

# UNIFORMED SERVICES UNIVERSITY OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES

4301 JONES BRIDGE ROAD BETHESDA, MARYLAND 20814-4799



### APPROVAL SHEET

Title of Thesis:

"Predicting Outcome in Patients with Work-Related Upper Extremity

Disorders: A Prospective Study of Medical, Physical, Ergonomic, and

Psychosocial Risk Factors"

Name of Candidate:

Grant D. Huang

Department of Medical and Clinical Psychology

Master of Science

1999

Thesis and Abstract Approved:

Wilal Just	ଧୃତ୍ୱାବ୍ୟ
Michael Feuerstein, Ph.D.	Date
Department of Medical and Clinical Psychology	

Thesis Advisor

David Krantz, Ph.D.

Department of Medical and Clinical Psychology

Committee Member

6/8/99 Date

Tracy Sbrocco, Ph.D.

Department of Medical and Clinical Psychology

Committee Member

The author hereby certifies that the use of any copyrighted material in the thesis manuscript entitled:

"Predicting Outcome in Patients with Work-Related Upper Extremity Disorders: A Prospective Study of Medical, Physical, Ergonomic, and Psychosocial Risk Factors"

beyond brief excerpts is with the permission of the copyright owner, and will save and hold harmless the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences from any damage which may arise from such copyright violations.

Grant D. Huang

Department of Medical and Clinical Psychology Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences

Grant D. Huang

#### ABSTRACT

Title of Thesis: Predicting Outcome in Patients with Work-Related Upper

Extremity Disorders: A Prospective Study of Medical, Physical,

Ergonomic, and Psychosocial Risk Factors

Grant D. Huang, Master of Science, 1999

Thesis directed by: Michael Feuerstein, Ph.D.

**Professor** 

Departments of Medical & Clinical Psychology and

#### Preventive Medicine & Biometrics

Although predictors of work-related upper extremity disorders (WRUEDs) have been identified, little is known about what predicts clinical outcomes in patients who already have this problem. The present investigation prospectively examined workers with WRUEDs (n = 70) over a 3 month period. A baseline questionnaire was used to assess demographic characteristics, occupational status, medical history, symptoms, physical function, ergonomic risk exposure, work demands, occupational psychosocial factors (e.g., job stress), social support (e.g., job support), and individual psychosocial factors (e.g., general distress, reactivity to pain). Logistic regression analyses were then conducted to predict composite outcome status. The composite outcome measure included symptom severity, functional status, mental health, and lost days from work. At both 1 and 3 months, ergonomic risk exposure (1 month RR = 1.06, 95% CI = 1.01 - 1.11; 3 month RR = 1.08, 95% CI = 1.01 - 1.15), job support (1 month RR = 1.03, CI = 1.00 - 1.07; 3 month RR = 1.04, CI = 1.01 - 1.08), and catastrophizing (1 month RR = 1.58, CI = 1.12 - 2.23; 3 month RR = 1.81, CI = 1.24 - 2.66) predicted poorer outcome.

Number of past upper extremity diagnoses (RR = 1.71, CI = 1.14 - 2.57), baseline SF-36 Mental Health score (RR = 1.24, CI = 1.01 - 1.54), and pain severity (RR = 1.50, CI = 1.08 - 2.07) also predicted outcome status at 1 month, while baseline symptom severity (RR = 6.21, CI = 1.28 - 30.09), past recommendation for surgery (RR = 5.53, CI = 1.18 - 25.86), number of prior treatments (RR = 2.24, CI = 1.26 - 3.96), and job stress (RR = 1.21, CI = 1.02 - 1.43) were additional significant predictors at 3 months. These findings indicate the need to address medical, physical, ergonomic, and psychosocial factors in efforts to improve outcomes. Furthermore, it is suggested that an organizational environment that encourages a coordinated effort from employees and management should also help improve recovery from these complex disorders.

# **Predicting Outcome in Patients with**

Work-Related Upper Extremity Disorders: A Prospective Study of Medical, Physical, Ergonomic, and Psychosocial Risk Factors

by

Grant D. Huang

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Department of Medical and Clinical Psychology

Graduate Program of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science 1999

#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to certain individuals for their valuable contributions and significant influences on this thesis.

First, I would like to thank my mentor, Dr. Michael Feuerstein, for his guidance and direction. While this thesis is just one of several milestones that are to hopefully come, its completion is an indication of his continual shaping and development of my academic pursuits. Additionally, I would like to thank Drs. Jerome Singer, David Krantz, and Tracy Sbrocco. Their input and suggestions for improving this study and manuscript have greatly added to the learning experience.

A tremendous amount of assistance and support on this project were provided by Francesca Belouad, Caroline Ennen, Amy Haufler, Julie Miller, and Julie Storey. Their help in conducting this investigation certainly made the process more manageable.

Robert Bettendorf and the Office Ergonomics Research Committee also deserve particular recognition for funding this research.

I am especially appreciative of my family as well as Patrick Chen, Faydeana Lau, David Tsai, Jenny Wang, and Andrea Yeh. Their prayers and encouragement served as strong motivations for putting forth a steady and quality effort. Furthermore, a more meaningful perspective on this work was provided through their challenging and thought provoking discussions.

Finally, I thank God who is my strength and the reason for my desire to learn and expand my mind through endeavors such as this one.

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Approval Sheet	i
Copyright Statement	ii
Abstract	iii
Title	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Table of Contents	vii
List of Tables	хi
Introduction	1
Work-Related Upper Extremity Disorders	1
WRUEDs and Their Relation to Physical and Psychological Health	2
Additional Impact of WRUEDs	3
Towards a Multidimensional Approach to Understanding WRUEDs	4
Physiological / Medical Factors	5
Ergonomic Risk Factors	6
Occupational Psychosocial Factors	7
Individual Psychosocial Factors	8
Study Rationale	9
Methods	11
Study Participants	11
Baseline Procedure	12
Follow-Up Procedure	13
Baseline Questionnaire	13

Demographic Characteristics	13
Occupational Status	14
Medical History / Status	14
Symptoms	14
Physical Function	15
Ergonomic / Biomechanical	15
Occupational Psychosocial	16
Work Demands	17
Social Support	17
Individual Psychosocial	18
Measures of Outcome	18
Selection of Potential Predictors	19
Calculation of Composite Outcome Index	20
Analyses	21
Results	22
Demographic Characteristics	22
Test-Retest	23
Predictors of Composite Outcome Status at 1 Month	23
Demographic Characteristics	24
Occupational Status	24
Medical History / Status	24
Symptoms	24
Physical Function	24

Ergonomic / Biomechanical	25
Occupational Psychosocial	25
Work Demands	25
Social Support	25
Individual Psychosocial	25
Predictors of Composite Outcome Status at 3 Months	26
Demographic Characteristics	26
Occupational Status	27
Medical History / Status	27
Symptoms	27
Physical Function	27
Ergonomic / Biomechanical	27
Occupational Psychosocial	28
Work Demands	28
Social Support	28
Individual Psychosocial	28
Predictors of Individual Outcomes at 1 Month	29
Predictors of Individual Outcomes at 3 Months	29
Discussion	30
Risk Factors for Poorer Outcome	30
Medical History / Status	30
Symptom Severity	31
Ergonomic Risk Factor Exposure	31

Occupational Psychosocial Factors	31
Low Job Support	32
Individual Psychosocial Factors	33
Potential Mechanisms	33
Implications and Suggestions for Intervention	36
Study Limitations	39
Conclusion	42
Tables	43
Appendices	58
References	99

# LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Correlations Among Medical Status Measures

Table 2: Correlations Among Symptom Measures

Table 3: Correlations Among Physical Function Measures

Table 4: Correlations Among Occupational Psychosocial Measures

Table 5: Correlations Among Work Demand Measures

Table 6: Correlations Among Individual Psychosocial Measures

Table 7: Standardized Factor Loadings for Composite Outcome Index

Table 8: Demographic Characteristics

Table 9: Diagnoses

Table 10: Treatments Used Prior to Baseline, 1 & 3 Month Follow-Ups

Table 11: Test-Retest Reliability of Independent Variables

Table 12: Predictors of Composite Outcome Status: 1 Month

Table 13: Predictors of Composite Outcome Status: 3 Months

Table 14: Predictors of Individual Outcomes: 1 & 3 Months

## INTRODUCTION

Work-related upper extremity disorders (WRUEDs) impact workers and work organizations because of the diverse set of medical, psychological, legal, social and financial challenges that they can present. This impact is further magnified considering that a wide array of individuals can be affected and/or involved with the case. In addition to the worker and management, physicians, occupational/physical therapists, ergonomists, psychologists, as well as co-workers and family members may also be affected by the sequelae of a given WRUED case. Over the past few decades, empirical investigations have found that medical, physical, ergonomic, and psychosocial factors are correlated with and/or predictive of these disorders (e.g., Armstrong et al., 1993; Bongers et al., 1993; Hales & Bernard, 1996). However, it is less clear how these factors contribute to clinical outcomes once a worker has developed a disorder.

# **Work-Related Upper Extremity Disorders**

The International Labor Organization Advisory Committee on Salaried and Professional Workers noted that "repetition strain injuries" were an occupational problem related to mechanized work during the 1960s (Chatterjee, 1987). In the 1980s, marked increases in the incidence and/or prevalence of these problems were reported in Australia (Hocking, 1987), Canada (Ashbury, 1995), and the United States (Hanrahan et al., 1991). As these "repetition strain injuries" received greater attention, other names were used synonymously in the literature, including: cumulative trauma disorders, repetitive trauma disorders, and overuse syndromes (Gerr et al., 1991). However, these descriptions imply a causal mechanism (i.e., repetition, overuse) that has not yet been definitively

established. One term that does not suggest an etiology and, therefore, is more appropriate is "work-related upper extremity disorders."

More precisely, WRUEDs stem from symptoms and functional limitation associated with muscles, tendons, and/or nerves in the finger, hand, wrist, elbow, arm, shoulder, and neck regions (Feuerstein, Huang, & Pransky, 1999; Rempel et al., 1992; Putz-Anderson, 1988). Cases typically present symptoms of pain, tingling, numbness, swelling, and/or tenderness (Szabo & Madison, 1995; Amadio, 1995; Downs, 1997). Additionally, while definitions for what constitutes a WRUED may vary, some of the more common diagnoses include: carpal tunnel syndrome, tendinitis, tenosynovitis (e.g., deQuervain's disease), lateral epicondylitis, and nerve entrapment syndromes (Rempel et al., 1992; Gerr et al., 1991).

# WRUEDs and Their Relation to Physical and Psychological Health

It has been noted that individuals with work-related upper extremity disorders continue to work with pain (Feuerstein et al., 1998). However, should symptoms associated with such disorders persist, functional limitations and/or work disability may result (Feuerstein, Huang, & Pransky, 1999). In other words, a worker may experience pain and/or other symptoms to an extent that he/she can no longer tolerate them and his/her ability to work becomes impaired. Should this impaired ability to work continue, the worker may eventually become disabled.

In addition to physical health considerations, the psychological health of WRUED patients also deserves attention. Anxiety disorders were found to be the most prevalent DSM-IIIR (American Psychiatric Association, 1987) diagnosis in a sample of carpal

tunnel syndrome patients who sought treatment from an orthopedic hand surgeon (Mathis et al., 1994). In a study of sign language interpreters, a fear of developing pain was associated with the presence of an upper extremity disorder and also had an impact on function, pain and perceived muscle tension while at work (Feuerstein et al., 1997). While causality cannot be established from the designs of these studies, the findings highlight the importance of addressing both physical and psychological health aspects in patients with WRUEDs.

### **Additional Impact of WRUEDs**

In addition to the physical and psychological impact on the worker, WRUEDs can also have significant organizational, financial, social, and legal impacts. Recent data reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (1999) indicated that over 419,000 upper extremity injuries/illnesses involved days away from work in 1997. According to the same data, carpal tunnel syndrome and tendinitis accounted for about 47,000 of these cases. Reports have also indicated that mean costs for upper extremity disorder cases can range between \$8,000 to \$10,000 (Webster & Snook, 1994; Brogmus & Marco, 1992). In 1989, it was estimated that all compensable upper extremity disorders in the United States cost approximately \$563 million (Webster & Snook, 1994). From a legal perspective, impairments of the upper extremities (i.e., arm, shoulder, hand, cumulative trauma disorders, carpal tunnel syndrome) were found to be the fourth most prevalent source of litigation associated with the Americans with Disabilities Act over a six-year period (Huang & Feuerstein, 1998). These data suggest that WRUEDs consume a large amount of resources at several levels. Therefore, it would seem that primary and

secondary prevention efforts that address WRUEDs could provide substantial benefits to the worker, work organization, and society.

# Towards a Multidimensional Approach to Understanding WRUEDs

Presently, a combination of medical, physical, ergonomic, and psychosocial factors is theorized to contribute to the development, exacerbation, and maintenance of work-related upper extremity disorders. Although the exact mechanisms by which these factors interact remain unclear, several models have been proposed to explain this multidimensional nature and to provide a conceptual framework for understanding WRUEDs. Armstrong and colleagues (1993) have suggested a dose-response model that focuses on mechanical and physiological factors and also notes the role of psychological factors. According to this model, internal doses (e.g., tissue loads and metabolic demands) stem from external exposure to work requirements. These internal doses subsequently lead to internal "disturbances" (i.e., mechanical, physiological, or psychological) that in turn, produce responses such as changes in tissue shape, ion concentrations, and substrate levels. After repeated or sustained doses and responses, an individual's capacity to adapt to the internal changes may be enhanced or reduced. It is believed that when this capacity is reduced, muscle, tendon, or nerve-related disorders result.

In a model of work disability associated with occupational musculoskeletal disorders in general, Feuerstein (1991) has suggested that such disability results from a complex interaction among medical status, physical capabilities, work demands, and psychological/behavioral resources. More specifically, this model suggests that medical

status variables associated with the musculoskeletal, neurologic, and cardiovascular systems influence a person's physical ability to work. These physical capabilities, in conjunction with work demands (i.e., biomechanical, aerobic, and psychological), determine a worker's ability to execute a given job task. However, discrepancies between the physical capabilities and work demands reduce the likelihood of returning to work from a work-related musculoskeletal disorder. Additionally, the model also suggests that the amount psychological/behavioral resources available to the worker can also moderate the discrepancy between physical capabilities and work demands. Taken together, this model proposes that medical, biomechanical, physical, and psychological factors all contribute to the worker's ability to return to work after a musculoskeletal injury or illness.

# Physiological / Medical Factors

Physiologically, inadequate blood supply, non-optimal hydrogen ion concentrations, and decreased supply of adenosine triphosphate and calcium ions are important factors that contribute to muscle fatigue (Rodgers, 1997). Additionally, if a worker is not given an adequate recovery time, symptoms such as aching, swelling, burning, and pain may arise from sustained and/or repetitive efforts. One study of workers who performed a standardized machine-paced task found that higher levels of static trapezius muscle activity (measured by electromyographic (EMG) recordings) were significantly correlated with complaints of soreness, fatigue, or pain in the neck and shoulder regions (Veiersted, Westgaard, & Andersen, 1990).

Compression of the median nerve at the wrist can also result in symptoms related to carpal tunnel syndrome (CTS) (Dawson, 1993). In cases of CTS, the pressure inside the carpal tunnel can increase from 3 mm Hg to 30 mm Hg (Rempel, Harrison, & Barnhart, 1992). Clinical assessment methods for CTS include Phalen's test, Tinel's sign, and determining nerve conduction velocity from the wrist to the thenar muscles (Dawson, 1993). It should be noted, however, that there is not a "gold standard" in diagnosing these problems (e.g., Baron, Hales, & Hurrell, 1996). In an investigation of asymptomatic workers, median sensory nerve conduction studies were not found to predict future CTS-like symptoms (i.e., pain, numbness, tingling, or burning) in the hands or fingers (Werner et al., 1997). Self-report measures of symptoms such as the Symptom Severity Scale (Levine et al., 1993) have also been developed to assess pain, weakness, numbness, and tingling. Studies on this scale have found it to be significantly correlated with physical measures (e.g., grip strength, pinch strength, and 2-point discrimination) of CTS (Levine et al., 1993).

#### Ergonomic Risk Factors

Ergonomic risk factors such as forceful exertions, repetitive or prolonged activities, awkward postures, contact stresses, vibration, and temperature extremes have all been associated with work-related upper extremity symptoms and disorders (e.g., Williams & Westmorland, 1993; Gerr et al., 1991). Methods for assessing exposure to ergonomic risk factors include direct observation, the use of checklists, and self-report (e.g., Punnett, 1998; Stetson et al., 1991). A study that assessed ergonomic exposure by means of a questionnaire as well as observation found an increasing prevalence of upper

extremity disorders was associated with greater exposure to ergonomic risk factors including non-neutral postures, vibration, manual forces in handling tools and parts, and mechanical pressures in tool use (Punnett, 1998). Another study that utilized the 1988 National Health Interview Survey found that self-reported repetitive bending/twisting of the hands/wrists as well as use of vibrating hand tools placed a worker at a greater risk for carpal tunnel syndrome (Tanaka et al., 1995). In a review of upper extremity disorders associated with video display unit work (Punnett & Bergqvist, 1997), factors such as high keyboard position, lack of arm support, chair discomfort, non-optimal desk height, and non-optimal screen height have also been found to place a worker at greater risk for neck/shoulder, arm/elbow, and hand/wrist disorders.

# Occupational Psychosocial Factors

Several models of occupational stress have incorporated organizational and individual characteristics in addressing occupational health in general as well as work-related musculoskeletal disorders (e.g., Cooper, 1986; Smith & Carayon, 1996). In these models, occupational stress has been proposed to stem from factors such as job/task design, organizational role, career development, interpersonal relationships at work (i.e., with colleagues, supervisors), work demands, and organizational climate.

Empirical investigations on occupational psychosocial risk factors have also found several variables to be associated with and/or predictive of WRUEDs. A review of these studies by Bongers and colleagues (1993) found that time pressure, monotonous work, high perceived work load, poor work content, high perceived work stress, and low job satisfaction were positively associated with neck or shoulder pain. Furthermore,

previous studies have found that lower levels of job support were associated with greater self-reported numbness in the hand and arm regions (Faucett & Rempel, 1994) and a greater risk for self-reported of shoulder and neck pain (Linton & Kamwendo, 1989).

Additionally, lower job support levels in both blue- and white-collar workers have predicted a change in the occurrence of upper extremity symptoms and disorders over a 10-year period (Leino & Hanninen, 1995).

#### Individual Psychosocial Factors

Emotional distress, perceptions, and interpretation of pain have been noted as some of the major components of an individual's pain experience (Craig, 1994; Weisenberg, 1994). Furthermore, it has been noted that stress can lead to increases in pain by triggering greater autonomic, visceral, and skeletal activity (Craig, 1994). In a study of musicians, a pain stressor task produced EMG elevations in the flexor and trapezius muscles in the musicians who had a history of upper limb pain (Moulton & Spence, 1992).

Patients with a history of upper extremity pain have been found to report higher levels of anxiety and distress prior to the provision of relaxation training and/or EMG biofeedback treatments (Spence et al., 1995). "Catastrophizing" has been described as "negative self-statements and overly negative thoughts and ideas about the future" and has also been implicated as a mediator of pain and function (Weisenberg, 1994). A study of low back pain patients that utilized the Catastrophizing subscale of the Coping Strategy Questionnaire found that a catastrophizing coping style was related to how a person adjusted to chronic pain (Rosenstiel & Keefe, 1983). Catastrophizing has also

been found to distinguish between workers with an upper extremity disorder who were disabled and those who continued working (Himmelstein et al., 1995).

