

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY TO ASSESS THE PHYSICAL, PSYCHOLOGICAL DISTRESS AND COPING STRATEGIES ADOPTED BY THE NURSING STUDENTS

Author's Name: Ms. Monika Narang¹, Ms. Gurjot Kaur²

Affiliation:

1. M.Sc. (N) Student, Saraswati Nursing Institute, Kurali, Punjab, India.
2. Assistant Professor, Saraswati Nursing Institute, Kurali, Punjab, India.

Corresponding Author Name and Email ID: Ms. Gurjot Kaur, gurjotlongia@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Background: Distress has been defined as "a poor state of mental health characterized by anxiety and depressive symptoms", which can be seen as an emotional disturbance that may affect an individual's ability to function in social situations and go about their daily lives. AIM: The aim of the study is to assess the physical, psychological distress and coping strategies adopted by the nursing students in selected colleges of Punjab. Methods: A Quantitative research approach and descriptive research design was used in the study. 200 subjects were selected as a sample by using convenient sampling technique. The tool was developed i.e. Checklist for Physical Distress and the standardized tool i.e. Kessler Psychological Distress scale was used to assess Psychological Distress and BRIEF Coping Orientation to Problem Experienced inventory was used to assess the Coping Strategies among nursing students. A descriptive and inferential statistics was used to analyze the data. Results: The results of the study showed that 74(37%) subjects had no physical distress, 79(39.5%) subjects had less physical distress, 47(23.5%) subjects had high physical distress. 59(29.5%) subjects were likely to be well psychologically, 57(28.5%) subjects were likely to have mild mental disorder, 42(21%) subjects likely to have moderate mental disorder, 42(21.0%) subjects were likely to have Severe mental disorder. 56 (28%) subjects used poor coping strategies, 135(67.5%) subjects were used an average coping strategies, 12 (6%) subjects used good coping strategies. The mean \pm SD of physical distress and psychological distress was 1.82 ± 0.369 and 2.29397 ± 0.00938 respectively. Conclusion: This study concludes that the subjects who used good coping strategies had no physical distress and likely to be well psychologically those who used average coping strategies had less physical distress and likely to have mild mental disorders, while those who used poor coping strategies had high physical distress and likely to have moderate or severe mental disorders.

Keywords: Distress, Physical, Psychological, Coping Strategies.

INTRODUCTION

Distress is defined as a condition that includes burnout, exhaustion, bad mental and physical quality of life (QOL), stress, anxiety, and depression. An increased incidence of suicidal thoughts, alcohol misuse, malpractice lawsuits, and healthcare attrition are also linked to distress.¹

Nursing students who experience chronic or long-term stress may experience memory loss and find it challenging to concentrate on their studies. In addition, they might feel depressed, anxious, or have rapid heartbeat. They might sleep excessively or inadequately when anything goes wrong, which could even lead to burnout.²

Psychological distress is often used as a sign of mental health issues. According to researchers such as Horwitz, depression can arise as a temporary, pathological emotional response to distress if it is not treated. Others are fond of According to Wheaton; psychological discomfort affects day-to-day functioning and social interactions. It is a somewhat stable state.³

Coping is the capacity to modify, adapt, and successfully navigate a challenge. Problem-focused and emotion-focused coping can both be positive or negative, with the former generally associated with lower levels of psychological distress and the latter with higher levels.⁴

According to various studies, problem solving is the most commonly used strategy among nursing students. While some researchers identify transference, optimism, and problem solving are the most prevalent coping mechanisms in this group, while others highlight the use of emotion-focused coping techniques.⁵

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study was conducted in Government Institute of Nursing Roopnagar and Rayat Bahra College of Nursing, Mohali, **Government Institute of Nursing, Rayat Bahra College of Nursing**. A Quantitative research design. A Quantitative research approach and descriptive research design was used in the study.

