstrate that 90% of illness is stress related. A considerable variety of different pathologies, both psychological and physical, have been associated with the experience of stress through work (Dohrenwend and Shroot, 1985). Disorders usually cited as being stress-related are: bronchitis, coronary heart disease, mental illness, thyroid disorders, skin-diseases,

certain types of rheumatoid arthritis, obesity, tuberculosis, headaches and migraine, peptic ulcers and ulcerative colitis and diabetes (Cox and Griffiths, 1996). Pratibha (2009) conducted a study on nurses and found that extent of work stress in a hospital setting leads to psychosomatic disorders like acidity, back pain, stiffness in neck and shoulders, forgetfulness, anger and worry.

Stress has the strongest impact on aggressive actions such as sabotage, interpersonal aggression, hostility and complaints (Chen and Spector, 1992). These types of problems from stress, in turn, are especially relevant to poor job performance, lowered level self esteem, and resentment of supervision, inability to concentrate and make decisions, and job dissatisfaction. There is evidence that employees under high stress can cost their organizations money from higher accident levels, lost time, and reduced productivity (Cohen, 1997).

According to Dorsey (1994) for many people, a great deal of stressful events comes from the workplace. Stress in employees is an endemic problem. It contributes to health problems in organization workers and decreases their efficiency. This risk increases with the length of overtime.

Physical demands is another stressor which is associated with job physical setting such as adequacy of temperature and lighting and physical requirements that job generate in employee. Working outdoors in extreme temperature can resulted heat or cool office can lead to stress and psychosomatic disorders can be occur. The stress of shift work can also aggravate health conditions and lead to heart disease or digestive disorders (Folkard and Monk, 1985). Shift workers are on the job in the evening or on weekends and they sleep during the day. Hence, they often miss out on social or family activities.

Running staff have to do shift work or attend irregular working hours. Their daily routine is disturbed and they do not have proper time for rest. They work out of door and night in double shift. The life of running staff workers is full of struggle and stress. The overall interpretation of results indicates that the level of psychosomatic symptoms in running staff is more than office staff. Disorders of eyes, ears, respiratory system, cardiovascular system digestive track, musculoskeletal system, nervous system, fatigability, frequency of illness, miscellaneous diseases and habits inadequacy depression and anger are found in running staff more than office staff. . It means running staff is more vulnerable to psychosomatic disorders in comparison to

office staff. On the basis of the results of this study, it can say that workers of running staff are more restless and impatient. They interact with the world in a way that produces continual stress and often lets to psychosomatic disorders. Thus, development of psychosomatic disorders is related to nature of employment.

### Conclusion:

Psychosomatic illness is not imaginary. It is very tricky to diagnose and treat. The key is to look for a source of stress that the person is not coping with. Chronic stress decreases motivation. It can lead to increased absenteeism and increased turnover and attrition rates. Every organization should assess the magnitude of stress and analyze it to recognize the need for action. This is also called a "stress audit." Earlier, stress was viewed as a personal problem to be tackled at an individual level with palliative or remedial measures. Now, the approach is to be proactive, with emphasis on prevention and elimination rather than treatment. Improving the quality of work life of employees may go a long way to decrease attrition. So, there is a need for coping techniques like, counseling, learning assertiveness, relaxation techniques and communication skills, which should be taught to all running staff, even incorporated in their training curriculum.

### References:

Baum.A., Gatchel R.J., and Schaeffer.M., 1983, Emotional Behaviour and Physiological effects of chronic stress at three Mile Island, *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 51, pp 565-572.

Chen.P., and Spector P.E., 1992, Relationships of work stressors with aggressions, withdrawal, theft, and substance use: An exploratory study, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 65, pp 177-184.

Cohen.A., 1997, Facing pressure, *Sales and Marketing Management, Medicine*, 5, pp 300-317.

Cox.T., and Griffiths.A., 1996, Work-related stress in nursing: controlling the risk to health, *Safe Work: ILO action in the field of workplace stress*, International Labour Organization Publication.

Dorsey.D., 1994, *The force: They sell for a living, and what drives them to the top can push them over the edge*. New York: Random House.

Folkard.S., and Monk T.H., 1985, Hours of work: Temporal factors in work-Scheduling, John Wiley and Sons; New York

Leventhal.H., and Tomarken A.J., 1987, Life stress research: A social-psychological perspective. In S.V. Kasl & Cooper (Eds.). Stress and Health: issues in research methodology, London: Wiley and Sons, 27-55

Margolish B.L., Kroes W.H., and Quinn R.R., 1974, Job stress: An unlisted occupational hazard, Journal of occupational medicine 16, pp 659-661.

McVicar A., 2003, Workplace stress in nursing: A literature review. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 44, pp 633-42.

Pratibha P., 2009, Stress causing psychosomatic illness among nurses, Indian Journal of Occupation and Environment Med, 13(1), pp 28-32.

Wig.N., Prasad.D., and Verma S.K., 1983, Abridged Manual for C.M.I. Health Questionnaire (Hindi), National Psychological Corporation, Agra, India.