# **Study Rationale**

While it is important to continue efforts that are directed at elucidating the etiology of these disorders, few studies have examined predictors of outcomes. Older age, non-white ethnicity, repetitive hand or wrist bending, and industry of last employment have been indicated as risk factors for work cessation in persons with carpal tunnel syndrome (Blanc et al., 1996). A recent study of U.S. Army soldiers found that age, race (i.e., Caucasian), lower organizational status, and self-reported occupational stress was predictive of work disability associated with an upper extremity disorder (Huang et al., 1998). Cole and Hudak (1996) reviewed prognoses related to nonspecific work-related upper extremity disorders and found that a longer duration of symptoms before medical consultation was sought and increased workplace demands were potentially important prognostic factors. However, they argue that methodological limitations and the lack of empirical evidence suggest a need for more research on the prognosis of these disorders. Another review of treatment outcomes in carpal tunnel syndrome patients (Feuerstein et al., 1999) found that compared to open release surgery, endoscopic release was related to increased physical function and fewer days to return to work. The same review also indicated that pain reduction was associated with steroid injections, use of vitamin B6, range of motion exercises, and cognitive behavior therapy. Return to work was also associated with range of motion exercises and multidisciplinary rehabilitation. Yet, despite these findings, the authors also note that there are few wellcontrolled investigations of such outcomes. Considering this scarcity of outcomesrelated research, even less is known about determinants of clinical outcomes in workers once diagnosed with a WRUED.

The present investigation prospectively examined a sample of patients with a recently diagnosed WRUED. It was hypothesized that a combination of medical, physical, ergonomic, occupational psychosocial, and individual psychosocial factors would predict a composite outcome comprised of symptom severity, functional status, mental health, and lost days. The purpose of this investigation was to delineate specific predictors in order to enable a more focused approach for future intervention and prevention efforts. Such strategies may subsequently help to improve health outcomes in affected workers, resulting in increased productivity, efficiency, and job satisfaction, as well as improvements in one's overall quality of life.

#### **METHODS**

# **Study Participants**

Study participants were recruited from the metropolitan Washington, D.C. region (including Maryland and Northern Virginia) through advertisements placed in regional newspapers, health newsletters, clinics, and hospitals. Persons interested in participating underwent a telephone interview to determine eligibility for the study (see Appendix A). Eligibility was based on the following criteria:

- 1) meeting a modified National Institute of Occupational Safety & Health (NIOSH) case definition for an occupational upper extremity disorder; this definition includes:
  - a) symptoms of pain, aching, stiffness, burning, tingling, and/or numbness in the finger, hand, wrist, elbow, arm, shoulder, or neck regions
  - b) symptoms beginning after employment at the present job
  - c) symptoms having lasted for more than one week, or at least once per month since their onset
  - d) no prior non-occupational accident or acute trauma to the symptom area within the past year
  - e) no prior diagnosis to the specified symptom area
  - f) having received a diagnosis from a health care provider within the past six weeks
- 2) between 20 and 65 years of age
- 3) presently working at least 20 hours per week

Based on these criteria, 87 individuals were determined eligible for participation.

#### **Baseline Procedure**

After participants consented to participate and provided documentation of their diagnosis from their health care provider, a physical examination was given to obtain measures of height, weight, pinch grip strength, and hand grip strength. Both the pinch grip strength and hand grip strength measurement procedures were conducted in accordance with the recommendations of the American Society of Hand Therapists (Casanova, 1992) as well as the manufacturers of the Jamar dynamometer. Following this examination, participants were given a 347-item baseline questionnaire.

Approximately 1 hour was required to complete the questionnaire and participants were allowed to take breaks as needed. Additionally, the investigator conducted checks at 15-20 minute intervals to provide clarification on questionnaire items, if necessary.

After completing the questionnaire, participants were given a packet that included three copies of a follow-up questionnaire to be completed at 1, 2, and 3 months post baseline survey. A note indicating the three follow-up dates was also provided in the packet. Monetary compensation (\$40) was provided to the participants upon the receipt of the third follow-up questionnaire.

At the conclusion of the initial visit, participants were offered the opportunity to participate in a test-retest investigation. This test-retest investigation was conducted to determine the reliability of the measures used in the present study. It involved returning to the university within 2 weeks of the baseline visit, completing the 347-item questionnaire again, and receiving monetary compensation upon completion. 24 participants (27.6% of the total sample) volunteered for the test-retest investigation.

All data obtained on the baseline and test-retest questionnaires were double-scored and double-entered into the database by two research assistants.

# **Follow-Up Procedure**

In addition to being provided with a reminder, participants were called 3 to 5 days prior to the follow-up date. Despite the follow-up efforts, 17 (19.5%) subjects were lost to follow-up. Reasons for this attrition included: decision to terminate participation after the initial visit because of a lack of personal time, loss of interest in the investigation, and failure to return the follow-up questionnaire on time. Of the 17 subjects lost to follow-up, one subject participated in the test-retest evaluation. All follow-up data were double-scored and double-entered into the database by two research assistants.

## **Baseline Questionnaire**

The baseline questionnaire was multidimensional in nature and assessed factors hypothesized to contribute to outcomes associated with upper extremity disorders. These factors were categorized as: demographic characteristics, occupational status, medical history/status, symptoms, physical function, ergonomic/biomechanical, occupational psychosocial, work demands, social support, and individual psychosocial. The entire questionnaire is provided in Appendix B.

### Demographic Characteristics

Demographic information obtained included age, gender, education level, marital status, and ethnicity.

### **Occupational Status**

Questions on occupational status included the following: type of job, duration at present job, part/full time status, days lost within the past month, and limited duty days.

### Medical History / Status

Items relating to medical history and status were primarily concerned with the upper extremity disorder and included the following: prior workers' compensation injury, number of past diagnosed upper extremity disorders, time between onset of present upper extremity symptoms and seeking medical help, number and types of therapies obtained, whether or not surgery had been recommended for any upper extremity disorder.

Additionally, questions regarding medical problems (i.e., diabetes, gout, thyroid problems, kidney failure, alcoholism, lupus, ruptured disc) and various health behaviors (i.e., tobacco, alcohol, prescription medication usage) were included in this section.

# Symptoms

Self-report of symptoms was obtained using three different measures. The first measure was the Symptom Severity Scale (SSS) (Levine et al., 1993) which is an 11-item measure that assesses pain, numbness, tingling, and weakness. It should be noted that while the questions specifically address symptoms in the hand and wrist regions, subjects in the present study were instructed to answer questions as they related to the area of their upper extremity disorder. The SF-36 Bodily Pain Subscale (Ware & Sherbourne, 1992) was also included to assess overall pain. This subscale consists of two questions relating

to the frequency of any bodily pain over the past 4 weeks. The third measure of symptoms was a single question using a 10-cm. visual analog scale of pain severity during the past week.

#### Physical Function

Four different measures were used to determine physical function. These measures were the Functional Status Scale (FSS) (Levine et al., 1993), the Physical Function and Role-Physical Subscales of the SF-36 (Ware & Sherbourne, 1992), and the Upper Extremity Function Scale (UEFS) (Pransky et al., 1997).

The FSS is an 8-item scale that measures a person's difficulty in conducting various daily hand-related tasks (e.g., writing, buttoning clothes, chores). The SF-36 Physical Function and Role-Physical subscales are comprised of 14 items (total) that assess general function/activity levels on daily life activities (e.g., bathing, moving). The UEFS is an 8-item questionnaire that assesses how problematic certain daily tasks (e.g., sleeping, writing, picking up small objects, washing dishes) are for a person as a result of his/her symptoms.

### Ergonomic / Biomechanical

Self-report of exposure to suspected ergonomic/biomechanical risk factors were obtained through two sets of questions. The first set of questions contained 10 items and was based on potential risk factors listed by Stetson and colleagues (1991) as well as those identified in the literature (e.g., Armstrong et al., 1993; Hagberg et al., 1995).

These risk factors included frequency of: repetition, forceful movements, ulnar/radial

deviation, and rest breaks. Questions on specific work-related tasks such as frequency of using the computer keyboard, mouse, telephone as well as frequency of writing and other hand motions were also included. All responses were obtained by using a 10-cm. visual analog scale.

The second set of questions was obtained from a questionnaire developed by Pransky and Hill-Fotouhi (1996). This questionnaire contains 10 items assessing frequency of performing work-related tasks that may place a worker at risk for injury or increased pain. Included in this measure are items regarding forceful movements, awkward postures, repetition, temperature extremes, and duration of sitting/standing.

# Occupational Psychosocial

Occupational psychosocial stressors that were examined were general job stressors. Items addressing general job stress were obtained from the Life Stressors and Social Resources Inventory (LISRES) (Moos & Moos, 1994) as well as the NIOSH Checklist of Work-Related Psychosocial Conditions (Tepper & Hurrell, 1995). The job stress measure of the LISRES contains six items on work-related conflicts, physical environment, and perceptions of work pace. The NIOSH checklist is a 26-item measure that examines a worker's perceptions on the physical work environment, work demands, work characteristics, and perceived work expectations. A 6-item measure of cognitive workstyle (Feuerstein, Huang, & Pransky, 1999) developed for this study was also included (Appendix B, Items 335-341). This measure was used to assess an individual's cognitive responses to work. Test-retest reliability analysis of this measure indicated a correlation coefficient of 0.85 (p < 0.01). An internal consistency analysis resulted in a Cronbach's alpha of 0.87.

#### Work Demands

Measures of work demands were based on questions developed by Caplan (1971) which had also been used in prior NIOSH investigations (e.g., Hales et al., 1994).

Specifically, these questions measure workload, workload variance, and physical and mental exhaustion. Borg's (1998) CR10 Scale which measures perceived exertion during a "typical day" was also included to assess perceived levels of work demands.

### Social Support

Three separate scales were used to measure social support. The first measure included an 11-item measure of social support at work (i.e., from co-workers and supervisor) that was based on questions developed by Caplan (1971). Prior NIOSH studies (e.g., Hales et al., 1994) have also used these questions to assess job support. However, it should be noted that for the purposes of this investigation, responses to these items were modified into a visual analog format.

The second measure of social support at work was obtained from the Job Resources Subscale of the LISRES (Moos & Moos, 1994). This subscale contains six items that assess the frequency of job support as well as perceptions of job characteristics (e.g., responsibility, challenge provided).

The third measure used five items obtained from the Organizational Self
Assessment (OSA) (Habeck et al., 1991) to assess the availability and/or offering of
workplace accommodations. While the OSA contains 30 questions that relate to
organizational climate as well as various management practices, only five items were

selected for the present study because of their relevance to general health and work-related upper extremity disorders. Specifically, these items asked about frequencies concerning: the provision of health-related resources and safety training, supervisory monitoring and encouragement in assisting with return to work, modifications made to help workers with pain and symptoms, and participation in decision-making and problem-solving in company operations. An internal consistency analyses of these five items resulted in a Cronbach's alpha of 0.71.

### Individual Psychosocial

Items assessing an individual's psychological health and emotional reactivity to stress and pain were obtained from four sources. The first was the 5-item Mental Health Subscale of the SF-36 (Ware & Sherbourne, 1992). The second was the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI), Form X-2 (Spielberger, Gorsuch, & Lushene, 1970), which is a 20-item measure of general anxiety. The third measure was the 6-item Catastrophizing Subscale from the Coping Strategies Questionnaire (Rosenstiel & Keefe, 1983). The fourth measure was the Discomfort Intolerance Survey (DIS) (Schmidt, 1995). The DIS is a 6-item visual analog scale that measures one's ability to tolerate pain/discomfort and his/her reactivity to such pain/discomfort.

#### **Measures of Outcome**

A follow-up questionnaire consisting of 100 self-report items was designed to obtain measures on the following outcomes: days lost from work within the past month, symptom severity, physical function, and mental health. Additionally, in order to

determine the influence of baseline levels of these variables, items used in the follow-up questionnaire were identical to those administered at baseline. Specifically, the scales used for follow-up were: the Symptom Severity Scale (Levine et al., 1993); the Functional Status Scale (Levine et al., 1993); the Physical Function, Vitality, Role-Physical, and Social Function Subscales of the SF-36 (Ware & Sherbourne, 1992); CR10 Scale of perceived exertion (Borg, 1998); the Mental Health Subscale of the SF-36 (Ware & Sherbourne, 1992); and, the STAI (Spielberger et al., 1970). The entire follow-up questionnaire is provided in Appendix C.

#### **Selection of Potential Predictors**

Several measures within each of the categories (i.e., demographic characteristics, medical history/status, symptoms, function, ergonomic/biomechanical, occupational psychosocial, work demands, social support, and individual psychosocial) hypothesized to contribute to upper extremity-related outcomes were obtained. Therefore, in an effort to reduce the number of potential predictors that were to be examined as well as any redundancies, correlation coefficients among variables within each of these categories were first obtained. In the ergonomic/biomechanical risk factor category, a correlation coefficient of 0.26 (p < 0.05) was found for the Pransky-Futouhi (1996) Scale and the ergonomic stressors scale based on Stetson et al. (1991). Since more than two variables were included in the other categories, the correlation matrices for these categories are provided in Tables 1 to 6.

Selection of potential predictors was partially based on an examination of the correlation coefficients. Measures determined to be representative of the construct in

question were chosen based on having a minimum correlation coefficient of 0.25 (p < 0.05) with other variables assumed to measure the same construct within the category. When two or more variables were significantly correlated, simplicity of the items (e.g., wording, number of items) and hypothesized relevance to upper extremity disorders (versus general or back-related problems) were factored into the final selection process.

The variables chosen for further analyses were: Demographic Characteristics - age, gender; Occupational Status - work days lost in the past month at baseline; Medical History/Status - prior workers' compensation injury, number of past upper extremity diagnoses, dominant hand grip strength, recommendation of surgery for an upper extremity disorder, treatment history; Symptoms - SSS at baseline, pain severity; Physical Function - FSS at baseline; Occupational Psychosocial - Moos & Moos (1994) Job Stress Subscale and the cognitive workstyle scale; Work Demands - Borg's (1998) CR10 Scale of perceived exertion; Social Support - Caplan's (1971) job support (i.e., co-workers and supervisor) scale and work accommodation (Habeck et al., 1991); Individual Psychosocial - SF-36 Mental Health Subscale (Ware & Sherbourne, 1992) and catastrophizing (Rosenstiel & Keefe, 1983).

# Calculation of Composite Outcome Index

For both the 1-month and 3-month follow-up periods, factor analyses were conducted on the standardized scores of four outcome measures: days lost from work, the SSS, the FSS, and the Mental Health Subscale of the SF-36 (e.g., Grice & Harris, 1998; Gorsuch, 1983). These measures were chosen because they represent outcomes of interest in several WRUED studies (e.g., Blanc et al., 1996; Franzblau et al., 1997; Stock et al., 1996; Spence, 1991). From the analyses, factor loadings on the four outcomes

were used to generate a composite outcome score. Since there were two follow-up periods of interest (1 and 3 months), a composite score for each follow-up period was calculated. Table 7 shows the loading factors obtained from the factor analyses for months 1 and 3. Based on a median split, the composite scores were categorized as "high" or "low." Scores above the median indicated poorer outcome. That is, high scorers had more days lost, higher levels of symptoms, poorer function, and lower mental health scores than low scorers.

#### Analyses

Logistic regression analyses (using SPSS v. 8.0) were conducted to predict composite outcome status (high vs. low) at both 1- and 3- month follow-up periods.

Variables selected as potential predictors were all simultaneously entered into the logistic regression model. A simultaneous entering method was chosen so that the predictive ability of the variables could be determined within the context of the other variables.

From these analyses, risk ratios, 95% confidence intervals, Wald test statistics, and standardized parameter estimates were obtained.

Subsequently, multiple linear regression analyses were conducted to determine predictors (at 1- and 3-month follow-up) of each of the four separate outcomes (i.e., symptom severity, functional status, lost days, and mental health) used to calculate the composite outcome score. Independent variables entered into the linear regression analyses were identical to those used in the logistic regression analyses. These variables were also simultaneously entered into the model.

#### RESULTS

Through t-test and  $\chi^2$  analyses, a comparison of study participants with (n = 70) and without (n = 17) complete 1- and 3-month follow-up data found no significant differences in age, education level, ethnicity, job category, or gender. The results described are based upon the 70 subjects for whom all follow-up (i.e., both 1- and 3-month) data were obtained.

# **Demographic Characteristics**

The sample ranged in age from 22 to 64 years with a mean age of 40.8 years (<u>SD</u> = 10.5). The majority of the sample was Caucasian (74.3%), female (77.1%), and had at least some college education (92.9%). Table 8 provides a more detailed description of the demographic characteristics.

Table 9 provides the breakdown of the International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision (ICD-9) (World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland, 1995) diagnoses of the participants. As shown in the table, carpal tunnel syndrome was the most common diagnoses in the sample. The second most frequent diagnosis was an unspecified disorder of the synovium, tendon, and/or bursa. In addition, the types of prior treatments that participants had before the baseline, 1-month, and 3-month assessment periods are given in Table 10.

There was a moderately significantly difference in age between the 1-month "high" ( $\underline{M} = 43.23$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 10.45$ ) and "low" ( $\underline{M} = 38.37$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 10.05$ ) scoring groups ( $\underline{t} = -1.98$ ,  $\underline{p} = 0.05$ ). No significant differences were found between these groups in education level, ethnicity, job category, or gender. For the 3-month follow-up period,

"high" and "low" scorers on the composite outcome measure did not significantly differ on age, education level, ethnicity, job category, or gender.

#### **Test-Retest**

Test-retest correlations ( $\underline{n}=23$ ) on the independent variables of symptoms, function, ergonomic risk exposure, occupational psychosocial factors, social support, and individual psychosocial factors were examined. The correlation coefficients are provided in Table 11. As shown, all measures were found to be significantly correlated ( $\underline{p}<0.05$ ), with correlation coefficients ranging from 0.42 to 0.90. These results indicate a moderate to high level of reliability in the self-report of the various assessment measures at baseline.

# **Predictors of Composite Outcome Status at 1 Month**

After a preliminary logistic regression analyses was conducted, a more specific model was determined by selecting variables that reflected the proposed multivariate nature of predictors and were significant at the p < 0.15 level. Variables that were entered into the final logistic regression model were: number of past upper extremity diagnoses, the Mental Health Subscale of the SF-36 at baseline, pain severity within the past week, ergonomic risk exposure, job stress (Moos & Moos, 1994), job support (Caplan, 1971), and catastrophizing.

All variables entered into the final logistic regression model with the exception of job stress were found to be significant predictors of composite outcome at 1 month.

Table 12 provides a summary of all significant predictors with their risk ratios (RR), 95%

confidence intervals (CI), Wald statistic, and standardized parameter estimates. All significant predictors had a continuous response scale, and therefore, the risk ratios are for each unit increase in a given response.

# Demographic Characteristics

No demographic characteristic variables from the preliminary model met the selection criteria for the final model.

# Occupational Status

No occupational status variables were found to meet the selection criteria for the final model.

# Medical History / Status

A history of upper extremity disorders was found to place a person at a greater risk for poorer outcome. Specifically, each upper extremity diagnosis was associated with a 1.71-fold risk (CI = 1.14 - 2.57) for a poorer outcome.

#### Symptoms

Self-reports of greater pain severity within the past week also resulted in a greater likelihood for poorer outcome (RR = 1.50; CI = 1.08 - 2.07).

### Physical Function

No functional measures were entered into the final logistic regression model because of failure to meet the selection criteria for the final model.

### Ergonomic / Biomechanical

Exposure to ergonomic risk factors was found to place a person at a greater likelihood for poorer outcome (RR = 1.05; CI = 1.01 - 1.11).

# Occupational Psychosocial

Job stress was not found to be a significant predictor of composite outcome status.

#### Work Demands

Perceived exertion as measured by the Borg CR10 Scale did not meet the selection criteria for the final model.