The target population of study were GNM students . Total 200 nursing student were selected as a sample by using convenient sampling technique. The tool was developed i.e. Checklist was used to assess the Physical Distress. The tool consist of 22 items. Criteria measure of the tool were:0-7 :No physical distress ,8-14: Less physical distress , 15-22 :High physical distress, Second standardized tool i.e. Kessler Psychological Distress scale was used to assess Psychological Distress. It is a five-point Likert scale which consists of ten items .Criteria measure of the tool were: 10-19 Likely to be Well, 20-24 Likely to have a mild mental disorder, 25-29 Likely to have a moderate mental disorder , 30-50 Likely to have a severe mental disorder and standardized tool i.e BRIEF Coping Orientation to Problem Experienced inventory was used to assess the Coping Strategies among nursing students. It consist 28 questions A descriptive and inferential statistics was used to analyze the data. Criteria measure of the tool were : 28-56:Poor coping strategies, 57-84:Average coping strategies ,85-112: Good coping strategies The reliability of Checklist was= 0.8,Kessler Psychological Distress scale was r= 0.8. ,Brief –coping orientation to problem experienced inventory sheet r= 0.8.

Hence, all the tools were seemed to be reliable.

The tool was administered to subjects in their classes. Averagely subjects took 25-30 minutes to fill the tool. Written consent was taken from the individual subject before administering the tool.

RESULTS

There were total 200 subjects .It was observed that majority of subjects 145(72.5%) were in the age group 18-20 years,123(61.5) were studying in GNM 1st year.176 (88.0%) were females 161(80.5%) subjects were unmarried and 134(67.0%) were Hindu.79(39.5%) of subjects mothers studied upto primary education level. Majority 119 (59.5%) subjects father were graduates and above.142(71%) subjects mothers were housewives 102 15.0%) subjects father were in private job.137 (68.5%) were living in nuclear family.79 (39.5%) had family monthly income below and 120(60.0%) subjects were hosteller.[Table1]

Table- 1:Frequency and Percentage distribution of socio –demographic variables.

N=200

| Characteristics | n | %age |
|----------------------------|----------|-------------|
| Age | 145 | 72.5 |
| 18-20 years | 036 | 18.0 |
| 21-23 years | 019 | 09.5 |
| Above 23 years | | |
| Year | 123 | 61.5 |
| GNM 1ST YR | 058 | 29.0 |
| GNM 2nd YR | 019 | 09.5 |
| GNM 3rd YR | | |
| Gender | 024 | 12.0 |
| Male | 176 | 88.0 |
| Female | | |
| Marital Status | 018 | 9.00 |
| Married | 161 | 80.5 |
| Unmarried | 021 | 10.5 |
| Widow/Separated | | |
| Religion | 134 | 67.0 |
| Hindu | 040 | 20.0 |
| Muslim | 015 | 07.5 |
| Christian | 011 | 05.5 |
| Sikh | | |
| Education of mother | 039 | 19.5 |
| No formal education | 079 | 39.5 |
| Primary | 019 | 08.5 |
| Secondary | 021 | 10.5 |
| Senior Secondary | 042 | 21.0 |
| Graduation and above | | |
| Education of father | 021 | 10.5 |
| No formal education | 039 | 19.5 |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|------|
| Primary | 021 | 10.5 |
| Secondary | 119 | 59.5 |
| Graduation and above | | |
| Occupation of mother | 142 | 71.0 |
| House wife | 037 | 18.5 |
| Government job | 021 | 10.5 |
| Private job | | |
| Occupation of father | 021 | 10.5 |
| Business | 077 | 38.5 |
| Government job | 102 | 51.0 |
| Private job | | |
| Type of family | 042 | 21.0 |
| Joint | 137 | 68.5 |
| Nuclear | 021 | 10.5 |
| Extended | | |
| Family Monthly Income (in Rs) | 079 | 39.5 |
| Below 5000 | 018 | 9.00 |
| 5000-10,000 | 042 | 21.0 |
| 10,000-15,000 | 040 | 20.0 |
| 15,000-20,000 | 019 | 09.5 |
| Above 20,000 | | |
| Type of Accommodation | 120 | 60.0 |
| Hosteller | 059 | 29.5 |
| Day scholar | 021 | 10.5 |
| Paying guest | | |

Table -2 depicts the level of physical distress among nursing students that .74(37%) subjects had no physical distress, 79(39.5%) subjects had less physical distress, 47(23.5%) subjects had high physical distress. The Mean Score and SD of Physical Distress was 1.82 ± 0.369 .

Table-2: Assessment of level of Physical Distress Among Nursing Student

N=200

| Physical distress (score) | N | %age | Mean ± SD |
|--------------------------------|----|-------|---------------|
| No physical distress (0-7) | 74 | 37.0% | 1.82 ± 0.369. |
| Less physical distress (8-14) | 79 | 39.5% | |
| High physical distress (15-22) | 47 | 23.5% | |

Table 3: The below table depicts an item analysis of physical distress of subjects. Majority, 105(52.5%) subjects experienced blurred vision or pain in their eyes while studying. 125 (62.5%) subjects were suffering from high or low blood pressure. 104 (52.0%) subjects experienced frequent cramps in their legs. **102(51.0%)** were suffering from indigestion or heartburn. 108 (54.0%) respondents experienced headaches or migraines due to stress. 109 (54.5%) subjects frequently experienced constipation or diarrhoea. 117 (58.59%) reported experienced excessive sweating. 118

(59.0%) subjects experienced changes in their appetite. 101 (50.5%) subjects had difficulty in falling asleep. 104 (52.0%) subjects experienced pains in the heart or chest. 114 (57.0%) subjects suffered from hair loss or grey hair. 109 (54.5%) female subjects noticed changes in their menstrual cycle or hormonal balance since started nursing school. 115 (57.5%) subjects frequently urinate during the day. 105 (52.5%) subjects experienced muscle aches or pains. 102 (51.5%) subjects experienced changes in their weight. 136 (68.09%).

Table 3: Item analysis regarding Assessment of Physical Distress

N=200

| S.no | Questions | Yes f (%) | No f (%) |
|------|---|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1. | Do you often have blurred vision or pain in your eyes while studying? | 95(47.5%) | 105(52.5%) |
| 2. | Do you suffer from high or low blood pressure? | 75(37.5%) | 125(62.5%) |
| 3. | Do you suffer from frequent cramps in your legs? | 96(48.0%) | 104(52.0%) |
| 4. | Do you suffer from indigestion or heartburn? | 102(51.0%) | 97(48.5%) |
| 5. | Have you experience headache or migraines due to stress? | 108(54.0%) | 92(46.0) |
| 6. | Do you often experience constipation or diarrhoea? | 91(45.5%) | 109(54.5%) |
| 7. | Do you experience excessive sweating? | 83(41.5%) | 117(58.5%) |
| 8. | Have you noticed any change in your appetite? | 118(59.0%) | 82(41.0%) |
| 9. | Do you usually have difficulty in falling asleep? | 101(50.5%) | 99(49.5%) |
| 10. | Do you have pains in the heart or chest? | 104(52.0%) | 96(48.0%) |
| 11. | Do you suffer from hair loss or grey hair? | 114(57.0%) | 86(43.0%) |
| 12. | Have you noticed any changes in your menstrual cycle or hormonal balance since starting nursing school? | 109(54.5%) | 91(45.5%) |
| 13. | During the day, do you usually have to urinate frequently? | 85(42.5%) | 115(57.5%) |
| 14. | Have you been experiencing any muscle aches or pains? | 95(47.5%) | 105(52.5%) |
| 15. | Have you noticed any change in your weight? | 98(49.0%) | 102(51.0%) |

Table- 4: depicts the level of psychological distress among nursing students that 59 (29.5%) subjects were likely to be well, 57 (28.5%) were likely to have a mild disorder, 42(21.0%) were likely to have a moderate disorder whereas 42 (21.0%) were likely to have a severe disorder. The Mean Score and SD of Psychological Distress was 2.29397 ± 0.938 respectively.