# Social Support

Reporting less social support from one's co-workers and/or supervisor was found to predict poorer outcome. Each unit decrease in reported social support had a risk ratio of 1.03 (CI = 1.00 - 1.07).

### Individual Psychosocial

A person who had a lower SF-36 Mental Health Subscale score (indicating poorer mental health/greater distress) at baseline was more likely to have a poorer outcome (RR = 1.25; CI = 1.01 - 1.54). Additionally, individuals who "catastrophized" more over their pain had an increased likelihood for a poorer outcome (RR = 1.58; CI = 1.12 - 2.23).

The final logistic regression model correctly classified 78.6% of all subjects ( $\chi^2$  = 24.80,  $\underline{df}$  = 7,  $\underline{p}$  < 0.001). Specifically, 77.1% of the "low" scorers and 80.0% of the "high" scorers were classified correctly.

# **Predictors of Composite Outcome Status at 3 Months**

Similar to the 1-month analyses, a preliminary logistic regression model was examined to obtain variables for a more specific model targeted at predicting composite outcome at 3 months. SSS score at baseline, past recommendation for surgery, number of prior treatments, ergonomic risk exposure, job stress, perceived exertion during a typical workday, job support, work accommodation, and catastrophizing were the variables found to be significant at the p < 0.15 level. Therefore, these variables were entered into the final model.

Table 13 summarizes the significant predictors identified by the final logistic regression model. All significant predictors, with the exception of past recommended surgery, had a continuous response scale. Therefore, for these continuous variables, the given risk ratios are for each unit increase in the responses.

#### Demographic Characteristics

No demographic characteristics met the selection criteria for the final 3-month model.

## Occupational Status

No occupational status variables were found to meet the selection criteria for the final model at 3 months.

## Medical History / Status

Recommended surgery as well as the number of prior treatments were found to significantly predict poorer outcome status. Having had a past recommendation for upper extremity-related surgery resulted in a risk ratio of 5.53 (CI = 1.18 - 25.86). Each treatment for an upper extremity disorder placed an individual at a 2.24-fold greater risk (CI = 1.26 - 3.96) for a poorer outcome.

#### Symptoms

An individual's baseline Symptom Severity Scale score significantly predicted poorer outcome. Each point increase in baseline SSS score was associated with a risk ratio of 6.21 (CI = 1.28 - 30.09).

#### Physical Function

No measures of function were entered into the final model.

#### Ergonomic / Biomechanical

Poorer outcome status was predicted by self-report of higher exposure levels to ergonomic risk factors ( $\dot{RR} = 1.08$ ;  $\dot{CI} = 1.01$  -1.15).

#### Occupational Psychosocial

Persons who reported higher levels of job stress also had a greater likelihood of having a poorer outcome (RR = 1.21; CI = 1.02 - 1.43).

#### Work Demands

Perceived exertion during a typical workday was not found to be a significant predictor of outcome.

## Social Support

Job support was found to predict poorer composite outcome status, while work accommodation was not a significant predictor. Lower levels of job support from coworkers and/or supervisor was associated with a risk ratio of 1.04 (CI = 1.01- 1.08) for poorer outcome.

# Individual Psychosocial

A greater tendency to "catastrophize" over pain significantly predicted poorer outcome (RR = 1.81; CI = 1.24 - 2.66).

The final logistic regression model correctly classified 77.1% of all subjects ( $\chi^2$  = 48.38,  $\underline{df}$  = 13,  $\underline{p}$  < 0.001). In this model, 80.0% of the "low" (i.e., better outcome) scorers and 74.3% of the "high" (i.e., poorer outcome) scorers were correctly classified.

#### Predictors of Individual Outcomes at 1 Month

Table 14 summarizes the predictors of the individual outcomes incorporated into the composite outcome index. Baseline SSS score was found to predict days lost, symptom severity and functional status at 1 month. Catastrophizing was found to predict symptom severity, functional status, and mental health. Baseline measures of days lost and mental health predicted their respective outcomes at 1 month as well.

#### Predictors of Individual Outcomes at 3 Months

12:3

Table 14 also summarizes the predictors of the individual outcomes that were incorporated into the composite outcome index at 3 months. Baseline SSS score predicted days lost in the past month, symptom severity, and functional status.

Additionally, 3-month symptom severity and functional status were predicted by a greater tendency to "catastrophize" over pain. An individual's cognitive workstyle was also found to predict days lost. More precisely, an adverse cognitive workstyle in which a person had more frequent beliefs of needing to continue work and/or being unable to take off from work predicted days lost. Poorer mental health was predicted by a lower baseline mental health score as well as perceived exertion during a typical workday.

#### DISCUSSION

The present investigation prospectively examined a community sample of workers with an upper extremity disorder to identify predictors of a composite measure of outcome. The findings indicated that poorer outcome could be predicted by a combination of medical, ergonomic, occupational psychosocial, and general distress factors and, therefore, supported the study's hypothesis. The specific variables found to distinguish outcome status at both 1- and 3- month follow-up periods were: exposure to ergonomic risk factors, job support, and catastrophizing. Additional predictive variables at the 1-month follow-up period included: history of upper extremity disorders, mental health (as measured by the SF-36 Subscale), and baseline pain severity within the past week. At the 3-month follow-up period, baseline symptom severity, recommended surgery, number of prior treatments, and job stress were also found to predict outcome status.

#### Risk Factors for Poorer Outcome

#### Medical History / Status

In addressing the future outcome of a worker with an upper extremity disorder, the present findings suggest that baseline medical history is an important preliminary factor to consider. A worker with past upper extremity diagnoses in multiple anatomical locations, who has had surgery recommended for a work-related upper extremity problem, and/or has had a multiple past treatments is at an increased risk for delayed recovery. These are potentially more complex cases and perhaps deserve greater attention especially with regard to follow-up.

#### Symptom Severity

It is interesting that even though greater symptom severity predicted poorer outcome at both 1 and 3 months, different measures were found to be significant predictors at the two follow-up periods. The implication of these findings is that perhaps a broader measure of symptoms (e.g., the SSS) would be more sensitive for assisting with the determination of future outcome. It is also interesting that none of the other baseline measures of functional status, lost days, or mental health predicted the outcome status that incorporated these variables. This finding suggests that a particular focus should be placed on the other factors (e.g., ergonomic and psychosocial) that were found to be significant predictors of outcome in workers with a WRUED.

# Ergonomic Risk Factor Exposure

While studies have found ergonomic and biomechanical risk factors to be associated with and/or predictive of upper extremity symptoms and disorders (e.g., Punnett, 1998; English et al., 1995; Tanaka et al., 1995; Feuerstein & Fitzgerald, 1992), few investigations have examined these variables as predictors of both physical and psychological health outcomes. The present study indicates that within a sample of upper extremity disorder patients, self-report of ergonomic risk factors can be used to predict a composite outcome index that incorporates both physical and psychological health.

# Occupational Psychosocial Factors

Occupational stress has been found to be correlated with and/or predictive of upper extremity symptoms as well as mental health. A study of newspaper employees

found that increased job pressure and working under deadlines are associated with a greater prevalence of neck, shoulder, hand, and wrist disorders (Bernard et al., 1994). Peer cohesion, staff support, control, work pressure, clarity in policies/rules, job satisfaction, work autonomy, stress, and physical comfort have also been found to distinguish between reports of "high" or "low" levels of pain in a sample of visual display unit operators employed at a newspaper publishing organization (Stephens & Smith, 1996). Occupational stress has also been found to be related to mental health outcomes as well (e.g., Smith, 1997; Spurgeon et al., 1997). In an empirical investigation of electronic company employees, items relating to trouble at work, greater job responsibility, lower margin for error, and poor relationships with superiors have been found to be associated with poorer general mental health as determined by the General Health Questionnaire (Shigemi et al., 1997). The present findings are consistent with previous studies and indicate that job stress can predict a composite outcome that incorporates a worker's physical and mental health. Furthermore, given that the present study assessed job stressors such as time pressure and interpersonal conflicts (i.e., using the Job Stress Subscale), the present findings relating to job support (discussed in the following section) take on added importance.

#### Low Job Support

Social support has been noted to be positively associated with physical and psychological health (House et al., 1988). A number of studies have also observed a relationship between lower levels of job support and upper extremity symptoms/disorders (Faucett & Rempel, 1994; Linton & Kamwendo, 1989; Leino & Hanninen, 1995). In the

present investigation, lower perceived levels of support specific to one's work environment (i.e., from co-workers, supervisor) was found to be a significant predictor of poorer outcome status. This result suggests that job support continues to play a role in the outcome of a worker once he/she develops an upper extremity disorder.

## Individual Psychosocial Factors

The findings also indicate that a greater reactivity to pain from an upper extremity disorder and its impact (i.e., catastrophizing) is predictive of poorer outcome at 1 and 3 months. Catstrophizing in relation to pain has also been found to differentiate work-disabled and non-disabled patients with a work-related upper extremity disorder as well as those with longer duration of disability (Himmelstein et al., 1995). The present results regarding heightened reactivity are also consistent with past studies indicating the significance of considering general distress in workers with WRUEDs. In a cohort of Finnish farmers, psychological distress (measured by the Symptoms Distress Checklist) was found to be a risk factor for disability from neck-shoulder disorders (Manninen et al., 1997). Additionally, self-reported depressive symptoms have been found to predict changes in neck/shoulder and upper limbs symptoms in both men and women (Leino & Magni, 1993).

#### **Potential Mechanisms**

In considering the identified risk factors of the present study, potential mechanisms can be suggested for conceptualizing how these variables may lead to poorer outcomes. It is interesting that both ergonomic and occupational stressors were found to

predict poorer outcomes. While multidimensional models of WRUEDs address the role of ergonomic and occupational psychosocial factors, their roles in outcomes is unclear. One possibility is that in workers who have already developed a WRUED, occupational stress can result in a heightened physiological reactivity, which in turn, can lead to a more detrimental outcome from exposure to ergonomic risk factors. This construct of "workstyle" (Feuerstein, Huang, & Pransky, 1999) has been proposed as a potential link between ergonomic and psychosocial factors in WRUEDs. While further empirical support is needed to validate this construct, it may provide a way to understand the potential interaction between psychosocial and ergonomic stressors.

Interpersonal relationships on the job also appear to play an important role in WRUED outcomes. Again, it should be noted that the Job Stress Subscale of the LISRES (Moos & Moos, 1994) used in the present study included items concerning relationships with co-workers and supervisors. Also, job support was found to be a significant predictor at both the 1-month and 3-month follow-up periods. Therefore, not only can adverse work relationships be a source of stress for workers with WRUEDs, but they also do not allow the worker to obtain support for which to better cope with pain and/or other consequences of the disorder. As these sequelae persist over time, they may contribute to poorer outcomes.

Personality factors (e.g., stable, enduring interactions with one's environment) have been associated with upper extremity disorders. For example, performance focus and efficiency, goal directedness, timeliness of task accomplishment, and organization of physical space taken from the Lifestyle Approaches scale (Williams et al., 1992) have been found to distinguish between carpal tunnel syndrome (CTS) and non-CTS patients

(Vogelsang, Williams, & Lawler, 1994). An investigation of Danish salespersons with self-reported musculoskeletal (i.e., neck, shoulder, low back) symptoms found that an interaction between low control and high levels of perceived competition from other salespeople placed a salesperson at a greater risk for neck-related symptoms (Skov, Borg, & Orhede, 1996). It has also been reported that 21% of acute carpal tunnel syndrome patients who saw an orthopedic hand surgeon met DSM-IIIR diagnostic criteria for at least one personality disorder (Mathis et al., 1994). In this sample, obsessive-compulsive (9%) and paranoid (9%) personality disorders were the most common diagnoses. This pattern of findings suggests that high levels of task-oriented behavior and heightened sensitivity to negative consequences in the environment are associated with upper extremity disorders. Subsequently, this disposition may place a worker with upper extremity symptoms at a greater susceptibility for distress which may exacerbate the problem.

In addition to these personality factors, it is has been suggested that uncertainty about prognosis may also contribute to greater distress (i.e., catastrophizing) in WRUED patients (Himmelstein et al., 1995). Failed attempts at seeking relief may further result in distress regarding the WRUED and, therefore, lead to poorer outcome. These possibilities may become more problematic when coupled with a work environment that contains adverse relationships, little or no support from co-workers and/or supervisors, and exposure to ergonomic risk factors. Other mechanisms by which catastrophizing may be related to pain experiences include a negative appraisal of and a decreased ability to cope with the pain (Weisenberg, 1994). Therefore, it is possible that stressful relationships at work as well as a lack of support may result in a reduced ability to cope

with and recover from a WRUED. Subsequently, workers with these risk factors may be more likely to have poorer outcomes in relation to their WRUED.

While these potential mechanisms are speculative, they highlight future directions for which research on WRUED outcomes can proceed. By obtaining a greater understanding of such mechanisms, more focused prevention and intervention efforts can also be conducted.

# Implications and Suggestions for Intervention

Few prospective studies have examined the combination of factors that were employed in the present investigation. Furthermore, while past studies have identified some predictors of work-related upper extremity disorders, it is less clear what role these factors play once the problem has developed. As previously discussed, there is also a need to identify mechanisms by which WRUEDs occur and how various factors contribute to their exacerbation and/or maintenance. However, the present findings that ergonomic risk exposure, job stress, job support, and catastrophizing predicted composite outcome at 3 months highlight the potential importance of an integrative approach to improving worker health and/or preventing further decrements in outcome following the onset of a WRUED. In addition, the present results suggest that such efforts should also address both organizational and worker-related factors.

Several organizational interventions have been suggested to address ergonomic risk factors (e.g., Cohen et al., 1997) and occupational stressors (e.g., Cooper & Cartwright, 1997; Murphy, 1996; Ivancevich et al., 1990). However, few intervention strategies have been proposed that target both ergonomic and psychosocial stressors.

Attempts at reducing these stressors should utilize a multidisciplinary team that involves management, the employee, occupational health providers, ergonomists, and psychologists. This approach has been suggested as a feasible way for generating and implementing accommodation efforts for disabled workers in light of the Americans with Disabilities Act (Kearney 1994; Stockdell & Crawford, 1992; Huang & Feuerstein, 1998). Schurman (1996) has also proposed the use of an intervention and research method called "participatory action research (PAR)" for redesigning work organizations as well as to improve performance, health, and safety. Components of PAR include: a focus on system development, a co-learning process, a participatory and democratic process, an empowering process, and a balance between research an intervention. Additionally, PAR should be a joint effort on the parts of labor, management, and researchers. A recent publication by the National Research Council (Druckman, Singer, & Van Cott, 1997) has noted that changes in technology, environment, and the population are major factors that influence organizational change. In response to these changes, different types of organizational forms have been developed. One such form utilizes a team-based organizational approach. While these teams can be temporary (called "adhocracies") or permanent in nature, it has been suggested that they can be appropriate given a particular type of situation.

With a multi-faceted team, a problem-solving strategy (Nezu & Nezu, 1993) may be utilized to reduce risk factors that may lead to decreased worker health. Specifically, this strategy involves identifying and analyzing problems, generating potential solutions, then selecting, implementing, and evaluating the solution. It has been indicated that self-appraised "effective" problem-solvers tend to report fewer physical symptoms (Elliott &

Marmarosh, 1994). A positive relationship has also been shown to exist between problem solving ability and reduced levels of psychological distress (D'Zurilla & Sheedy, 1991). Other studies on social problem solving have found it to be a moderator of depressive symptoms related to stress (Nezu et al., 1986; Nezu & Ronan, 1988). With a multidisciplinary team involved in a problem-solving process, it is possible that considerations and/or barriers can be more directly and effectively addressed. As a result, more immediate and efficient solutions for reducing organizational and/or environmental risk factors can be obtained and implemented.

The use of a multidisciplinary team may also help to increase levels of job support. It should be noted that one aspect of the job stress measure assessed in the present study was interpersonal conflicts on the job. Coupled with the findings relating to job support, it would appear that interpersonal relations on the job play a vital role in influencing the outcome of a worker with a WRUED. This suggestion can be better understood within the context of "autonomy support." Ryan and Solky (1996) describe this type of support as:

"...the readiness of a person to assume another's perspective or internal frame of reference and to facilitate self-initiated expression and action" (p. 252).

Within a work organization, it is possible that the inability of a worker to take the perspective of management and vice versa may help explain how interpersonal factors affect upper extremity outcome. Accordingly, if employees and management can learn to increase their awareness of the pressures, concerns, and/or difficulties of the other party, then a less antagonistic and more supportive environment may be produced.

Furthermore, with such a support system available, anxiety and heightened reactivity (i.e., catastrophizing) associated with the disorder may also be reduced.

Presently, it is not clear how to best design a work environment that encourages autonomy support and/or a team-based form of organization. However, the organizational literature has discussed total quality management (TQM) as one technique for facilitating organizational change that encourages such workplace attributes.

Although the construct of TQM has not been clearly specified and quality can be a relative concept (Druckman, Singer, & Van Cott, 1997), TQM does address the strategy, culture, techniques, activities, and overall functioning of the organization. Therefore, it is possible that TQM may be a potential strategy for improving the upper extremity health of workers as well as enhancing an organization's overall performance. However, a lack of empirical evidence on the effectiveness of TQM highlights the preliminary nature of these suggestions and emphasizes the need for more systematic investigations of these approaches.

## **Study Limitations**

While this study has several implications for the improvement of physical and psychological health as well as for secondary prevention, the limitations of the study must also be taken into account. In generalizing the present findings to a larger population, one should note that the majority of the participants in the present study were college educated, Caucasian women. While gender differences in WRUEDs have not been definitively established, past studies have found that women are more likely to report upper extremity symptoms (e.g., Polanyi et al., 1997; Bernard et al., 1994). There

is also uncertainty concerning the role of education in WRUEDs. Certain jobs (i.e., cleaners, hairdressers, secretaries, assembly line workers, and machine operators) have been found to be significantly over-represented in women who were diagnosed with an upper extremity disorder (English et al., 1995). However, job type may not necessarily be a direct reflection of educational level. Therefore, to understand how applicable the present findings are to the population in general, further investigations that delineate individual predictors of WRUEDs (e.g., gender, ethnicity, education) and their outcomes are needed.

The eligibility criteria of a recent diagnosis presented some difficulty in obtaining participants for the study. Subsequently, a relatively small sample size was examined. However, even with the limited sample size, a number of variables were found to be significant predictors at 3 months. Therefore, it is possible that for the identified risk factors, a larger sample size would have found a greater likelihood for a poorer outcome.

The methodological approach used in obtaining information relating to upper extremity diagnoses could have also been improved. Although upper extremity disorder diagnoses were documented by each participant's respective health care provider, the use of a standardized method for diagnosis (e.g., using a single physician) would have been more desirable. Such a method may also have provided useful objective information regarding clinical presentation, symptoms, and quantitative functional limitations.

Nevertheless, given that significant findings were obtained with a diverse set of diagnostic procedures, this study provides useful information concerning this heterogeneous population.

The exclusive use of self-report measures in the composite measure of outcome may have also been a limitation because of the potential for subject bias. The Symptom Severity Scale and the Functional Status Scale were utilized in the present study because of their correlations with other clinical measures (Levine et al., 1993). Nevertheless, future investigations should incorporate concurrent measures of symptoms, functional limitation, and psychosocial factors from sources such as health care utilization and/or medical records, personnel records, and/or supervisor reports. It has been argued that because expert judgments as well as self reports of ergonomic exposures may provide only a limited amount of information, future research might also use direct observations in the ergonomic assessment (van der Beek & Frings-Dresen, 1998).

It is also possible that differences in the patterns of predictors may have been found for a longer follow-up period. The predictors of composite outcome status may change when a patient has had time to heal and/or obtain treatment. Presently, there is an on-going effort to determine outcome in these patients after a 12-month period. Once this follow-up is completed, it would be possible to determine whether any differences occur in the patterns of predictors over time. These subsequent results may also provide further direction for improving worker health and/or secondary prevention efforts.

One other potential study limitation may be the definition of composite outcome. While symptoms, function, lost days, and mental health have recently become more commonly measured clinical outcomes, perhaps a more empirically validated set of outcomes should be examined. However, few studies have utilized a composite outcome measure that incorporates both physical and mental health outcomes. Consequently, it is

difficult to ascertain what a meaningful measure of composite outcome and/or health should entail.

#### Conclusion

The present investigation indicated that ergonomic and psychosocial stressors associated with one's work are predictive of poorer outcome in workers with a WRUED. There were also indications that medical history, symptom severity, and interpersonal factors deserve attention as potential moderators of these stressors. Implementation of an interdisciplinary team that utilizes a problem solving approach was proposed as one strategy for removing potential barriers that contribute to poorer outcome. An organization with such a team dedicated to improving worker health may also facilitate more positive worker perceptions of a supportive work environment. While future evaluation of such an intervention is needed to determine its efficacy, the present findings indicate that medical, physical, ergonomic, and psychosocial factors all need to be addressed in any efforts targeted at helping workers recover from work-related upper extremity disorders. By improving outcomes in these workers, it is hoped that recurrent and/or chronic problems associated with these disorders can be prevented. Subsequently, it is possible that organizational efficiency as well as worker satisfaction, productivity, and overall quality of life can be increased.

# **TABLES**

TABLE 1

CORRELATIONS AMONG MEDICAL STATUS MEASURES

	Dominant Hand Grip Strength	Dominant Hand Pinch Strength	Prior Workers' Compensa- tion injury	# of Past Upper Extremity Diagnoses	Time from Symptom Onset to Seeking Treatment	# of Past Treatments	Surgery Recom- mended	Other Medical Problems
Body Mass Index	0.170	0.100	0.150	0.122	0.008	-0.031	0.250*	0.167
Dominant Hand Grip Strength		0.862**	0.208	-0.176	0.369**	-0.313**	0.030	-0.095
Dominant Hand Pinch Strength			0.172	-0.239°	0.256*	-0.233	0.033	-0.144
Prior Workers' Compensa- tion injury				-0.42	0.040	-0.034	0.148	0.037
# of Past Upper Extremity Diagnoses					-0.112	0.276	-0.086	0.070
Time from Symptom Onset to Seeking Treetment						-0.014	0.088	0.010
# of Past Treatments							0.083	-0.152
Surgery Recom- mended							*****	0.326**

<sup>\*</sup> g < 0.05 \*\* g < 0.01

TABLE 2

CORRELATIONS AMONG SYMPTOM MEASURES

	SF36 Bodily Pain Pain Severity	Pain Severity
Symptom Severity -0.402** Scale	-0.402**	0.481**
SF36 Bodily Pain		-0.387**
n = 70		

• p < 0.05

\*\* p < 0.01

TABLE 3

CORRELATIONS AMONG PHYSICAL FUNCTION MEASURES

	SF36 Physical Function	SF36 Role- Physical	Upper Extremity Function Scale
Functional Status Scale	-0.642**	-0.543**	0.880**
SF36 Physical Function		0.395**	-0.623**
SF36 Role - Physical			-0.620**

\* <u>p</u> < 0.05 \*\* <u>p</u> < 0.01

TABLE 4

CORRELATIONS AMONG OCCUPATIONAL PSYCHOSOCIAL MEASURES

	NIOSH Occupational Psychosocial Checklist	Cognitive Workstyle
Job Stress (Moos & Moos, 1994)	0.644**	0.370**
NIOSH Occupational Psychosocial Checklist		0.437**

\* p < 0.05 \*\* p < 0.01

TABLE 5
CORRELATIONS AMONG WORK DEMAND MEASURES

	Workload Variance	Physical / Mental Exhaustion	Borg (1998) CR 10 Scale of Perceived Exertion
Workload	0.406**	0.490**	0.277*
Workload Variance		0.439**	0.200
Physical / Mental Exhaustion			0.340**

\* <u>p</u> < 0.05 \*\* <u>p</u> < 0.01

TABLE 6
CORRELATIONS AMONG INDIVIDUAL PSYCHOSOCIAL MEASURES

	State-Trait Anxiety Inventory	Catastrophizing	Discomfort Intolerance Scale
SF36 Mental Health	-0.687**	-0.625**	-0.321**
State-Trait Anxiety Inventory		-0.442**	0.206
Catastrophizing			0.206

<sup>\* &</sup>lt;u>p</u> < 0.05 \*\* <u>p</u> < 0.01

TABLE 7
STANDARDIZED FACTOR LOADINGS FOR COMPOSITE OUTCOME INDEX

	Composite Health Index Loading			
Factor	1 Month	3 Months		
Functional Severity	0.871	0.875		
Symptom Severity	0.832	0.804		
Days Lost	0.431	0.723		
Mental Health	0.755	0.689		

TABLE 8

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Age Mean (years) SD	1	0.8 0.5
	n	%
Gender	54	
Female	54	77.1
Male	16	22.9
Ethnicity		
White/Caucasian	52	74.3
Black/African-American	11	15.7
Latino/Hispanic	4	5.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	2	2.9
Other	1	1.4
Education Level		
High School Diploma or GED	5	7.1
Some college	17	24.3
2 Year degree	6	8.6
Bachelor's degree	10	14.3
Some graduate school	11	15.7
Master's degree	15	21.4
Graduate degree	6	8.6
Job Category		
Clerical worker; word processor	23	34.3
Professional/Technical	23	34.3
Management/Administration	12	17.1
Service	4	5.7
Sales	3	4.3
Machine Operator	2	2.9
Craftsman	1	1.4

 $\underline{n} = 70$ 

TABLE 9
DIAGNOSES

Specific ICD-9 Diagnosis	No. of Subjects *
Nerve Root and Plexus Disorders (353)	
Thoracic Outlet Syndrome (353.0)	2
Mononeuritis of Upper Limb (354)	
Carpal Tunnel Syndrome (354.0)	33
Unspecified mononeuritis of upper limb (354.9)	3
Cubital Tunnel Syndrome (354.2)	1
Disorders of the Cervical Region (723)	
Cervicalgia (pain in neck) (723.1)	2
Unspecified neck symptoms or disorders (723.9)	1
Peripheral Enthesopathies (726)	
Lateral epicondylitis (726.32)	5
Medial epicondylitis (726.31)	2
Unspecified enthesopathy (726.9)	2
Tendon, Synovium, and Bursa Disorders (727)	
Unspecified disorder of synovium, tendon, and bursa (727.9)	13
Radial styloid tenosynovitis (deQuervain's) (727.04)	4
Trigger finger (acquired) (727.03)	1
Other tenosynovitis of hand/wrist (727.05)	1
Disorders of muscle, ligament, and fascia (728)	
Muscle spasm (728.85)	1
Unspecified disorder of muscle, ligament, and fascia (728.9)	1
Other Disorders of Soft Tissues (729)	
Myalgia, myositis, fibromyositis (729.1)	2

<sup>\*</sup> Note: Total number of subjects is greater than sample size  $(\underline{n}=70)$  because certain subjects had multiple diagnoses.

TABLE 10
TREATMENTS USED PRIOR TO BASELINE, 1 & 3 MONTH FOLLOW-UPS

Treatment	Baseline <u>n</u> (%)	1 Month <u>n</u> (%)	3 Months <u>n</u> (%)
Medical			
Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs	59 (84.2)	56 (80.0)	44 (62.9)
Local steroid injections	14 (20.0)	17 (24.3)	14 (20.0)
Surgery	6 (8.6)	5 (7.1)	9 (12.9)
Other	2 (2.9)	4 (5.7)	5 (7.1)
Oral steroids	2 (2.9)	1 (1.4)	0 (0.0)
Antidepressants	1 (1.4)	4 (5.7)	3 (4.3)
Physical Therapy			
Splinting	36 (51.4)	37 (52.9)	30 (42.9)
Ultrasound	17 (24.3)	18 (25.7)	16 (22.9)
Other	16 (22.9)	17 (24.3)	17 (24.3)
Muscle re-education	11 (15.7)	9 (12.9)	9 (12.9)
Transcutaneous nerve stimulation	9 (12.9)	11 (15.7)	10 (14.3)
Traction	3 (4.3)	3 (4.3)	3 (4.3)
Collar	0 (0.0)	2 (2.9)	1 (1.4)
Psychological			
Stress management	6 (1.4)	4 (5.7)	5 (7.1)
Other	1 (1.4)	1 (1.4)	0 (0.0)
Pain management	0 (0.0)	2 (2.9)	1 (1.4)
Psychotherapy	0 (0.0)	1 (1.4)	0 (0.0)
Biofeedback	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.4)

TABLE 11
TEST-RETEST RELIABILITY OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Measure	Į.
Symptom Severity Scale	0.79**
Functional Status Scale	0.90**
SF-36 Mental Health Subscale	0.84**
Ergonomic Stressors Scale	0.86**
Job Stress Subscale	0.83**
Cognitive Workstyle	0.85**
Job Support	0.84**
Catastrophizing	0.72**
Work Accommodation	0.42*

\* <u>p</u> < 0.05 \*\* <u>p</u> < 0.001

Note: Duration = 2 weeks

TABLE 12
PREDICTORS OF COMPOSITE OUTCOME STATUS: 1 MONTH

		95% CI			_
Baseline Variable	Risk Ratio	Lower	Upper	Wald	R
No. of Past Upper Extremity Diagnoses	1.71	1.14	2.57	6.62	0.22
SF36 Mental Health	1.24	1.01	1.54	4.29	0.15
Pain Severity	1.50	1.08	2.07	5.90	0.20
Ergonomic Risk Exposure	1.06	1.01	1.11	4.78	0.17
Job Support	1.03	1.00	1.07	4.83	0.17
Catastrophizing	1.58 "	1.12	2.23	6.85	0.22

<sup>\* &</sup>lt;u>p</u> < 0.05 \*\* <u>p</u> < 0.01

TABLE 13

PREDICTORS OF COMPOSITE OUTCOME STATUS: 3 MONTHS

Baseline Variable	Risk Ratio	Lower	Upper	Wald	R
Symptom Severity Scale	6.21 *	1.28	30.09	5.14	0.18
Recommended Surgery	5.53 *	1.18	25.86	4.71	0.17
No. of Prior Treatments	2.24 **	1.26	3.96	7.62	0.24
Ergonomic Risk Exposure	1.08 *	1.01	1.15	4.63	0.16
Job Stress (Moos)	1.21 *	1.02	1.43	4.71	0.17
Job Support	1.04 *	1.01	1.08	5.63	0.19
Catastrophizing	1.81 **	1.24	2.66	9.27	0.27

<sup>\*</sup> **p** < 0.05 \*\* **p** ≤ 0.01

TABLE 14

PREDICTORS OF INDIVIDUAL OUTCOMES: 1 & 3 MONTHS

Days Lost in Past Month					
1 Month 3 Months					
<b>Variable</b> No. of Past UE	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Variable Baseline SSS	Beta	ΔR <sup>2</sup>
Diagnoses Baseline SSS	-0.330 **	0.184	Score Cognitive	0.301 *	0.210
Score Baseline Days	0.267 *	••	Workstyle	0.444 **	0.128
Lost	0.465 **	0.294			
	9	vmptom S	Severity		
Symptom Severity 1 Month 3 Months					
<b>Variable</b> Baseline SSS	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Variable Baseline SSS	Beta	$\Delta R^2$
Score Perceived	0.755 **	0.635	Score	0.557 **	0.404
Exertion	-0.1 <b>88 *</b>	0.023	Catastrophizing	-0.482 *	0.066
Catastrophizing	-0.281 *	0.022			
	F	- Functional	Status		
1	1 Month 3 Months				
<b>Variable</b> Baseline SSS	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Variable Baseline SSS	Beta	ΔR <sup>2</sup>
Score	0.182 *	0.613	Score	0.230 *	0.497
Catastrophizing	-0.308 *	0.027	Catastrophizing	-0.472 *	0.063
Mental Health					
1 Month 3 Months					
Variable Baseline SF36	Beta	ΔR²	Variable Baseline SF36	Beta	ΔR²
Mental Health Score	0.666 *	0.541	Mental Health Score Perceived	0.652 **	0.434
Catastrophizing	0.484 **	0.066	Exertion	0.246 *	0.038

<sup>\* &</sup>lt;u>p</u> < 0.05 \*\* <u>p</u> < 0.01

# **APPENDICES**

# WRUED PHONE SCREEN INTERVIEW

J <del>7</del>
Hi, I'm, a researcher at the Uniformed Services University. I'm calling you back to ask whether you are interested in participating in the research study of work-related upper extremity disorders. The study involves coming in for ONE 1 to 1½ hour visit where you will fill out a questionnaire and complete several tasks. You will also be given three copies of a brief 20-minute questionnaire to fill out 1, 2, and 3 months after your visit. You'll mail them back in the self-addressed, pre-paid envelopes provided.
None of the procedures are harmful or dangerous in any way. For instance, there are no needles or blood draws or taking of any drugs. For your participation, (a total of about 2 hours of your time), you will receive \$40.00 upon completion of the third follow-up questionnaire.
Do you think that you might be interested in participating?
If NO, say, "Thank you anyway for your time. Goodbye."
If YES, say, "Great. Let me do two things now if you have a few minutes. OK, the FIRST thing I'd like to do now is to ask you some questions in reference to your medical history. Do you have a few more minutes now to answer these questions?
If NO, say, "When is a good time for me to call you back?"
If YES, continue with he screen on the next page.
Interviewer:
Date:
Name:
Phone: H/W
Gender: M F
1) What is your age?
2) Are you currently employed? Y N
If YES, how many hours per week?
If VES, what kind of work do you do?

3) Have you been diagnosed with an UPPER EXTREMITY DISORDER If yes, when?	Y	N
If yes, did you or the doctor who diagnosed it believe that it was related to your work?	Y	N
If yes, was the diagnosis within the last 30 days? (will accept up to six weeks)	Y	N
If yes, have you ever had surgery for an Upper Extremity Disorder?	Y	N
If yes, would you be able to obtain a note from your doctor stating this or would he/she be able to fill out a short form with a couple of questions about your diagnosis?	Y	N
4) Do you have any significant medical, physical, or emotional problems, such as diabetes, ulcer, thyroid problems, arthritis, alcoholism, depression, panic?	Y	N
If yes, what ?		
when ?		
What kind of medications were you prescribed?		
5) Are you taking any medications currently?  If YES, what		
6) Do you have any other condition that might be affecting your current health s	status?	
Do you have any questions?		

20

#### AFTER THE MEDICAL SCREEN:

OK, SECOND, let me briefly explain the main components of the study. One, at your visit, you will be given a questionnaire to fill out that will ask you some questions about such things as your work, medical history, and your pain or symptoms. You will have your height and weight measured, along with what we call a pinch/grip test of your hand strength. Afterward, you will be given three copies of a brief questionnaire to take home and mail back 1, 2, and 3 months after your visit. That's it. Any questions at this point?

What would be a good time for you to come and do the questionnaire?

# **UPPER EXTREMITY SCREEN**

NAME:	
DATE:	
SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER:	
STREET ADDRESS:	
CITY, STATE, ZIP:	
WORK ADDRESS:	
CITY, STATE, ZIP:	
HOME PHONE:	·
WORK PHONE:	
GRIP:	

### UPPER EXTREMITY SCREEN

		10 Ti
L	DEMOGRAPHICS	
1)	Age: What is your date of birth? (month/day/year)	
2)	Gender: Male Female	
3)	Education: What is the highest level of education that you have completed? (Circle one letter)  a) Less than High School b) High School diploms or GED c) Some Callege d) 2 year degree e) Bachelor's Degree f) Some graduate school g) Master's Degree h) Graduate Degree	
4)	Marital Status: (Circle one letter) a) Single b) Single but cohabiting (unmarried, living together in romantic love relationship) c) Divorced d) Separated e) Widowed f) Married	
5)	Ethnicity/Race: (Circle one tetter) a) Asien or Pacific Islander b) Black or African-American c) Latino or Hispanic d) Native American or Alaskan Native e) White or Caucasian, but non Hispanic f) Other:	
<b>6</b> )	What are you primarily? (circle one)	•
	Right-handed Left-handed Soth	
7)	What is your current job title?	
8)	If military, what branch/corpe/rate?	
9)	How long have you held your current job?	
10	) le your job (atale ane)	
	pert-time (20 hours per week or fewer) full-time (more than 20 hours per week)	
11	How long have you consistently (without breaks longer than one month) been working a similar number type of job? yearsmonths	r of hours perweek i

12) For the chart below, circle the month when you had your work injury. Place an "N" in the box below each month when you were not working at all. Place on "L" in the box for months when you were on light duty or alternate duty. Place an "R" for months you were on requist duty.

If you were on any status for less than one month, indicate the number of weeks by placing a number indicating this before the k you chose.