Table 4: Assessment of level of Psychological Distress Among Nursing Student

N=200

| S.NO | Psychological distress (score) | n | % | Mean ± SD |
|------|---|----|---------|-----------------|
| 1. | Likely to be Well (10-19) | 59 | (29.5%) | 2.29397 ± 0.938 |
| 2. | Likely to have a mild disorder (20-24) | 57 | (28.5%) | |
| 3. | Likely to have a moderate disorder (25-29) | 42 | (21.0%) | |
| 4. | Likely to have a severe disorder (30-50) | 42 | (21.0%) | |

Table 5: depicts an item analysis of coping strategies. Majority of the subjects 86(36.4%) —a little bit turn to work or other activities to take their mind off things. 76(32.2%) subjects —a little bit concentrated their efforts on doing something about the situation they are in. 76(32.2%) subjects — a little bit saying to themselves —this isn't real. 115(48.7%) subjects were not used alcohol or other drugs to make themselves feel better. 90(38.1%) subjects got a little emotional support from others. 73(30.9%) subjects a little bit gave up tried to deal with it. 83(35.2%) subjects a little bit take action to try to make situation better. 85(36.0%) subjects a little bit refused to believe that it has happened. 71(30.1%) subjects a little bit said things to let unpleasant feelings escape. 67(28.4%) subjects a little bit got help and advice from other people. 98(41.5%) subjects not used alcohol or other drugs to get through it. 74(31.4%) subjects a little bit tried to see it in a different light, to make it seems more positive.

Table 5 :Item analysis regarding Assessment of Coping Strategies .

N=200

| S.no | Questions | I haven't been doing this at all f(%) | A little bit f(%) | A medium amount f(%) | I have been doing this at all f(%) |
|------|--|---|----------------------|----------------------------|--|
| 1 | I have been turning to work or other activities to take my mind off things | 41(17.4%) | 86(36.4%) | 40(16.9%) | 33(14.0%) |
| 2 | I have been concentrating my efforts on doing something about the situation I m in | 42(17.8%) | 76(32.2%) | 60(25.4%) | 22(9.3%) |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|-------------------|------------------|-----------|-----------|
| 3 | I have been saying to myself —this isn't real | 60(25.4%) | 76(32.2%) | 40(16.9%) | 24(10.2%) |
| 4 | I have been using alcohol or other drugs to make myself feel better. | 115(48.7%) | 50(21.2%) | 25(10.6%) | 10(4.2%) |
| 5 | I have been getting emotional support from others | 59(25.0%) | 90(38.1%) | 34(14.4%) | 17(7.2%) |
| 6 | I have been giving up trying to deal with it | 64(27.1%) | 73(30.9%) | 38(16.1%) | 24(10.2%) |
| 7 | I have been taking action to try to make situation better | 34(14.4%) | 83(35.2%) | 42(17.8%) | 40(16.9%) |
| 8 | I have been refusing to believe that it has happened | 57(24.2%) | 85(36.0%) | 33(14.0%) | 25(10.6%) |
| 9 | I have been saying things to let my unpleasant feelings escape | 55(23.3%) | 71(30.1%) | 42(17.8%) | 30(12.7%) |
| 10 | I have been getting help and advice from other people | 46(19.5%) | 67(28.4%) | 51(21.6%) | 36(15.3%) |
| 11 | I have been using alcohol or other drugs to get through it | 98(41.5%) | 41(17.4%) | 36(15.3%) | 25(10.6%) |
| 12 | I have been trying to see it in a different light, to make it seems more positive. | 44(18.6%) | 74(31.4%) | 42(17.8%) | 40(16.9%) |

Table- 6: depicts the level of coping strategies among nursing students that 56 (28%) subjects used poor coping strategies ,135(67.5%) used average coping strategies ,12(6%) used good coping strategies. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation (SD) of coping strategies adopted by nursing student was 1.777±0.015.

TABLE 6: Assessment of level of coping strategies Among Nursing Students

N=200

| Coping strategies(score) | n | %age | Mean ± SD |
|--------------------------------|-----|-------|-------------|
| Poor coping strategies (28-56) | 056 | 28.0% | 1.777±0.015 |
| Average coping strategies | 135 | 67.5% | |

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----|-------|--|
| (57-84) | | | |
| Good coping strategies (85-112) | 012 | 6.00% | |

Table 7: depicts that the association of physical distress were not significantly associated with their age ,class, marital status, education and occupation of mother and father , type of family ,family monthly income and type of accommodation whereas significantly associated with gender.