For example, if you were on 2 weeks limited duty and 2 weeks regular duty in January 1995, you would place "2L" and "2R" in I

	If it was 997	only day	s, indicat	e it was d	lays inste	ed of wee	ks by "2da	lysL" insti	sed of "ZL			
JĀN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	
JAN	998	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	Ju	AUG	8EP	OCT	NOV	DEC	
	CAL STA		or discom	fort that y	ou believ	to be rei	ated to yo	ur work?			Yes	N
	stop her	•	nterfering	with your	shility to	do vour u	ab?				Yes	
·	·			•	•	•						
16) Have	you beer	n maintain	ning your r	eguler w	ork sched	ule and ni	imber of h	ours?	• • • • • • •	••	Yes	N
16) Has	your work	decrease	ed to a lim	ited, alter	nate, or li	ght duty s	<b>180</b> 45?	· • • • • • •	• • • • • •	• • • •	Yes	N
17) Have	e you mis	sed work (	due to this	problem	7	•••••	• • • • • • •	• • • • • • •	· · · · · · · · ·	•••	Yes	N
•		uch work	did you m oks	niss in <b>th</b> e	last mon	ith due to	<b>t</b> his <b>prob</b> k	im?	٠.			
			to work a	t all due (	lo work-re	isted inju	r <b>y</b>	• • • • • • •	• • • • • • •	•••	Yes	•
			Place a str your ansi		ical line th	wough the	<b>epproprie</b>	to area o	n the hart	tantai line	below.) You	cen usi
		a low pai	in threshol	id.					ı <b>-</b>			
Hei Lik	t at All  -								Estrai	icly Like M	ie.	
20) Plea	nse rate Y	ne severity	l of Aort I	ein durin	g the past	t week.						
No	pain  -								Sever	e <b>pai</b> n		

21	Excluding your present	problem, have yo	ou ever had a prid	or worker's comp	injury? (circle one)	. <b>Yes</b>	•
22	If yes to #21, were you	off from work for	more than 6 mon	ths? (circle one)	•••••••	. Yes	•
23)	Tobacco Intake History:	: Do you smoke (	cigarettes or che	v tobecco?		Yes	•
24)	If so how many cigaretts	es or how much t	obacce do you d	new/day?		-	
25)	Do you ever consume a	icohol?	••••••	••••••	•••••	Yes	*
26)	If so how many drinks (d	ount doubles as	2) <b>per wee</b> k?		·	•	
27)	Do you take any prescri	ption medications	?	••••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Yes	M
28)	If so what are those med	fications?					
29)	How much and how ofte	n do you take the	se prescription m	nedications?			
30)	Do you take any non-pr	escription medica	itions?	******	••••	Yes	N
31)	If so what are these med	lications?			<del></del>		
32)	How much and how ofte	n do you take the	ee non-prescripti	on medications?			
33)	Have you been diagnost	ad with a specific	upper extremity (	disorder?	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Yes	Na
34)	If so what was the diagn	osis?			·.		
36)	Have you ever been tok bureltis in any of the the	) by a doctor that se areas? (circle (	you had tendonil my or all that apply,	ie, tenceynovitis, ( )	cerpel tunnel synd	rome, thoracic d	uliet syndrom
	nook	left	right	both both	none		
	shoulder elbew	left left	right right	both	none		
	forcerm hendforlet	iofi iofi	right right	both both	none none		

	i) What was the length of time between the onset of any upper extremity symptoms and your seeking medical help? Please check the appropriate answer.)
	Hed no difficulty that needed medical help (skip to #41)
371	Have problems but never sought medical help (skip to #41)  Please check all of the following therapies that you have had for any type of pain or other problem in your hands, wrist, arm
	shoulders, or neck:
•	MEDICAL:
	Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (i.e., Ibuprofen, Naproxen, Naprosyn)  Oral steroids Local steroid injections  Antidepressants  Surgery: indicate type
	PHYSICAL THERAPY:
	Splinting Muscle re-education Transcutaneous nerve stimulation Ultrasound Traction Coller Other (specify) PSYCHOLOGICAL:
	Strees Management Pain Management Psychotherapy Hypnotherapy Biofeedback Other (specify)
	Think about all the examinations, treatments, and therapy you've had for your work injury. How much pain or discomfort had from these examinations, treatments, or therapy?
	None Slight peln or discomfort Average pain or discomfort Severe pain or discomfort
<b>30</b> )	Hee your physician over <u>recommended</u> surgery for <u>work-related</u> problems in any of these crees? (Please check of that apply)
	Neck Shoulder Elbow Fereerm Hend/wrist

40)	i) Have you ever <u>had surpary</u> for <u>work-related</u> problems in any of these areas? (Please check all that a								
	Neck	Shoulder	Elbow	Forearm	Hand/Wrist				
41)	Have you eve	or been told by a	doctor that you i	had any of the folio	wing? (Please check all that apply)				
	Diabete	6							
	Gout Thyroid	problems							
	Lupus								
		d diec in NECK d diec in BACK		_					
	Rheume	stoid Arthritis		•					
,	Alcoholi Kidney f								

How helpful have the following providers and treatments been toward your recovery from your work injury? (Please circle one number that corresponds to your ensure for each question)

			HODOG 8	DISN'T MOD	Hindaged	- Hindaria	Does not			
		Helped Helped a Didn't Help Hindered Hindered a Lot								
42)	Family doctor	5	4	3	2	1	Apply 8			
43)	Specialist (for example, Orthopodist)	5	4	3	2	1	8			
44)	Paychalogist	5	4	3	2	1	8			
45)	Worker's Comp Case Manager	5	4	3	2	1	8			
46)	Overnight hospital stay	5	4	3	2	1	8			
47)	Surgery	5	4 .	3	2	1	8			
48)	Prescription medicines or injections	5	4	3	2	1	8			
49)	Over-the-counter (non-prescription) medicines	5	4	3	2	1	8			
<b>SO</b> )	medicines Splint or brece	5	4	3	2	1	•			
<b>5</b> 1)	Physical therapy	5	4	3	2	1	•			
62)	Ultrecound	5	4	3	2	1	8			
\$3)	Chireproctic treatment	5	4	3	2	1	8			
54)	Work rehabilitation program	5	4	3	2	1	8			
<b>66</b> )	Sports program or	5	4	3	2	1	8			
66)	gym Strees Menagement	5	4	3	2	1	8			
67)	Pain Management	8	4	3	2	1	8			
\$8)	Poychotherapy	5	4	3	2	1				
\$0)	Hypnetherapy	5	4	3	2	1				
80)	historia	5	4	3	2	1	8			
61)	Other (explain)*	8	4	3	2	1	•			

• Evalaia:	
• Explain:	

ihin	k about the person (famuy doctor, chiropractor, etc.) who primarily treated y	ou for yo	ur work injury. Did this person
62)	Explain your medical condition in a way that you could understand?	Yes	No
63)	. Tell you when you could return to work?	Yes	No
64)	Encourage you to go back to work?	<b>Yes</b>	No
65)	Take your problem seriously?	.Yes	No

### M. PAIN / SYMPTOMS

The following questions refer to your symptoms for a <u>trained twenty-four-hour period</u> during the past two weeks. (circle one answer each question)

- 66) How severe is the hand or wrist pain that you have at night?
  - 1 I do not have hand or wrist pain at night.
  - 2 Mild pain
  - 3 Moderate pain
  - 4 Severe pain
  - 5 Very severe pain
- 67) How often did hand or wrist pair wake you up during a typical night in the past two weeks?
  - 1 Never
  - 2 Once
  - 3 Two or three times
  - 4 Four or five times
  - 5 More than five times
- 68) Do you typically have pain in your hand or wrist during the destime?
  - I never have pain during the day
  - 2 I have mild pain during the day
  - 3 I have moderate pain during the day
  - 4 I have severe pain during the day
  - 5 I have very severe pain during the day
- 60) How often do you have hand or wrist pain during the destime?
  - 1 Never
  - 2 Once or twice a day
  - 3 Three to five times a day
  - 4 More than five times day
  - 5 The pain is constant
- 70) How long, on average, does an epicode of pain last during the daylime?
  - 1 I never get pain during the day
  - 2 Less then 10 minutes
  - 3 10 to 60 minutes
  - 4 Greater than 60 minutes
  - 5 The pain is constant throughout the day

																	-
•	71)	Da	you h	ive UT	mbness	(loss of s	ensation) i	in your hand?	74		ow se ight?	VOR	is numl	bness	(loss o	f sensa	tion) or ti
		1	No														
					numbne		_			1			no numb	mees :	or tingli	ing at n	ight
					orate nun		_			2	Mil						
					re numbi					3	Mo		ie e				
		5	i hev	e very	oovere n	umbness	}			4	Sen						
		_								5	Ver	ry 86	vere				
	72)	Do	Aon pe	iae Mili	<u>akpeas</u> ir	n your he	nd or wrist	!?									
									75								s maps Ac
		1		oeknee						du	rring a	مير ا	cal nigh	j durin	ig the p	get bus	marks?
			Mild v														
					pekness					1	Nev						
			Sever								Onc						
		5	Very a	MANALA	weekne	16				3			hree tim				
		_								4	Fou	ror	five time	6			
7	73)	Do	you he	ve <u>jing</u>	ing sone	lations in	your hand	1?		5	Mor	e th	in five ti	mes			
		1	No tin												graspin	ng and i	uee of em
			Mild ti	ngling									eys or p		- •	-	
		3	Moder	rate tin					-•								
		4	Seven	e tingli						1	No	diffic	uity				
		5	Very s	evere	tingling					2	Mild						
			•		•								e difficul	RV .			
													Miculty	•			
										5			rere diffi	vilus			
Ü	ndic	ele j	YOUR BE	ISWOT.		inrough		opriate area d	on the horizo	ntel	ine b	elow	.) You c	en ue	) the en		ige to bes
		Not	at All									ı	Extreme	بطليا بيان	. Ma		
			Mo		,							7		.,			
7	7) 1	CON	tolera	le a gn	eet deel	of physic	al discomi	fort.									
	•																
		Not	at All									ı	Extreme	ly Libe	Me		
		Libe	Me	1							·	7					
7	1 (8	hev	re a hiç	h pain	thresho	ld.											
	-																
		Net	et All	<u></u>								4	Extreme	ly Like	Me		
			Mo	•								1					
7	-	-						sically uncom									
															- 00-		
		Not	MAN.									4	Estrone	ly LIN			
				•								•					
_					. A 69												
	<b>10</b> ) (					vhen i ex											
												1	S-1	4.1			
		No	EGLAN									┪		7			
				•								-					
_				-i- 4- 4	سطح لمحا	محدد عظامما		e, I quickly to	ke stone in s	حمثام	میں ور	عمتل	omfort				
	) (TI			_													
													Extrem	خلا يراه	n Ma		
		110	TEL AND	-								7			<del></del>		
				•													
					مه ده همد	سائم مولا	معمل طنعه	mfort comper	ed to most s	900	le.						
	16)		। सम्बद्ध	-	A 10 100												

IV. ACTIVITY

On a typical day during the past but make have hand and unist symptoms caused you to have any difficulty doing the activities listed below? Please circle one number that best describes your ability to do the activity.

- No difficulty Mild difficulty Moderate difficulty Severe difficulty
- Cannot do at all due

### oning of clothes

- No difficulty
  Mild difficulty
  Moderate difficulty
  Severe difficulty
  Cannot do at all due to hand or wrist symptoms

## 86) Holding a book while reading

- No difficulty Mild difficulty Moderate difficulty Severe difficulty
- Cannot do at all due to hand or wrist symptoms

# pping of a telephone handle

- No difficulty
  Mild difficulty
  Moderate difficulty
  Severe difficulty
  Central do at all due t

### ing of jans

- No difficulty
  Mild difficulty
  Moderate difficulty
  Severe difficulty
  Cannot do at all due (

### old chores

- No difficulty
  Mild difficulty
  Moderate difficulty
  Severe difficulty
  Carrect do et all due to hand or wrist sym

### ying of grocery begs

- No difficulty
  Mild difficulty
  Moderate difficulty
  Severe difficulty
  Cannot do at all due to hand or wrist symple

### 90) Bathing and dressing

- No difficulty
  Mid difficulty
  Moderate difficulty
  Severe difficulty
  Cannot do at all due to hand or wrist symptoms

# 91) Typing / teyboarding / word-proc

- No difficulty
  Mild difficulty
  Moderate difficulty
  Severe difficulty
  Cannot do at all due t

### ng a heavy box

- No difficulty
  Mild difficulty
  Moderate difficulty
  Severe difficulty
- Cannot do at all due to hand or wrist symptoms

### 25) Z ching overhead

- No difficulty
  Mild difficulty
  Moderate difficulty
  Severe difficulty
  Cannot do at all due to hand or write

# ng a hammer or acrewdriver

- No difficulty
  Mild difficulty
  Moderate difficulty
  Severe difficulty
  Cannot do at all due to hand or wrist symptoms

- Moderate difficulty
  Severe difficulty
  Cannot do at all due t

### aing your jeb

### . 97) Brushing your teeth

- 1 No difficulty
- 2 Mild difficulty
- 3 Moderate difficulty
- 4 Severe difficulty
- 5 Cannot do at all due to hand or wrist symptoms

### 98) Picking up a coin or other small object in your fingers

- 1 No difficulty
- 2 Mild difficulty
- 3 Moderate difficulty
- 4 Severe difficulty
- 5 Cannot do at all due to hand or wrist symptoms

### 99) Sleeping

- 1 No difficulty
- 2 Mild difficulty
- 3 Moderate difficulty
- 4 Severe difficulty
- 5 Cannot do at all due to hand or wrist symptoms

### 100) In general, would you say your health is: (circle one)

Excellent Very Good Fair Poor Good

101) Compared to one year ago, how would you rate your health in general now? (circle one)

- a) Much better than one year ago
- b) Somewhat batter than one year ago
- c) About the same as one year ago
- d) Somewhat worse now then one year ago
- e) Much worse then one year ago

The following items are about activities you might do during a typical day. Does your health limit you in these activities? (Circle your response for each question)

182) Vigorous activities, such as running, lifting heavy objects, participating in strenuous sports

Yes, limited a let Yes, limited a little No, Not limited at all

163) Moderate activities, such as moving a table, pushing a vacuum cleaner, bowling, or playing golf

Yes, limited a let Yes, limited a Mile No, Not limited at all

104) Lifting or carrying groceries

Yee, limited a let Yes, limited a 1986 No. Not limited at all

105) Climbing several flights of stairs

Yes, limited a lot Yes, limited a Note No. Not timited a

106) Climbing one flight of stairs

Yes, firnited a lot Yes, limited a 1886 No. Not limited at

107) Bending, kneeling, or stooping

Yes, limited a let Yes, limited a MMle No, Not limited at

106) Walking more than a mile

Yes, limited a lot Yes, limited a little No. Not irrated at

109) Walking several blocks

Yes, limited a lot Yes, limited a little No. Not limited at

110) Walking one block

Yes, limited a lot Yes, limited a little No. Not limited at

111) Bathing or dressing yourself

Yes, limited a lot Yes, limited a Nittle No. Not limited at

During the past 4 weeks, have you had any of the following problems with your work or other regular daily activities as a result of your physical health? (Circle Yes or No for each dem)

112) Cut down the amount of time you spent on work or othe activities

Yes No

113) Accomplished less then you would like

Yes No

114) Were limited in the kind of work or other activities

Yes No

115) Had difficulty performing the work or other activities (to example, it took extra effort)

Yes No

During the past 4 weeks, have you had any of the following problems with your work or other regular daily activities as a result of any emotional problems (such as feeling depressed or annious)?

116) Cut down the amount of time you spent on work or other activities

Yes

No

117) Accomplished less then you would like

Yes

No

118) Didn't do work or other activities as carefully as usual

Yes

No

119) During the past 4 weeks, to what extent has your physical health or emotional problems interfered with your normal social activities with family, friends, neighbors, or groups?

Not at all A little bit Moderately Quite a bit Extremely

120) How much bodily pain have you had during the past 4 weeks?

None

Very

Moderate

Severe

Very

121) During the past 4 weeks, how much did pain interfere with your normal work (including both work outside the home and housework)?

Not at all A little bit Moderately Quite a bit Extremely

These questions are about how you feel and how things have been with you during the past 4 weeks. For each question, please give the one answer that comes closest to the way you have been feeling. How much of the time during the past 4 wooks:

122) Did you feel full of pep?

S-All of the time 4-Most of the time 3=A good bit of the time 2-Some of the time 1=A Ittle of the time 0=None of the time

123) Have you been a very nervous person?

S-All of the time 4=Most of the time 3-A good bit of the time 2=Some of the time 1=A MMe of the time 0=None of the time

124) Have you felt so down in the dumps that nothing coul cheer you up?

5=All of the time 4=Most of the time 3=A good bit of the time 2=Some of the time 1=A little of the time 0=None of the time

125) Have you felt calm and peaceful?

Saall of the time 4=Most of the time 3=A good bit of the time 2=Some of the time 1=A NUIs of the time Orlione of the time

126) Did you have a lot of energy?

5=All of the time 4-Most of the time 3=A good bit of the time 2=Some of the time 1=A little of the time O=None of the time

127) Have you felt downhearted and blue?

S-All of the time 4=Most of the time 3=A good bit of the time 2=Some of the time 1=A little of the time O-None of the time

128) Did you feel worn out?

SeAll of the time 4-Most of the time 3=A good bit of the time 2=Some of the time . 1=A little of the time O-None of the time

128) Have you been a happy person?

SeAll of the time <del>delicat</del> of the time 3-A good bit of the time 2-Some of the time 1=A tittle of the time O-Hone of the time

130) Did you feel tired?

SeAll of the time 4-Meet of the time 3-A good bit of the time ne of the time 1=A IIIIo of the time O-None of the time

, 131)	During to activities	he past 4 wo s (like visiting	eks, how m g with friend:	uch of the times, relatives, e	ne has your phy tc.)?	rsical mealth of (	emotional problems interfered w	ith you social
	if the     Ne	Most of the time	Same of the time	A little of the time	None of the time			
How	TRUE or	FALSE is e	ach of the fo	llowing state	ments for you?	(Circle your reap	onse)	
132)	i seem t	o get sick a i	ittle easier ti	nan other peo	ople			
	Definitely true	Mostly true	Don't know	Mostly false	Definitely felse			
133)	i am as t	realthy as ar	nybody i kno	w				
	Definitely true	Mostly	Den't knew	Mostly folse	Definitely false			
134)	expect	my health to	get worse					
	Definitely true	Mostly true	Don't know	Mostly false	Definitely false			
136) (	Vy heelt	1 is excellen	t					
	Definitely true	Mostly true	Don't know	Mostly talse	Definitely false			
<b>V</b> .					-			
The fo	llowing a	isks e serie:	s of question	regarding h	ow you view yo	ur work.		
						nt your work situ onk line before s		
Receiv	1	Occasion 2		Some	imes 3	Often 4	<u>Very Often</u> 5	
The n	nd serie	s of cuestics	ne meks how	often certei	n things happe	n at vour iob.		
					work very fast?			
					work very herd			
•				- •		· pt things done?		
			_	deel to get d		<b>.</b>		
•					n your worldoo		encuired on wave inh?	
							required on your job?	
-						have to think?		
						f the work day?		
144)	Ho	w often are	you mental	y exhausted	at the end of t	us Mork and		

	ace a strai icale your	ght vertical line through the appropriate area on the horizontal line banswer.	elow.) You can use the entire range to best
Ē	emple: 1	have a low pain threshold.	
	Not at A Like Me	· <del> </del>	Extremely Like Me
146	) At work:	How frequently do you find your fingers/wrists/hands/arms (any one or	combination) moving "as fast as they can go?"
	Never		Very Frequently
146	) At work:	How frequently do you find your fingers/wrists/hands/arms making jarky	guick, sudden movements?
	Never		Very Frequently
147)		How frequently do you find your fingers/wrists/hands/arms making repai	
	Nover		Very Frequently
148)	At work:	low frequently do you find your fingers/wrists/hands/arms making force	i <u>ul</u> movements?
	Never		Very Frequently
149)		low frequently do you pause or stretch for at least one minute during a	•
	Never		Very Frequently
	fingers/wi	buring a typical workday, how concerned are you with maintaining the prists/hands/arms that affect your work quality? (for example: typing accusts to cortain keys to achieve work goal)	recision and accuracy of movements in your rately and rapidly requires highly precise
	<b>94</b>		

151) Think about the job you were doing when your work injury occurred. How often did you have to do the following? (Please circle one number that corresponds to your enswer for each statement)

	Never	Seldom	Sametimes	Often	Very Often
Lift heavy objects	1	2	3	4	6
Twist your back while lifting	1	2	3	4	8
Work in a cold or refrigerated area less than 55° F?	1	2	3	4	6
Push, pull, or pinch with a lot of force	1	2	3	4	6
Sit for long periods without a chance to get up	1	2	3	4	-6
Stand for long periods without a chance to sit down	1	2	3	4	6
Work with your arms raised	1	2	3	4	6
Work in an awkward position	1	2	3	4	6
Repetitive activities (for example, type, turn screws, assemble, pack, cut) more than twice per minute	1	2	3	4	6
Use equipment that vibrates (for example, power tools)	1	2	3	4	5

- 152	) At work:	How frequently do you find yourself moving your wrists from side to side e	ither with or without using a tool?
	Never	<del></del>	Very Frequently
153	) At work:	How frequently do you find yourself making a "clothes-wringing type" moti	on?
	Never		Very Frequently
154)	At work:	How frequently do you find yourself making a "screwdriver-twisting type" re	notion?
	Never		Very Frequently
156)		Now frequently do you find yourself making a "hammering-type" motion?	
٠	Never		Very Frequently
156)		low frequently do you find yourself making a "pinching type" motion?	Man Resourcette
		•	
_		low frequently do you find yourself making a "squeezing or fist type" motion	
		low much can the configuration or levout of the work surface at your works	
1 <b>50</b> ) <i>i</i>	At work: H	in the height of the work surface be adjusted?	
!	Not at all	<b> </b>	Very Much
160)	At work: H	low much can the location of the work surface be adjusted?	<u>.</u>
1	Not at all		Very Much
		low often is the tool that you use one that is suspended from something?	
	Never		Very Frequently
•		tow frequently do you find yourself using the computer mouse?	Alexa Bernarda
	Never		very requestry
163)		low trequently do you find yourself using a keyboard?	Very Frequently
_ ,	•		
164)		law frequently do you find yourself holding a document/book at eye level?	Very Frequently

100	, ~	WUIK.	LION Madhaunh on han una hansau an mil a hallan u. annaul	<b>-</b> :
				Voc Empressiv
				very requesting
1661	A	wark:	How frequently do you find yourself holding or dialing a telephone?	
,	,	<b></b>	non mequality as you mis yourself instanty or stanting a temperature	
		NAT.	<del> </del>	Very Frequently
167)	A	work: I	How frequently do you find yourself writing?	
	No	ver		Very Frequently
168)	Att	work: F	riow frequently do you find yourself using manual hand-held tools?	
	No	707		Very Frequently
			1	
169)	Alı	vork: F	flow frequently do you find yourself using your palm as a striking tool?	
	No	707		Very Frequently
			1	
170)	At v	vork: H	iow frequently do you find yourself manually stapling?	
	Nev	FOF		Very Frequently
			1	
171)	At u	rork: H	low frequently do you find yourself using your finger or thumb as pressin	g tool?
			•	
	Nev			Very Frequently
			1	
172)	Al w	rork: H	low frequently do you find yourself grasping objects with your hands?	
				_
	Nev			Very Frequently
			'	
				_
173)	Al u	rork: H	low frequently do you find yourself picking up small objects in your finger	<b>6</b> 7
:	Nev			Very Frequently
			' '	
			and the seakers Artis consists a B	
174)	Do ;	you we	ser bifocals while working?	
			<b>A1</b> -	
	Yet	•	No	
	_		a company of the second and the seco	and along the consti
175)	Rei	o The C	degree of physical exertion or effort you believe is associated with a typi	ery at work.
	_		M. t A . M	
	0		thing at all	
	0.5		ny, vony easy	
	1 2	En	ny <b>000y</b>	
	3		oy Iderately herd	
	4		mounet hard	
	5	Ho		
	7.	Vo	ry hard	
	•			
	•			
	10	Va	er untilheid	

	76
, 176) Rate the degree of physical exertion or effort you believe is associated with a highly demanding day at work.	186) A work space appropriate for the job.
0 Nothing at all 0.5 Very, very easy	Very Somewhat A little Not at all Conft determ 1 2 3 4 9
0.5 Very, very easy 1 . Very easy 2 Easy	187) A fest-pace
3 Moderately hard 4 Somewhat hard	Very Somewhat A little Not at all Can't determ
5 Herd 6 7 Very herd	188) Physically strenuous.
	Very Somewhat Alittle Not at all Can't determi
10 Very, very hard .	1 2 3 4 9
Please airale Yes or No to the following work environment cherecteristics:	188) Repetitive.
Would you say that in your job you:	Very Somewhat Allthe Not at all Can't determine 1 2 3 4 9
177) Work at a forced pace Yes No	190) Mentally demanding.
178) Work rotating shifts Yes No 178) Are required to work overtime Yes No	Very Somewhet Altitle Not at all Con't determin
180) Have flexible work hours Yes No	191) A high workload.
181) Work serving the public Yes No	Very Somewhet Alttile Not at all Can't determin
Circle the answer that best describes your impressions of the following work environment characteristics (at your workplace).	192) Resources for performing work tasks readily available.
182) A clean work area.	Very Samewhet Alltile Not at all Can't determin 1 2 3 4 9
Very Semanhat A little Not at all Can't determine 1 2 3 4 9	. 183) Clear job expectations.
183) A quiet work area.	Very Somewhet Alittle Not at all Cen't determin
Very Semanhet A IIII Not at all Con't determine 1 2 3 4 9	194) Workers feel pressured to keep working.
184) A comfortable air quality (in terms of usual temperature, circulation, moisture, odors).	Very Semewhet Allthe Not at all Can't determine
Very Semeuhat A IIII Not at all Can't determine	195) Job activities are controlled by the workers.
	Very Semewhet A Mile Net at all Cen't determin
186) A well-lighted work area.	
Very Semantet Allillo Not at all Con't determine 1 2 3 4 9	196) Cooperation and support among workers is high.

Semewhet 2

101		s are effectiv					open at you	r workpla	ce. (If the que ir work situation	stion is.N	of Applicat
	Very 1	Somewhat 2	A Mile 3	Not at all	Can't determine 9	201	li The com	-	rides wellness		s and Sine
4001	Employ	_	-			200			ote employee		
100)	Employ	ee constitut	one are	recognized (	by menegers.		Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Fairle	Often
	Very 1	Somewhat 2	A titolo	Not at all	Can't determine 9					Often	
199)	Opportu	nities for ac	/anceme	ent are avail	sble.	204		ors to assi	ed to monitor ( ist the return o		
	Very 1	Somewhet 2	A tittle	Not at all	Cen't determine		Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Often
200)	A freque	ntly-changin	g work e	nvironment		205)	Safety tra	ining agg	urs as a regula	r pert of	orientation
	Very	Somewhat		Not at all	Cen't determine				d employees.		
201) (	ا Good job	2 security.	3	4	•		Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Often
	Very 1	Semewhat 2	3	Not at all	Cen't determine 9	206)	help work	ers who h	ents and/or mo ave experienc ock to work.		
202) \		are satisfied Semewhet		if jobs. Not at all	Cen't determine		Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Often
	1	2	3	4	9	207)			ite in problem- part of compi		
							Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Often
(Place You o	yer woul a alreig	d be to provi In vertical iii ne entire ran	ide you : ne   Shro	with: uph the app	rould help you return ropriate area on the lour answer.				•	ly do you	think your
	Not at all Italy							Extreme	ply likely		
200) (	Now we	ist-met:									
	let at all likely		<del></del>				—	Extrem	sly Wholy		
210)_	new ch										
(	Not at all Mody	-						Extrem	ely likely		
211) (	modific	d work ache	dde:								
(	Not at all Moly				<del></del>		——	Extrem	ely likely		
212) (	A modific	d work area	(for ex	mpie: a ne	v arrangement. local	ion, or lig	hting for y	our desk):			
(	Not at all				•			Extrem	nely Minely		
1	Harry V	•					•				

						78	
213) How many po	sople work for y	our company / k	ocal organization	n? (circle ane)			
For	wer then 50		More t	hen 50			
How often do you : pain?	sey these thing:	to yourself who	on you are in				
214) It's terrible en	nd i feel it's neve	or going to get a	ny better.	217) I worry all th	e time about who	ether it will end.	
not at all 0	sometimes 1	quite a bit 2	often 3	ngt at all 0	sometimes 1	quite a bit 2	
				218) I feel that I d	en't stand it anyr	nore.	
215) It's awful and	i feel that it ove	rwheims me.		not at all	sametimes	quite a bit	
not at all 0	sometimes 1	quite a bit 2	often 3	•	1	2	•
948) I feel oo; life is	anis wadh fiving			219) i feel like i ca	en't go on.		
216) I feel my life is	en ( woren namê).			not at all	sometimes	quite a bit	of
not at all 0	· sometimes 1	quite a bit 2	often 3	0	1	2	3
you have ove	r them? (Place		cal line   through	symptoms, on an avera the appropriate area or			
control '				•			
How often do you u	se the following	strategies to de	ed with your pa	in? Plaese circle your an	anner.		
221) I leave the hor	wee and do som	ething, such as	going to the mo	ovies or shopping.			
not at all 0	acmatimes 1	quite a bit 2	often 3	•			
222) I read.					٠.		
net at ell 0	ecmetimes 1	quite a bit 2	eften 3				
223) I try to be area	und other peopl	€.					
net at all 0	semetimes 1	quite a bit 2	eften 3		·		
224) I do anything	to get my mind	off the pain.					

225) I do something I enjoy, such as watching t.v., or listening to music. 228) I do something active, like household chores or projects. quite a bit 2 not at all

	1	ty on the j	b		rou can do y on the job	Rate your confidence to perform this activity on the j
Use of a computer mouse.				1		
Keyboarding / typing /			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Holding of document/book at eye level.		•				
Page turning, papersorting.						
tolding / disling telephone.		·				
Artting.						
Cerrying with right hand						
Carrying with left hand.						······································
Cerrying with both hands						
Jee of menual hand held pols.						
Jee of power tools.						
Jee of palm, finger or thumb is pressing or striking tool.						
Brasping objects with hands.					·	
Picking up small objects in ingers.						
	Keyboarding / typing / wordprocessing. Holding of document/book at bye level. Page turning, pepersorting. Holding / dieling telephone. Mitting. Carrying with right hand. Carrying with left hand. Carrying with both hands arms). Jee of menual hand held bols. Jee of power tools.	Keyboarding / typing / wordprocessing. Holding of document/book at bye level. Page turning, papersorting. Holding / dieling telephone.  Milting.  Carrying with right hand  Carrying with left hand.  Carrying with both hands arms). Hee of menual hand held bols. Hee of palm, finger or thumb is pressing or striking tool.  Grasping objects with hands.	Keyboarding / typing / wordprocessing. Holding of document/book at bye level. Page turning, peperaorting. Holding / dialing telephone.  Mitting.  Carrying with right hand  Carrying with left hand.  Carrying with both hands arms). Hee of manual hand held bots. Hee of power tools. Hee of pelm, finger or thumb is pressing or striking tool.  Grasping objects with hands.	Keyboarding / typing / wordprocessing. Holding of document/book at bye level. Page turning, peperaorting. Holding / dialing telephone.  Mitting.  Carrying with right hand  Carrying with left hand.  Carrying with both hands arms). Hee of manual hand held bots. Hee of power tools. Hee of peim, finger or thumb a pressing or striking tool.  Grasping objects with hands.	Keyboarding / typing / wordprocessing. Holding of document/book at bye level. Page turning, papersorting. Holding / dieling telephone.  Writing. Carrying with right hand Carrying with both hands arms). Hee of menual hand held bots. Hee of power tools. Hee of power tools.  Resping objects with hands.  Picking up small objects in	Keyboarding / typing / wordprocessing.  Holding of document/book at type level.  Page turning, papersorting.  Holding / dialing telephone.  Writing.  Carrying with right hand.  Carrying with both hands.  Incomplete of manual hand held cols.  Incomplete of power tools.  Incomplete of power tools.

242) How certain are you that you will be able to return to your job?

M	_							
in	the future, :	eome jobe	will be chang	ing while oth		w your work. nying the same. sale below to an		stions.
						bout wave work. Marik line balo		lion).
	Very Uncert 1	ein A	Lillio Uncertai 2	in <b>S</b> c	rmawhat Certai 3	n F	airly Certain 4	Very C
34	B) Ho	w certain a	re you about	what your fu	turo caroar pi	icture locita like	?	
344	l) Ho: ne:	w certain a kt few year	re you of the to?	opportunities	s for promotio	n and advancer	nent which w	II edet in the
			-	•	-	be of use and	·	
			·	·		will be abt mont		•
				•	-	d support yours be replaced by		machines?
(Ple	co a atraig	ht verticel	line   through	the appropri	iato area on ti	he horizontal be	ilow each que	netion)
240	How certs	iin are you	-		ng for you wh	en you are able		rark? y cortain
•	mourtain							<b>,</b>
200					•	er with me and	-	
-		•				. 4	1	
<b>-51</b> )			my cowerker					engly disagree

252) It is easy for me to talk with my coworkers.	
Strengty	Strongly disagree
263) I can rely on my coworkers when things get tough at work	
284) My coworkers are willing to listen to my personal problems	
Strengty	Strongly Clasgree
256) My coworkers go out of their way to make my worklife easi	
256) I get along well with my closest immediate supervisor.	Strongly disagree
257) It is easy for me to talk with my immediate supervisor.  Strengty agree	Strongly disagree
288) I can rely on my immediate supervisor when things get tou	
200) My immediate supervisor is willing to listen to my personal	problems.
Strengty	
Strengty	
201) I enjoy the tasks involved in my job.  Strengty	Strengty disagree

The following seks a series questions about your work	s of questions regarding <i>h</i> situation by placing the n	low you view your work lumber that correspond	k. Using th	e scale below, places as r answer in the blank by	newer the following each question.
Disegree Strongly	Moderately Disagree 2	Neither Agree Nor Did 3	sagree	Moderately Agree 4	Strongly Agrad 5
262) in my workgroup	p, people cennot afford to	reiex.			
263) in my workgroup	p, there is constant pressi	ure to keep working.			
264) In my workgroup	), there is a sense of urge	ncy about everything.			
(Place a straight vertical line You can use the entire rang			al line belo	w each question)	
265) I am engry about how	my employer has treated	me since my upper-ex	dremity pro	blem begen.	
Strongly degree			<del></del>	Strengly disagree	
296) I blame my employer f	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			l december discourse	
agrae			•		
The following is a list of read amployer may have had to y apply in your case.				the above question, Wh # Shet apply)	o contacted you?
257) Your supervisor/emplo	yer:		_ Supervis	lor	
Planed way for t	to tologo		_ Co-work	er presentative	
Blamed you for t	ine mjury	_		y Nurse or Doctor	
Wee enery that y	you were off work		_ Case Ma	neger .	
Did not believe t	hat anything was wrong v	vith you	_ Claims N		
Was eager for y	ou to return to work		Someon	e else (explain)	
Didn't went you to fi	10 Me 8 Claim ile e claim				
Had no reaction Other (Explain)		Dic	your empl mit you to	oyer make any of the fol return to work:	lowing arrangement
200) Would you say your g	<u>o-workers'</u> reactions to yo		i) Arrange hours	for reduced hours until a	ble to work pre-inju
injury were:			Yes	No	
Sympathetic Unsympathetic		27	2) Arrango	a flexible work schedule	ı
Hed no reaction Some other we	) y (Explain)		Yes	No	
I had no co-wor		21	3) Provide	special training	
·		•	Yes	No	
289) Did anyone contact y your work injury?	ou to ask how you were (	Joing effer 21	(4) Modify (	the leyout or equipment	in the area where yo
Vee No	•		<del></del>		

	Yes		No			
276)	Other	(expl	sin)			
			-		 -	

When you think about how your employer responded to your work injury, how satisfied are you with the following?

		Very Satisfied	Somewhet setisfied	Uneure	Somewhat unsatisfied	Very Unestisfied	Does Not Apply
	Employer's efforts to communicate with you after your work injury	1	2	3	4	5	8
278)	Changes made to your job	1	2	3	4	5 .	6
	Employer's efforts to prevent reinjury	1	2	3	4	5	8
280)	Worker's Comp insurer's handling of your claim	1	2	3	4	5	8

Compared to the job you were doing when your work injury occurred, how often do you have to do the following on your current jo

		Less than the Job Before Your Work Injury	The Same as the Job Before Your Work Injury	More then the Job Before Year Work Injury
281)	Lift heavy objects	1	2	3
282)	Push, pull, or pinch with a lot of ferce	1	2	3
283)	Exert heavy physical effort	1	2	3
	Work in a gold or rolligerated area teas then 55° F	1	2	3
206)	Turist your back while liking	1	2	3
•	Sit for long periods without a chance to get up	1	2	3
267)	Stand for long portods without a chance to all down	1	2	3
200)	Work with your arms relead	1	2	3
200)	Work in an autoward pacition	1	2	3
	Perform repetitive ectivities (for example, type, turn ecrows, essemble, pack cut) more than twice per minute	1	2	3
291)	Use equipment that vibrates (for example, power tools)		2	3

292			below best de your work sta		how your	work	290	) Does yo	ur supervi	sor criticize y	ou over i	niner thin
			my work injury		enged jot	<b>)6.</b>		Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Otton
		iceuse of i	ny work injury rk.	, I'm on i	light duty	or	290	Do you h	isve confli	cts with your (	co-works	rs?
	1	eldenu ma	to work beca	use of m	y work inj	ury.		Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Ollen
		ave been i ury.	aid off or fired	<u>because</u>	e of my w	rork	200	<b>D</b> a <b>b</b>				_
							300)	Do you n	EVE COMM	as with your e	reported:	T'
	i no	rve chang s is <u>not</u> rei	ed jobs since sted to my wo	rk injury.	(dek	9). <u>bul</u>		Never	Seldom	Semetimes	Fairly Often	Often
•			ing, <u>but</u> this it	not rela	ted to my	work						
	inja	Ny.					301)	Do you go	et adequal	e recognition	for your	contributi
	No	affact: I'm	been workin	n at the c	tame inh	einee	_	work?	·	•	•	
		(dete)						Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Otton
293)	Are you s	member (	of a union?	. <b></b> '	Yes N	<b>.</b>						
·	•						302)	is there o	onstant pr	ssure to kee	p working	?
2041	Mana man		an attorney (			-	-			<b>.</b>	<b>.</b>	-
			1 <b>2</b> 1 <b>?</b>		Yes No			Mever	Seigem	Sometimes	Often	CREAT
			volved in litigation claim?				303)	Are respo	nsibilities :	et work clearly	defined	?
Here :	are some	questions	about your c	urrent jol	b. The			Never	Seldom	Sametimes	Fairty Often	Often
			papply to all by not be quit									
			e, the term su				304)	is your wo	rk really c	hellenging?		
			r, departmen					Marine	Seldom	Semetimes	Fairty	
معمام	e indicate	how after	loyee reports these things he nature of y	happen.	. If the qu	ection					Often	
	e check N					••	306)	Does then	e seem to	be a rush or	urnency	ahast
<b>84-4-</b>	. 16					abaab		everything			<b></b>	
	T you or	even Fra	a auporvisor	, proces	piace a	SPINGER.		Never	Soldem	Semetimes	Fairly	Otton
	Do you te problems		ow employee	s about y	our work	:					<b></b>	
	Maria	Colden	Semetimes	Fairly	Offen	MA	306)	Can you	uee your o	wn initiative t	o do thin	96?
	Never			Often				Never	Seldem	Semetimes	Fairly Often	Otton
	A		s friendly tow	and west	1							
<b>49</b> 7)	Never	Seldem	Semetimes	Feitly	Often	NA	307)			nt physical co cise, dust etc		on your je
		-		Often				Never	_	Semetimes	Fairly Often	Otton

(Piece a atre	ight vertical line	through the ap	eene eteingorgo	on the horizontal	below each question)
You can use	the entire range	to best indicate	your enswer.		

		•	
306	l em setic	fied with the way my spouse / lover / friends / relatives talk things over v	vitti me and share problems with me.
	Strengly agree		Strongly disagree
		well with my spouse / lover / friends / relatives.	Strengly disagree
		for me to talk with my spouse / lover / friends / relatives.	Strongly diseases
		on my spouse / lover / friends / relatives when things get tough at work.	
	Strengly Ograe		Strongly disagree
		/ lover / friends / relatives are willing to listen to my personal problems.	Strongly disagree
313)	My spouse	/ lover / friends / relatives go out of their way to make my worklife easis	

,	VIII.				323) I am happy.			
	A number of statement themselves are give circle the appropriate corresponds to your	n below. Read e number belov response indic	i each stat w each qui ating how	ement and then estion that you generally	1 Almost Never	2 Sametimes	3 Often	4 Almost Alm
	feel. There are no ri much time on any or seems to describe h	ight or wrong a ne statement b	newers. [ ut give the	Do not spend too answer which	324) I am inclined to	take things he		4
	enewer.				Almost Never	2 Sametimes	3 Often	Almost Ahr
	314) I feel pleasant.							
	1	2	3	4	325) I lack self-confid	dence.		
	Aimost Never	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	1 Almost Never	2 Sometimes	3 Often	4 Almost Ahre
	315) I tire quickly.							
	1 Almost Never	2 Sametimes	3 Often	4 Almost Always	326) i feel secure.		_	•
	316) I feel like crying	•			Almost Never	2 Sometimes	Often	Almost Ahre
			•	_	327) I try to avoid fac	ing a crisis or	difficulty.	
	Almost Never	Sametimes	Often	Almost Always	1	2	3	4
				•	Aimost Never	Sometimes	Often	Almost Alway
	317) I wish I could be	as happy as	others sec	m to be.	328) I feel blue.			
	1 Almost Never	2 Sometimes	3 Often	4 Almost Alweys	1 Aimost Never	2 Sometimes	3 Often	4 Almost Away
	318) I am losing out mind soon enou		iuse i can'	t make up my	329) I am content.			
	1	2	3	. 4	1 Almost Never	2 Sometimes	3 Often	4 Almost Alven
	Almost Never	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always				
	319) I feel rested.				330) Some unimporta bothers me.	ant thought run	s through	my mind and
	1 Almost Never	2 Sometimes	3 Often	4 Almost Always	1 Almost Never	2 Sometimes	3 Often	4 Almost Awey
	320) I am "calm, coc	oi, and collecte	ď.°		331) I take disappoint out of my mind.		ly that I c	en't put them
	1 Almost Never	2 Sometimes	3 Often	4 Almost Always	1 Almost Never	2 Sometimes	3 Often	4 Altreat Alum
	321) I feel that diffici overcome them		up so the	it I cannot	332) I am a steady po	rson.		
	1 Almost Never	2 Sometimes	3 Often	Almost Always	1 Aimest Never	2 Sometimes	3 Often	4 Almost Alway
	322) I worry too mut matter.	ch over sameti	ning that re	nally doesn't	333) I get in a state of recent concerns		moil <b>as</b> 11	think over my
	1	2	. 3	4	1	2	3	4

(circle one)

(Place a straight vertical line | through the appropriate area on the horizontal below each question) You can use the entire range to best indicate your answer.