Table 7: The Association of Physical Distress with Selected Demographic Variables

N=200

| Characteristics | Physical distress level | | | df | χ^2 | p-value |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|----|----------|---------------------|
| | No physical distress | Less physical distress | High physical distress | | | |
| Age | | | | | | |
| 18-20 years | 53 | 64 | 28 | 4 | 2.636 | 0.620 ^{Ns} |
| 21-23years | 15 | 13 | 08 | | | |
| Above 23 years | 06 | 11 | 02 | | | |
| Class | | | | | | |
| GNM 1 ST YR | 46 | 54 | 23 | 4 | 2.332 | 0.675 ^{Ns} |
| GNM 2 nd YR | 22 | 23 | 13 | | | |
| GNM 3 rd YR | 06 | 11 | 02 | | | |
| Gender | | | | | | |
| Male | 06 | 08 | 10 | 2 | 9.141 | 0.010 * |
| Female | 68 | 80 | 28 | | | |
| Marital Status | | | | | | |
| Married | 10 | 06 | 04 | 4 | 3.468 | 0.483 ^{Ns} |
| Unmarried | 56 | 48 | 60 | | | |
| Widow/Separated | 08 | 07 | 60 | | | |
| Education of mother | | | | | | |
| No formal education | 15 | 14 | 10 | 8 | 7.676 | 0.466 ^{Ns} |
| Primary | 29 | 39 | 11 | | | |
| Secondary | 05 | 07 | 07 | | | |
| Senior Secondary | 08 | 10 | 03 | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|----|---|-------|---------------------|
| Graduation and above | 17 | 18 | 07 | | | |
| Education of father | | | | | | |
| No formal education | 10 | 09 | 02 | 6 | 3.009 | 0.808 ^{Ns} |
| Primary | 14 | 18 | 07 | | | |
| Secondary | 07 | 08 | 06 | | | |
| Senior Secondary | 43 | 53 | 23 | | | |
| Occupation of mother | | | | | | |
| House wife | 15 | 66 | 25 | 4 | 4.965 | 0.291 ^{Ns} |
| Government job | 13 | 13 | 11 | | | |
| Private job | 10 | 09 | 02 | | | |
| Occupation of father | | | | | | |
| Business | 10 | 09 | 02 | 4 | 2.061 | 0.725 ^{Ns} |
| Government job | 26 | 35 | 16 | | | |
| Private job | 03 | 44 | 20 | | | |
| Type of family | | | | | | |
| Joint | 17 | 19 | 06 | 4 | 3.157 | 0.532 ^{Ns} |
| Nuclear | 47 | 60 | 30 | | | |
| Extended | 10 | 09 | 02 | | | |
| Family Monthly Income (in Rs.) | | | | | | |
| Below 5000 | | | | | | |
| 5000-10,000 | 31 | 34 | 14 | 8 | 5.990 | 0.648 ^{Ns} |
| 10,000-15,000 | 07 | 07 | 04 | | | |
| 15,000-20,000 | 14 | 22 | 06 | | | |
| Above 20,000 | 17 | 18 | 07 | | | |
| | 05 | 07 | 07 | | | |
| Type of Accommodation | | | | | | |
| Hosteller | 49 | 48 | 23 | 4 | 2.971 | 0.563 ^{Ns} |
| Day scholar | 19 | 28 | 12 | | | |
| Paying guest | 06 | 12 | 03 | | | |

*= Significant at 0.05 level

Table 8: depicts that the association of psychological distress was not significantly associated with their class, gender, marital status, education and occupation of mother and father, type of family, family monthly income and type of accommodation. However, it was significantly associated with age.

Table-8: The Association of Psychological Distress with Selected Demographic Variables.

N=200

| CHARACTERSTICS | Psychological distress level | | | | df | χ^2 | p-value |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|----|----------|---------------------|
| | Likely to be well | Likely to have a mild Disorder | Likely to have a Disorder | Likely to have a Severe Disorder | | | |
| Age | | | | | | | |
| 18-20 years | 43 | 47 | 35 | 20 | 6 | 18.640 | 0.005* |
| 21-23 years | 11 | 06 | 05 | 14 | | | |
| Above 23 Years | 05 | 04 | 02 | 18 | | | |
| Class | | | | | | | |
| GNM 1 ST YR | 37 | 38 | 26 | 22 | 6 | 6.705 | 0.349 ^{Ns} |
| GNM 2 nd YR | 17 | 15 | 14 | 12 | | | |
| GNM 3 rd YR | 05 | 04 | 02 | 08 | | | |
| Gender | | | | | | | |
| Male | 03 | 06 | 09 | 06 | 3 | 6.533 | 0.088 ^{Ns} |
| Female | 56 | 51 | 33 | 36 | | | |
| Marital Status | | | | | | | |
| Married | 07 | 06 | 03 | 02 | 6 | 8.344 | 0.214 ^{Ns} |
| Unmarried | 46 | 45 | 31 | 39 | | | |
| Widow/Separated | 06 | 06 | 08 | 01 | | | |
| Religion | | | | | | | |
| Hindu | 39 | 35 | 31 | 28 | 9 | 11.366 | 0.251 ^{Ns} |
| Muslim | 14 | 09 | 06 | 11 | | | |
| Christian | 02 | 09 | 03 | 01 | | | |
| Sikh | 04 | 04 | 02 | 02 | | | |
| Education of mother | | | | | | | |
| No formal education | 11 | 09 | 06 | 13 | 12 | 17.222 | 0.141 ^{Ns} |
| Primary | 24 | 24 | 11 | 20 | | | |
| Secondary | 04 | 05 | 07 | 03 | | | |
| Senior Secondary | 06 | 06 | 08 | 01 | | | |
| Graduation and above | 14 | 13 | 10 | 05 | | | |
| Education of father | | | | | | | |
| No formal education | 07 | 08 | 03 | 03 | 9 | 9.091 | 0.429 ^{Ns} |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|--------|---------------------|
| Primary | 11 | 14 | 03 | 11 | | | |
| Secondary | 06 | 05 | 05 | 05 | | | |
| Graduation and above | 35 | 30 | 31 | 23 | | | |
| Occupation of mother | | | | | | | |
| House wife | 43 | 40 | 31 | 28 | 6 | 3.789 | 0.705 ^{Ns} |
| Government job | 09 | 09 | 08 | 11 | | | |
| Private job | 07 | 08 | 03 | 03 | | | |
| Occupation of father | | | | | | | |
| Business | 07 | 08 | 03 | 03 | 6 | 5.455 | 0.487 ^{Ns} |
| Government job | 21 | 17 | 21 | 18 | | | |
| Private job | 31 | 32 | 18 | 21 | | | |
| Type of family | | | | | | | |
| Joint | 15 | 11 | 11 | 05 | 6 | 5.794 | 0.447 ^{Ns} |
| Nuclear | 37 | 38 | 28 | 34 | | | |
| Extended | 07 | 08 | 03 | 03 | | | |
| Family Monthly Income (in Rs) | | | | | | | |
| Below 5000 | 23 | 21 | 11 | 24 | 12 | 17.894 | 0.119 ^{Ns} |
| 5000-10,000 | 06 | 02 | 04 | 06 | | | |
| 10,000-15,000 | 12 | 16 | 10 | 04 | | | |
| 15,000-20,000 | 14 | 13 | 10 | 05 | | | |
| Above 20,000 | 04 | 05 | 07 | 03 | | | |
| Type of Accommodation | | | | | | | |
| Hosteller | 38 | 32 | 23 | 27 | 6 | 7.376 | 0.287 ^{Ns} |
| Day scholar | 15 | 15 | 17 | 12 | | | |
| Paying guest | 06 | 10 | 02 | 03 | | | |

*=Significant at 0.05 level

Table 9: depicts that the association of coping strategies were not significantly associated with their age, year, gender, marital status, religion, education and occupation of mother and father, type of family, family monthly income, or type of accommodation.