334)Since your current carpal tunnel syndrome problem began, how successful have you been in coping with stressful situations in your life (for example, finances, spouse conflicts, childrens' behavior)?

84 84	let at all recessful		Estromoly Successful
• ,	ALW	ork: How frequently do you experience each of the following thou	ghts:
		keep working this way despite my discomfort or the quality of my	
(	Never		Very Frequently
•		take off from work because this place would fall apart without me.	
(	Never		Very Frequently
•		ake off from work because I'd be letting down or burdening my co	-workers."
	Never		Very Frequently
-		ske off from work because I'd be letting down or burdening my bo	•
<b>338)</b>	peych	ake off from work because I need to keep my nose to the grindsto acks coming"	
340\		ake off from work because it will negatively affect my evaluations,	
•		take off from work because other people at work will think less of I	me."
(	Never		Very Frequently
342)	Do you l	believe that your work makes your carpel tunnel syndrome proble	m worse? (circle one) Yes No
·	-	have many stresses in your life before your current carpel tunnel	

344	Did you <u>tunn</u>	experience physical symptoms (problems) most of the time <u>before your current carnal</u> el syndrome problem bagan? (circle one)
		ight vertical line   through the appropriate area on the horizontal below each question) the entire range to best indicate your answer.
		How frequently do you find yourself concerned about planning efficiently and finding useful, effective to problems?
	Never	Very Frequently
346)	At work:	How frequently do you find yourself maintaining a feeling of calm emotional composure and self-cont
347\	At work:	How frequently do you focus on the positive aspects of situations?
<b></b> ,	Never	Very Frequently
		THANK YOU very much for completing this questionnaire.

### APPENDIX C

### **HEALTH STATUS FOLLOW-UP**

ID (		
Def	in: Follow-Up#: 1 2 3 4 (	5 6 (circle one)
L.		
ł. -		
1)	Please check one job type that best describes the i	kind of work you are currently doing.
	Job Type	Examples
	Professional or Technical	lawyer, scientist, health professional, teacher, artist
	Farmer and Farm Manager	
	Meneger and Administrator	bank officer, office manager, inspector
	Seles Worker	insurance or real estate agent, sales clerk
	Clerical Worker	bank teller, receptionist, word processor
	Craftsman	carpenter, electricien, mechinist, mechanic
	Transport Equipment Operator	ceb, truck, or bus driver; conductor
	Mechine Operator	assembler, machine or textile operative
	Service Worker	janitor, cook, waitress/waiter, nursing aide, police
	Private Household Worker	private cook, maid, child care worker
·	Is your job (circle one)	weers months  M-time (more then 20 hours per week)
	part-time (20 hours per week or fewer)	M-Gine (more sien 20 nours per vieek)
4)	During the past month , have you had any pain or	discomfort that you believe to be related to your work?
	Ye	S No
<b>*</b> (1)	f <u>NO</u> , ekip to # 6)	
<b>5</b> )	Has this problem been interfering with your ability	to do your job?
	Ye	B No
<b>6</b> )	. Have you been maintaining your regular work ache	edule and number of hours?
Ť	Ye	No No
<b>-</b>	If Yes, has your work decreased to "limited," alte	mete, or "light duty" status?
7)		na No
	•	<del></del>
8)	Have you missed work due to this problem?	

Yes

And the second s

9)	If Yes, how much work did you miss in the last month due to this process:daysdays
10)	Have you not been able to work at all due to work-related injury?
	Yes No
11)	Check which one below best describes how your work injury now affects your work status:
	Because of my work injury, I've changed jobs.
	Because of my work injury, I'm on light duty or alternate work.
	I am unable to work because of my work injury.
	I have been laid off or fired <u>because</u> of my work injury.
	I have changed jobs since(date), but this is not related to my work injury.
	I am not working, but this is not related to my work injury.
	No effect; I've been working at the same job since(date).
II.	following questions refer to your symptoms for a <u>typical twenty-four-hour period</u> during the past two weeks (circle one an
	h question).
491	How severe is the hand or wrist pain that you have at night?
•=;	I do not have hand or wrist pain at night.
	2 Mild pain
	3 Moderate pain 4 Severe pain
	5 Very severe pain
13)	How often did hand or wrist pain wake you up during a typical night in the past two weeks?
	1 Never
	2 Once 3 Two or three times
	4 Four or five times
	5 More than five times
14)	Do you typically have pain in your hand or wrist during the daylime?
	1 I never have pain during the day
	2 I have mild pain during the day 3 I have moderate pain during the day
	4 I have severe pain during the day
	5 I have very severe pain during the day
15)	How often do you have hand or wrist pain during the daytime?
	1 Never
	2 Once or twice a day 3 Three to five times a day
	3 Three to five times a day 4 More than five times day
	The second of th

### 16) How long, on average, does an episode of pain last during the day time?

- 1 I never get pain during the day
- 2 Less than 10 minutes
- 3 10 to 60 minutes
- 4 Greater than 60 minutes
- 5 The pain is constant throughout the day

### 17) Do you have numbrases (loss of sensation) in your hand?

- 1 No
- 2 I have mild numbriess
- 3 I have moderate numbrass
- 4 I have severe numbriess.
- 5 I have very severe numbriess

### 18) Do you have weakness in your hand or wrist?

- 1 No weakness
- 2 Mild weekness
- 3 Moderate weakness
- 4 Severe weekness
- 5 Very severe weekness

### 19) Do you have tingling sensations in your hand?

- 1 No tingling
- 2 Mild tingling
- 3 Moderate tingling
- 4 Severe tingling
- 5 Very severe tingling

### 20) How severe is numbrass (loss of sensation) or tingling at night?

- 1 I have no numbress or tingling at night
- 2 Mild
- 3 Moderate
- 4 Severe
- 5 Very severe

### 21) How often did hand numbrace or tingling wake you up during a project night during the past two weeks?

- 1 Never
- 2 Once
- 3 Two or three times
- 4 Four or five times
- 5 More than five times

### 22) Do you have difficulty with grasping and use of small objects such as keys or pans?

- 1 No difficulty
- 2 Mild difficulty
- 3 Moderate difficulty
- 4 Severe difficulty
- 5 Very severe difficulty

23)	Please rate the severity of your pain during	g the <u>past week</u> .	
•	(Place a straight vertical line   through the You can use the entire range to best indicate.)	appropriate area on the horizontal line late your answer.	below.)
	No pain	·	Savere pain
24)	Please check all of the following therapies shoulders, or neck:	that you have had for any type of pain (	or other problem in your hands, wrists, arm
	MEDICAL:		
	Nonsteroidel anti inflammatory drugs     Oral steroids     Local steroid injections     Antidepressants	(i.e., Ibuprofen, Naproxen, Naprosyn)	
•	Surgery (indicate type and problem)		
		type	•
	Other (specify)	problem	•
	PHYSICAL THERAPY:		
	Splinting		
	Muscle re-education		
	Transcutaneous nerve stimulation		
	Ultrasound Traction		
	Coller		
	Other (specify)		
	PSYCHOLOGICAL:		
	Stress Management		
	Pain Menagement		
	Psychotherapy		
	Hypnotherapy Bioleedback	·	
	Other (specify)		
25)	Think about all the examinations, treatment had from these examinations, treatments,	its, and therapy you've had for your wor or therapy?	k injury. How much pain or discomfort hav
	None		
	Slight pain or discomfort		
	Average pain or discomfort		-
	Severe pain or discomfort		

₽

vice! day during the <u>past two weeks.</u> have hand and wrist symptoms caused you to have any difficulty doing the activities low? Please circle one number that *best* describes your ability to do the activity.

1 No difficulty 2 Mild difficulty 3 Moderate difficulty 4 Severe difficulty 5 Cannot do at all due to hand or wrist symptoms	31) Household chores	1 No difficulty 2 Mild difficulty 3 Moderate difficulty 4 Severe difficulty 5 Cannot do at all due to hand or wrist symptoms	36) Opening of jars	<ol> <li>No difficulty</li> <li>Mild difficulty</li> <li>Moderate difficulty</li> <li>Severe difficulty</li> <li>Cannot do at all due to hand or wrist symptoms</li> </ol>	29) Gripping of a tatephone handle	28) Holding a book while reading  1 No difficulty 2 Mild difficulty 3 Moderate difficulty 4 Severe difficulty 5 Cannot do at all due to hand or wrist symptoms	1 No difficulty 2 Mild difficulty 3 Moderate difficulty 4 Severe difficulty 5 Cannot do at all due to hand or wrist symptoms	27) Buttoning of clothes	1 No difficulty 2 Mild difficulty 3 Moderate difficulty 4 Severe difficulty 5 Cannot do at all due to hand or wrist symptoms	Butter (SE
No difficulty     Nidderste difficulty     Severe difficulty     Cannot do at all due to hand or wrist symptoms.	37) Using a hammer or screwdriver	<ol> <li>No difficulty</li> <li>Mild difficulty</li> <li>Moderate difficulty</li> <li>Severe difficulty</li> <li>Cannot do at all due to hand or wrist symptoms</li> </ol>	36) Reaching overhead	<ol> <li>No difficulty</li> <li>Mild difficulty</li> <li>Moderate difficulty</li> <li>Severe difficulty</li> <li>Cannot do et all due to hand or wrist symptoms</li> </ol>	35) Lifting a heavy box	34) Typing / keyboarding / word-processing  1    No difficulty 2    Mild difficulty 3    Moderate difficulty 4    Severe difficulty 5    Cannot do at all due to hand or wrist symptoms	No difficulty     Mild difficulty     Moderate difficulty     Severe difficulty     Cannot do at all due to hand or wrist symptoms.	33) Bething and dressing	1 No difficulty 2 Mild difficulty 3 Moderate difficulty 4 Severe difficulty 5 Cennot do at all due to hand or wrist symptoms	32) Carrying of grocery bags

### 38) Hobbies

- 1 No difficulty
- Mild difficulty
- 3 Moderate difficulty
- 4 Severe difficulty
- 5 Cannot Do at all due to Hand or Wrist Symptoms

### 30) Performing your job

- 1 No difficulty
- 2 Mid difficulty
- 3 Moderate difficulty
- 4 Severe difficulty
- 5 Cannot do at all due to hand or wrist symptoms

### 40) Brushing your teeth

- 1 No difficulty
- 2 Mild difficulty
- 3 Moderate difficulty
- 4 Severe difficulty
- 5 Cannot do at all due to hand or wrist symptoms

### 41) Picking up a coin or other small object in your fingers

- No difficulty
- 2 Mild difficulty
- 3 Moderate difficulty
- 4 Severe difficulty
- 5 Cannot do at all due to hand or wrist symptoms

### 42) Sleeping

- 1 No difficulty
- Mild difficulty
- 3 Moderate difficulty
- 4 Severe difficulty
- 5 Cannot do at all due to hand or wrist symptoms

### 43) In general, would you say your health is (circle one):

Excellent Very Good Good Fair Peor

### 44) Compared to one year ago, how would you rate your health in general new (circle one)?

- a) Much better than one year ago
- b) Somewhat batter than one year ago
- c) About the same as one year ago
- d) Somewhat worse now than one year ago
- e) Much worse then one year ago

The following items relate to activities you might do during a typical day. Does your health first you in these activities?

(Circle your response for each question)

46) Vigorous activities, such as running, lifting heavy objects participating in strenuous sports

Yes, limited a let Yes, limited a little No, Not limited at a

46) Moderate activities, such as moving a table, pushing a vacuum cleaner, bowling, or playing golf

Yes, limited a let Yes, limited a little No, Not limited at a

47) Lifting or carrying groceries

Yes, limited a let Yes, limited a little No. Not limited at a

48) Climbing several flights of stairs

Yes, limited a lot Yes, limited a little No. Not limited at a

40) Climbing one flight of stairs

Yes, limited a let Yes, limited a little No, Not limited at (

50) Bending, kneeling, or stooping

Yes, limited a let Yes, limited a little No. Not limited at (

\$1) Walking more than a mile

Yes, limited a let Yes, limited a little No. Not imited at I

**62) Walking several blocks** 

Yes, limited a let Yes, limited a little No. Not irrited at

\$3) Walking one block

Yes, limited a let Yes, limited a little No. Not limited at

**64) Bething or dressing yourself** 

Yes, limited a lot Yes, limited a little No. Not traded at

phy	raical health? (Circle Yes	•		·	_	
56)	Cut down the amount	of time you spent on work (	other activi	iies	<b>Ye</b>	s No
56)	Accomplished less the	n you would like	•••••		Ye	. No
<b>57</b> )	Were limited in the kin	d of work or other activities		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Ye	, No
<b>58</b> )	Hed difficulty performing	ng the work or other activiti	ss (for examp	ie, it took extra effort	) Ye	, No
		eve you had any of the folk as feeling depressed or an		ns with your work or	other regular daily activi	Nos as a reault of
<b>59</b> )	Cut down the amount	of time you spent on work (	r other activit	ies	Yes	No No
<b>60</b> )	Accomplished less the	n you would like	•••••		Yes	No No
61)	Didn't do work or other	activities as carefully as u	<b>le</b> uc	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Yes	No.
<b>62</b> )		ks, to what extent has your iends, neighbors, or group		th or emotional probl	ems interfered with you	r normal social
	Not at all	A little bit	M	oderately	Quite a bit	Edramely
<b>6</b> 3)	How much bodily pain	have you had during the p	sst 4 wooks?			
	None	<b>Very mild</b>	Mild	Moderate	Severe	Very Seve
64)	During the past 4 week housework)?	ks, how much did <i>pain</i> inte	ilere with you	r normel work (includ	ing both work outside th	e home and
	Not at all	A little bit		oderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
The (cir	iee questions are about ple) the one answer the	t how you feel and how thir it comes closest to the way	igs have been you have be:	n with you <i>during the p</i> an feeling. How muci	past 4 weeks. For each h of the time during the	question, please ( past 4 weeks:

65) Did you feet full of pep?

5=All of the time 4=Most of the time 3=A good bit of the time 2=Some of the time 1=A little of the time O=None of the time

66) Have you been a very nervous person?

5=All of the time 4=Meet of the time 3=A good bit of the time 2=Some of the time 1=A little of the time 0=None of the time

- 67) Have you felt so down in the dumps that nothing could cheer you up?
  - 5 All of the time
  - 4 Most of the time
  - 3 A good bit of the time
  - 2 Some of the time
  - 1 A Mille of the time
  - O None of the time

### 68) Have you felt calm and peaceful?

- 5 All of the time
- 4 Most of the time
- 3 A good bit of the time
- 2 Some of the time
- 1 A Mille of the time
- 0 None of the time

### 69) Did you have a lot of energy?

- 5 All of the time
- 4 Most of the time
- 3 A good bit of the time
- 2 Some of the time
- 1 A little of the time
- O None of the time

### 70) Have you felt downhearted and blue?

- 5 All of the time
- 4 Most of the time
- 3 A good bit of the time
- 2 Some of the time
- 1 A little of the time
- O None of the time

### 71) Did you feel worn out?

- 5 All of the time
- 4 Most of the time
- 3 A good bit of the time
- 2 Some of the time
- 1 A little of the time
- O None of the time

### 72) Have you been a happy person?

- 5 All of the time
- 4 Most of the time
- 3 A good bit of the time
- 2 Some of the time
- 1 A Nation of the time
- O None of the time

### 73) Did you feel tired?

- 5 All of the time
- 4 Most of the time
- 3 A good bit of the time
- 2 Some of the time
- 1 A little of the time
- 0 None of the time

74)	During the past 4 weeks, how much of the time has you
	physical health or emotional problems interfered with ye
	social activities (like visiting with friends, relatives, etc.)

All of the	Most of the	Some of	A Ittile of	None
time	time	the time	the time	the tin

How TRUE or FALSE is each of the following statements for you? (Circle your response)

### 75) I seem to get sick a little easier than other people

Definitely	Mostly	Den't	Mostly	Definit
true	true	know	folce	felec

### 76) I am as healthy as anybody I know

Definitely	Mostly	rned	Mostly	Definit
true	true	know	folce	felet

### 77) I expect my health to get worse

Definitely	Mostly	Don't	Mostly	Definit
true		know	false	fals:

### 78) My health is excellent

Definitely	Mostly	Don't	Mostly	Definit
true		know	folce	feler

### IV. Your Mood:

A number of statements which people have used to describe themselves are given below. Read each statement and then circle appropriate number below each question that corresponds to your response indicating how you generally feel. There are no rivering answers. Do not spend too much time on any one statement but give the answer which seems to describe how you generally feel. Please circle your answer.

70) I feel pleass	int.			86) I am happy.			
Almost Nev	2 Sometimes	3 Often	4 Almost Always	1 Almost Never	2 Sometimes	3 Often	4 Almost Ali
80) I tire quickly	· <b>.</b>			86) I am inclined to	take things h	ard.	
1 Almost Nev	2 Sometimes	3 Often	4 Almost Always	1 Almost Never	2 Sametimes	3 Often	4 Almost Ah
81) I feel like cr	ring.			90) I lack self-confid	dence.		
Almost Neve	2 Sometimes	3 Often	4 Almost Always	1 Almost Never	2 Sometimes	3 Olten	4 Almost Alu
82) I wish I coul	d be as happy as	others see	m to be.	91) I feel secure.			
1 Almost Neve	2 r <b>S</b> ometimes	3 Often	4 Almost Always	1 Almost Never	2 Sometimes	3 Often	4 Almost Alu
83) I am losing of mind soon e	out on things beca nough.	tuse i can'i	t make up my	92) I try to avoid fac		_	
1 Almost Neve	2 r <b>Sometimes</b>	3 Often	4 Almost Always	Almost Never	2 Sometimes	3 Often	Airmost Air
84) I feel rested.				93) I feel blue.	_	_	
1 Almost Neve	2 or <b>Sometimes</b>	3 Often	4 Almost Always	Almost Never	2 Sometimes	3 Often	Almost Alu
86) I am "caim, (	cool, and collecte	id."		94) i am content.	•		
1 Almost Neve	2 or <b>Sametimes</b>	3 Often	4 Almost Always	1 Almost Never	2 Sametimes	3 Often	4 Almost Au
86) I feel that dis		g up so the	t i cannot	96) Some unimportable bothers me.	ent thought ru	ns through	my mind en
1 Almost New	2 or <b>S</b> ometimes	3 Often	4 Almost Always	Almost Nover	2 Samatimes	3 Often	4 Almost An
87) I worry too r	nuch over somet	hing that re	ally doesn't	96) I take disappoir of my mind.	itments so ked	only that I c	en't put thes
Almost Nev	2 er Sometimes	3 Often	4 Almost Always	1 Almost Never	2 Sometimes	3 Often	4 Almost As

97) I am a steady person.