Table 9 :The Association of coping strategies with Selected Demographic Variables.

N=200

| Characteristics | Coping strategies | df | χ^2 | p-value |
|-----------------|-------------------|----|----------|---------|
|-----------------|-------------------|----|----------|---------|

| | Poor coping strategies | Average coping strategies | Good coping strategies | | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|---|-------|---------------------|
| Age | | | | | | |
| 18-20 years | 33 | 104 | 08 | 4 | 4.592 | 0.332 ^{Ns} |
| 21-23years | 13 | 020 | 03 | | | |
| Above 23 years | 07 | 011 | 01 | | | |
| Year | | | | | | |
| GNM 1 ST YR | 30 | 86 | 23 | 4 | 1.514 | 0.824 ^{Ns} |
| GNM 2 nd YR | 16 | 38 | 04 | | | |
| GNM 3 rd YR | 07 | 11 | 02 | | | |
| Gender | | | | | | |
| Male | 02 | 021 | 01 | 2 | 5.165 | 0.076 ^{Ns} |
| Female | 51 | 114 | 11 | | | |
| Marital Status | | | | | | |
| Married | 02 | 015 | 01 | 4 | 5.469 | 0.242 ^{Ns} |
| Unmarried | 47 | 103 | 11 | | | |
| Widow/Separated | 04 | 017 | 00 | | | |
| Religion | | | | | | |
| Hindu | 32 | 93 | 08 | 6 | 2.038 | 0.916 ^{Ns} |
| Muslim | 14 | 24 | 02 | | | |
| Christian | 04 | 10 | 01 | | | |
| Sikh | 03 | 08 | 01 | | | |
| Education of mother | | | | | | |
| No formal education | 11 | 26 | 02 | 8 | 6.418 | 0.600 ^{Ns} |
| Primary | 25 | 49 | 05 | | | |
| Secondary | 06 | 12 | 01 | | | |
| Senior Secondary | 04 | 17 | 00 | | | |
| Graduation and above | 07 | 31 | 04 | | | |
| Education of father | | | | | | |
| No formal education | 03 | 17 | 01 | 6 | 3.841 | 0.698 ^{Ns} |
| Primary | 14 | 23 | 02 | | | |
| Secondary | 05 | 15 | 01 | | | |
| Senior Secondary | 31 | 80 | 08 | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|----|---|-------|---------------------|
| Occupation of mother | | | | | | |
| House wife | 38 | 95 | 09 | 4 | 2.506 | 0.643 ^{Ns} |
| Government job | 12 | 23 | 02 | | | |
| Private sector job | 03 | 17 | 01 | | | |
| Occupation of father | | | | | | |
| Business | 03 | 17 | 01 | 4 | 2.852 | 0.583 ^{Ns} |
| Government job | 24 | 49 | 04 | | | |
| Private job | 26 | 69 | 07 | | | |
| Type of family | | | | | | |
| Joint | 08 | 32 | 02 | 4 | 4.677 | 0.332 ^{Ns} |
| Nuclear | 42 | 86 | 09 | | | |
| Extended | 03 | 17 | 01 | | | |
| Family Monthly Income (in Rs.) | | | | | | |
| Below 5000 | 21 | 54 | 04 | | | |
| 5000-10,000 | 07 | 09 | 02 | 8 | 6.672 | 0.572 ^{Ns} |
| 10,000-15,000 | 12 | 29 | 01 | | | |
| 15,000-20,000 | 07 | 31 | 04 | | | |
| Above 20,000 | 06 | 12 | 01 | | | |
| Type of Accommodation | | | | | | |
| Hosteller | 28 | 83 | 09 | 4 | 3.196 | 0.526 ^{Ns} |
| Day scholar | 17 | 40 | 02 | | | |
| Paying guest | 08 | 12 | 01 | | | |