1 2 3 4 Almost Never Sometimes Often Almost Alweys

98) I get in a state of tension or turmoil as I think over my recent concerns and interests.

1 2 3 4 Almost Never Semetimes Often Almost Alweys

98) Rate the degree of physical exertion or effort you believe is associated with a <u>typical</u> day at work.

O Nothing at all
O.5 Very, very easy
Very easy
Easy
Moderately hard
Somewhat hard
Hard

7 Very herd

ē

10 Very, very hard

100) Rate the degree of physical exertion or effort you believe is associated with a highly demanding day at work.

- O Nothing at all
- 0.5 Very, very easy
- 1 Very easy
- 2 Easy
- 3 Moderately hard
- 4 Somewhat hard
- 5 Herd
- 6
- 7 Very herd

•

9

10 Very, very hard

THANK YOU very much for completing this questionnaire. Please return this form as econ as possible in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided to you. If you have misplaced the envelope, please mell the completed form to: Dr. Michael Feuerstein, USUHS, MPS, 4301 Jenes Bridge Rd., Betheede, MD 20014.

### REFERENCES

- Amadio PC (1995). DeQuervain's disease and tenosynovitis. In SL Gordon, SJ Blair, LJ Fine (Eds.), Repetitive motion disorders of the upper extremity (pp. 435-448). Rosemont, Illinois: American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons.
- American Psychiatric Association (1987). <u>Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental</u> <u>disorders</u> (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., revised). Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Armstrong TJ, Buckle P, Fine LJ, Hagberg M, Jonsson B, Kilbom A, Kuorinka IAA, Silverstein BA, Sjogaard G, Viikari-Juntura ERA (1993). A conceptual model for work-related neck and upper-limb musculoskeletal disorders. <u>Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment, and Health, 19</u>, 73-84.
- Ashbury FD (1995). Occupational repetitive strain injuries and gender in Ontario, 1986 to 1991. Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 37, 479-485.
- Baron S, Hales T, Hurrell J (1996). Evaluation of symptom surveys for occupational musculoskeletal disorders. <u>American Journal of Industrial Medicine</u>, 29, 609-617.
- Bernard B, Sauter S, Fine L, Petersen M, Hales T (1994). Job task and psychosocial risk factors for work-related musculoskeletal disorders among newspaper employees.

  <u>Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment, and Health</u>, 20, 417 426.
- Blanc PD, Faucett J, Kennedy JJ, Cisternas M, Yelin E (1996). Self-reported carpal tunnel syndrome: Predictors of work disability from the National Health Interview Survey Occupational Health Supplement. <u>American Journal of Industrial Medicine</u>, 30, 362-368.
- Bongers PM, deWinter CR, Kompier MAJ, Hildebrandt VH (1993). Psychosocial factors at work and musculoskeletal disease. <u>Scandinavian Journal of Work</u>, <u>Environment</u>, and <u>Health</u>, <u>19</u>, 297-312.
- Borg G (1998). <u>Borg's perceived exertion and pain scales</u>. Champaign, Illinois: Human Kinetics.
- Brogmus G, Marco R (1992, October). The proportion of cumulative trauma disorders of the upper extremities in U.S. industry. In <u>Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society 36<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting (pp. 997-1001). Santa Monica, California: Human Factors and Ergonomics Society.</u>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics (1999). Lost-worktime injuries: Characteristics resulting time away from work, 1997. USDL No. 99-102. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- Caplan RD (1971). Organizational stress and individual strain: A social psychological study of risk factors in coronary heart disease among administrators, engineers, and scientists. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research (University Microfilms No. 72-14822).
- Casanova JS (Ed.) (1992). <u>Clinical assessment recommendations</u> (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Chicago, Illinois: American Society of Hand Therapists.
- Chatterjee DS (1987). Repetition strain injury: a recent review. <u>Journal of Social and Occupational Medicine</u>, <u>37</u>, 100-105.
- Cohen AL, Gjessing CC, Fine LJ, Bernard BP, McGlothlin JD (1997). Elements of ergonomics programs: A primer based on workplace evaluations of musculoskeletal disorders (NIOSH Publication No. 97-117). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Cole DC, Hudak PL (1996). Prognosis of nonspecific work-related musculoskeletal disorders of the neck and upper extremity. <u>American Journal of Industrial Medicine</u>, 29, 657-668.
- Cooper CL (1986). Job distress: Recent research and the emerging role of the clinical occupational psychologist. <u>Bulletin of the British Psychological Society</u>, <u>39</u>, 325-331.
- Cooper CL, Cartwright S (1997). An intervention strategy for workplace stress. <u>Journal of Psychosomatic Medicine</u>, 43, 7-16.
- Craig KD (1994). Emotional aspects of pain. In PD Wall, R Melzack (Eds.), <u>Textbook of pain</u> (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) (pp. 261-274). New York, New York: Churchill Livingstone.
- Dawson DM (1993). Entrapment neuropathies of the upper extremities. New England Journal of Medicine, 329, 2013-2018.
- Downs DG (1997). Nonspecific work-related upper extremity disorders. <u>American Family Physician</u>, <u>55</u>, 1296-1302.
- Druckman D, Singer JE, Van Cott H (Eds.). (1997). Enhancing organizational performance. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- D'Zurilla TJ, Sheedy CF (1991). Relation between social problem-solving ability and subsequent level of psychological stress in college students. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</u>, <u>61</u>, 841-846.
- Elliott TR, Marmarosh CL (1994). Problem solving appraisal, health complaints, and health-related expectancies. <u>Journal Counseling and Development</u>, 72, 531-537.

- English CJ, Maclaren WM, Court-Brown C, Hughes SPF, Porter RW, Wallace WA, Graves RJ, Pethick AJ, Soutar CA (1995). Relations between upper limb soft tissue disorders and repetitive movements at work. <u>American Journal of Industrial Medicine</u>, 27, 75-90.
- Faucett J, Rempel D (1994). VDT-related musculoskeletal symptoms: Interactions between work posture and psychosocial work factors. <u>American Journal of Industrial Medicine</u>, 26, 597-612.
- Feuerstein M (1991). A multidisciplinary approach to the prevention evaluation, and management of work disability. Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation, 1, 5-12.
- Feuerstein M, Fitzgerald TE (1992). Biomechanical factors affecting upper extremity cumulative trauma disorders in sign language interpreters. <u>Journal of Occupational Medicine</u>, 34, 257-264.
- Feuerstein M, Carosella AM, Burrell LM, Marshall L, DeCaro J (1997). Occupational upper extremity symptoms in sign language interpreters: Prevalence and correlates of pain, function, and work disability. <u>Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation</u>, 7, 187-205.
- Feuerstein M, Miller V, Burrell LM, Berger R (1998): Occupational upper extremity disorders in the federal workforce: Prevalence, health care expenditures, and patterns of work disability. <u>Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine</u>, 40, 546-555.
- Feuerstein M, Burrell LM, Miller VI, Lincoln A, Huang GD, Berger R (1999). Clinical management of carpal tunnel syndrome: A 12-year review of outcomes.

  <u>American Journal of Industrial Medicine</u>, 35, 232-245.
- Feuerstein M, Huang GD, Pransky G (1999). Workstyle and work-related upper extremity disorders. In RJ Gatchel, DC Turk (Eds.), <u>Psychosocial factors in pain:</u> <u>Critical perspectives</u> (pp. 175 192). New York, New York: Guilford Press.
- Franzblau A, Salerno DF, Armstrong TJ, Werner RA (1997). Test-retest reliability of an upper-extremity discomfort questionnaire in an industrial population.

  <u>Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment, and Health</u>, 23, 299-307.
- Gerr F, Letz R, Landrigan PJ (1991). Upper-extremity musculoskeletal disorders of occupational origin. <u>Annual Review of Public Health</u>, <u>12</u>, 543-566.
- Gorsuch RL (1983). <u>Factor analysis</u> (2<sup>ad</sup> ed.). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Grice JW, Harris RJ (1998). A comparison of regression and loading weights for the computation of factor scores. <u>Multivariate Behavioral Research</u>, 33, 221-247.

- Habeck R, Leahy M, Hunt H, Chan F, Welch E (1991). Employer factors related to workers' compensation claims and disability management. Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 34, 210-226.
- Hagberg M, Silverstein B, Wells R, Smith M, Hendrick H, Carayon P, Preusse M (1995).

  <u>Work-related musculoskeletal disorders (WMSDs): A reference book for prevention</u>. Bristol, Pennsylvania: Taylor & Francis.
- Hales TR, Sauter SL, Peterson MR, Fine LJ, Putz-Anderson V, Schleifer LR, Ochs TT, Bernard BP (1994). Musculoskeletal disorders among visual display terminal users in a telelcommunications company. <u>Ergonomics</u>, <u>37</u>, 1603-1621.
- Hales TR, Bernard BP (1996). Epidemiology of work-related musculoskeletal disorders.

  Orthopedic Clinics of North America, 27, 679-709.
- Hanrahan LP, Higgins D, Anderson H, Haskins L, Tai S (1991). Project SENSOR: Wisconsin surveillance of occupational carpal tunnel syndrom. Wisconsin Meidcal Journal, 90, 82-83.
- Himmelstein JS, Feuerstein M, Stanek EJ, Koyamatsu K, Pransky GS, Morgan W, Anderson KO (1995). Work-related upper extremity disorders and work disability: Clinical and psychosocial presentation. <u>Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine</u>, <u>37</u>, 1278-1286.
- Hocking B (1987). Epidemiological aspects of "repetition strain injury" in Telecom Australia. Medical Journal of Australia, 147, 218-222.
- House JS, Landis KR, Umberson D (1988). Social relationships and health. <u>Science</u>, 241, 540-545.
- Huang GD, Feuerstein M (1998). Americans with Disabilities Act litigation and musculoskeletal-related impairments: Implications for work re-entry. <u>Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation</u>, 8, 91-102.
- Huang GD, Feuerstein M, Berkowitz SM, Peck CA (1998). Occupational upper-extremity-related disability: Demographic, physical, and psychosocial factors. Military Medicine, 163, 552-558.
- Ivancevich JM, Matteson MT, Freedman SM, Phillips JS (1990). Worksite stress management interventions. <u>American Psychologist</u>, <u>45</u>, 252-261.
- Kearney D (1994). Reasonable accommodations: Job descriptions in the age of ADA.

  OSHA. and Workers' Compensation. New York, New York: Van Nostrand
  Reinhold.

- Leino P, Magni G (1993). Depressive symptoms as predictors of low back pain, neck-shoulder pain, and other musculoskeletal morbidity: A 10-year follow-up of metal industry employees. Pain, 53, 89-94.
- Leino PI, Hanninen V (1995). Psychosocial factors at work in relation to back and limb disorders. Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment, and Health, 21, 134-142.
- Levine DW, Simmons BP, Koris MJ, Daltroy LH, Hohl GG, Fossel AH, Katz JN (1993). A self-administered questionnaire for the assessment of severity of symptoms and functional status in carpal tunnel syndrome. The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery, 75, 1585-1592.
- Linton SJ, Kamwendo K (1989). Risk factors in the psychosocial work environment for neck and shoulder pain in secretaries. <u>Journal of Occupational Medicine</u>, 31, 609-613.
- Manninen P, Heliovaara M, Riihimaki H, Makela P (1997). Does psychological distress predict disability? <u>International Journal of Epidemiology</u>, 26, 1063-1070.
- Mathis LB, Gatchel RJ, Polatin PB, Boulas HJ, Kinney RK (1994). Prevalence of psychopathology in carpal tunnel syndrome patients. <u>Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation</u>, 4, 199-210.
- Moos RH, Moos BS (1994). <u>Life Stressors and Social Resources Inventory: Adult Form Manual</u>. Odessa, Florida: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Moulton B, Spence SH (1992). Site-specific muscle hyper-reactivity in musicians with occupational upper limb pain. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 30, 375-386.
- Murphy L (1996). Stress management techniques: Secondary prevention of stress. In MJ Schabracq, JAM Winnubst, CL Cooper (Eds.), <u>Handbook of work and health psychology</u> (pp. 427-441). New York, New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Nezu AM, Nezu CM, Saraydarian L, Kalmar K, Ronan G (1986). Social problem solving as a moderating variable between negative life stress and depressive symptoms. Cognitive Therapy and Research, 10, 489-498.
- Nezu AM, Ronan GF (1988). Social problem solving as a moderator of stress-related depressive symptoms: A prospective analysis. <u>Journal of Counseling Psychology</u>, 35, 134-138.
- Nezu AM, Nezu CM (1993). Identifying and selecting target problems for clinical interventions: A problem-solving model. <u>Psychological Assessment</u>, <u>5</u>, 254-263.

- Polanyi MFD, Cole DC, Beaton DE, Chung J, Wells R, Abdolell M, Beech-Hawley L, Ferrier SE, Mondloch MV, Shields SA, Smith JM, Shannon HS (1997). Upper limb work-related musculoskeletal disorders among newspaper employees: cross-sectional survey results. American Journal of Industrial Medicine, 32, 620-628.
- Pransky G, Hill-Fotouhi C (1996). <u>Injured worker outcomes evaluation instrument</u>. Amherst, Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts, Occupational Health Program.
- Pransky G, Feuerstein M, Himmelstein J, Katz JN, Vickers-Lahti M (1997). Measuring functional outcomes in work-related upper extremity disorders. <u>Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine</u>, 39, 1195-1202.
- Punnett L, Bergqvist U (1997). <u>Video display unit work and upper extremity</u>
  <u>musculoskeletal disorders: A review of epidemiological findings</u>. Solna, Sweden:
  National Institute for Working Life.
- Punnett L (1998). Ergonomic stressors and upper extremity disorders in vehicle manufacturing: cross sectional exposure-response trends. Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 55, 414-420.
- Putz-Anderson V (1988). <u>Cumulative trauma disorders: A manual for musculoskeletal disease of the upper limbs</u>. Bristol, Pennsylvania: Taylor & Francis.
- Rempel DM, Harrison RJ, Barnhardt S (1992). Work-related cumulative trauma disorders of the upper extremity. <u>Journal of the American Medical Association</u>, <u>267</u>, 838-842.
- Rodgers SH (1997). Work physiology fatigue and recovery. In G Salvendy (Ed.),

  <u>Handbook of human factors and ergonomics</u> (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (pp. 268-297). New York:

  Wiley.
- Rosenstiel AK, Keefe FJ (1983). The use of coping strategies in chronic lower back pain patients: Relationship to patient characteristics and current adjustment. Pain, 17, 33-44.
- Ryan RM, Solky JA (1996). What is supportive about social support? On the psychological needs for autonomy and relatedness. In GR Pierce, BR Sarason, IG Sarason (Eds.), <u>Handbook of social support and the family</u> (pp. 249-267). New York, New York: Plenum Press.
- Schmidt NB (1995). <u>Discomfort Intolerance Survey</u>. Bethesda, Maryland: Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences.

- Schurman SJ (1996). Making the "New American Workplace" safe and healthy: a joint labor-management-researcher approach. <u>American Journal of Industrial Medicine</u>, 29, 373-377.
- Shigemi J, Mino Y, Tsuda T, Babazono A, Aoyama H (1997). The relationship between job stress and mental health at work. <u>Industrial Health</u>, 35, 29-35.
- Skov T, Borg V, Orhede E (1996). Psychosocial and physical risk factors for musculoskeletal disorders of the neck, shoulders, and lower back in salespeople.

  Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 53, 351-356.
- Smith MJ, Carayon P (1996). Work organization, stress, and cumulative trauma disorders. In SD Moon, SL Sauter (Eds.), <u>Beyond biomechanics: Psychosocial aspects of musculoskeletal disorders in office work</u> (pp. 23-42). Bristol, Pennsylvania: Taylor & Francis.
- Smith M (1997). Psychosocial aspects of working with video display terminals (VDTs) and employee physical and mental health. <u>Ergonomics</u>, 40, 1002-1015.
- Spence SH (1991). Cognitive-behaviour therapy in the treatment of chronic, occupational pain of the upper limbs: A 2 year follow-up. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 29, 503-509.
- Spence SH, Sharpe L, Newton-John T, Champion D (1995). Effect of EMG biofeedback compared to applied relaxation training with chronic, upper extremity cumulative trauma disorders. Pain, 63, 199-206.
- Spielberger CE, Gorsuch RI, Lushene RE (1970). Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory. Palo Alto, California: Consulting and Clinical Psychologists Press.
- Spurgeon A, Harrington JM, Cooper CL (1997). Health and safety problems associated with long working hours: A review of the current position. Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 54, 367-375.
- Stephens C, Smith M (1996). Occupational overuse syndrome and the effects of psychosocial stressors on keyboard users in the newspaper industry. Work & Stress, 10, 141-153.
- Stetson DS, Keyserling WM, Silverstein BA, Armstrong TJ, Leonard JA (1991).

  Observational analysis in the hand and wrist: A pilot study. Applied

  Occupational and Environmental Hygiene, 6, 627-637.
- Stock SR, Cole DC, Tugwell P, Streiner D (1996). Review of applicability of existing functional status measures to the study of workers with musculoskeletal disorders of the neck and upper limb. <u>American Journal of Industrial Medicine</u>, 29, 679-688.

- Stockdell SM, Crawford MS (1992). An industrial model for assisting employers to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 46, 427-433.
- Szabo RM, Madison M (1995). Carpal tunnel syndrome as a work-related disorder. In SL Gordon, SJ Blair, LJ Fine (Eds.), Repetitive motion disorders of the upper extremity (pp. 421-434). Rosemont, Illinois: American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons.
- Tanaka S, Wild DK, Seligman PJ, Halperin WE, Behrens VJ, Putz-Anderson V (1995).
  Prevalence and work-relatedness of self-reported carpal tunnel syndrome among U.S. workers: Analysis of the Occupational Health Supplement data of 1988
  National Health Interview Survey. <u>American Journal of Industrial Medicine</u>, 27, 451-470.
- Tepper A, Hurrell JJ (1995, September). A checklist for assessing occupational stressors. Poster session presented at the American Psychological Association/National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health Conference "Work, Stress, and Health, '95". Washington, D.C.
- van der Beek AJ, Frings-Dresen MHW (1998). Assessment of mechanical exposure in ergonomic epidemiology. Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 55, 291-299.
- Veiersted KB, Westgaard RH, Andersen P (1990). Pattern of muscle activity during stereotyped work and its relation to muscle pain. <u>International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health</u>, 62, 31-41.
- Vogelsang LM, Williams RL, Lawler K (1994). Lifestyle correlates of carpal tunnel syndrome. <u>Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation</u>, 4, 141-152.
- Ware JE, Sherbourne CD (1992). The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36). Medical Care, 30, 473-483.
- Webster DS, Snook SH (1994). The cost of compensable upper extremity cumulative trauma disorders. <u>Journal of Occupational Medicine</u>, <u>36</u>, 713-717.
- Weisenberg M (1994). Cognitive aspects of pain. In PD Wall, R Melzack (Eds.), <u>Textbook of pain</u> (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) (pp. 275-289). New York, New York: Churchill Livingstone.
- Werner RA, Franzblau A, Albers JW, Buchele H, Armstrong TJ (1997). Use of screening nerve conduction studies for predicting future carpal tunnel syndrome.

  Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 54, 96-100.

- Williams R, Westmorland M (1994). Occupational cumulative trauma disorders of the upper extremity. <u>American Journal of Occupational Therapy</u>, 48, 411-420.
- Williams RL, Moore CA, Pettibone TJ, Thomas SP (1992). Construction and validation of a self-report scale of self-management practices. <u>Journal of Research in Personality</u>, 26, 216-234.