*=Significant at 0.05 level

DISCUSSION

The present study revealed that 74(37%) subjects had no physical distress, 79(39.5%) subjects had less physical distress, 47(23.5%) subjects had high physical distress. It was concluded that majority of subjects has less physical distress. Similarly, **K Betty (2019)** conducted a descriptive -exploratory study to assess the academic stress among nursing students. 100 students were selected as a sample. The results revealed that 45% had mild stress, 51% had moderate stress, 4% had severe stress.⁶

The present study revealed that 59(29.5%) subjects likely to be well, 57(28.5%) subjects likely to had mild mental disorder, 42(21%) subjects likely to had moderate mental disorder, 42(21.0%) had Severe mental disorder. Similarly, **J. Selva Mary Devakani¹, B. Jayabharathi (2023)** conducted a cross sectional to assess the levels of psychological

distress and overall mental health in a sample of adult subjects. 200 students were selected as a sample. The results showed that 122 (61%) subjects had moderate psychological distress, 64 (32%) had better mental health, and 14 (7%) experienced severe psychological problems.⁷

The present study revealed that 56 (28%) subjects used poor coping strategies 135(67.5%) used average coping strategies 12 (6%) used good coping strategies. Similarly **Ubale VG, SubravgoudarPL(2021)** conducted a descriptive study to assess the adjustment problems and coping strategies employed by college students. 110 nursing students were selected as a sample., The findings revealed that, 0.90% used poor coping strategies, 38.18% used average coping strategies, 60.91% used good coping strategies.⁸

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study suggested that, there is need of interventions to reduce the physical distress as well as psychological distress. The information booklet to manage physical as well as psychological distress among nursing students was prepared and disseminated to all subjects.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT AND SPONSORSHIP

Nil

REFERENCE

1. Chiang G, Low L, Chia T, Sundram M, Tan B. Prevalence of risk of distress and associated factors among physicians, nurses and rehabilitation therapists working in a community hospital: a cross-sectional study. *Singapore Medical Journal*. 2021 Oct 24;
2. Jancy Rachel Daisy. —A Study to Assess the Level of Stress and Coping Behaviours and to Evaluate the Effectiveness of Selected Coping Strategies among Student Nurses in Selected Institutions of Tamil Nadu. *RepositoryTnmgrmu.ac.in*, 1 Dec. 2012, repository-tnmgrmu.ac.in/19071/. Accessed 1 June 2023.
3. Viertiö, Satu, et al. —Factors Contributing to Psychological Distress in the Working Population, with a Special Reference to Gender Difference. *BMC Public Health*, vol. 21, no. 1, 29 Mar. 2021, bmcpublikealth.biomedcentral. com/articles/10.1186/s12889-021-10560-y, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-10560-y>.
4. Ramón-Arbués E, José Manuel Granada-López, Pedro José Satústegui-Dordá, Echániz-Serrano E, Lucía Sagarra-Romero, Antón-Solanas I. Psychological distress in nursing students: relationship with screen time, diet and physical activity. 2023 Dec 1;31. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC10370156/> 62 14. Lino MM, Raulino MEF, Lino MM, Amadigi FR, Castro LSEP, Kempfer SS. Nursing Students' Stress Level and How Its Influence on Educational Praxis. *OALib*. 2022;09(09):1–16.



5. Lino MM, Raulino MEF, Lino MM, Amadigi FR, Castro LSEP, Kempfer SS. Nursing Students' Stress Level and How Its Influence on Educational Praxis. OALib. 2022;09(09):1–16.
6. Betty K. A descriptive-exploratory study to assess the academic stress among nursing students. 2019.
7. J. Selva Mary Devakani¹, B. Jayabharathi. Assessment of Psychological Distress among B. Sc Nursing Students at SRM College of Nursing. Int J Nurs Educ. 2019;11(3):45. DOI: 10.5958/0974-9357.2019.00062.X.
8. Ubale VG, Subravgoudar PL. Assess the adjustment problems and coping strategies among nursing students in selected colleges of nursing at Kolhapur. International Journal of Advanced Psychiatric Nursing [Internet]. 2021;3(2):948. Available from <https://www.psychiatricjournal.net/archives/2021.v3.i2.B.69>.