
OCCUPATIONAL STRESS OF OFFICERS VIS-A-VIS SUBORDINATES OF SECURITY FORCES IN RELATION TO PERSONALITY TYPES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

Prof. Anu singh lather, Dean, University School of Management Studies, GGS Indraprastha
University, Delhi. E-mail: anusinghlather@gmail.com

Dr. Vijita Aggarwal, Reader, University School of Management Studies, GGS Indraprastha
University, Delhi. E-mail:

Lal Mohan Samantray

Abstract

Keeping in view the growing menace of occupational stress among the security force personnel, the paper discuss about the differential effect of occupational stress among subordinates vis-a-vis officers of the security forces engaged in the internal security duties. The study has also linked the personality types of these security personnel to each of the occupational stress factors to find how they get influenced by these OS factors. Four hundred employees (Officers: 200 & Subordinates: 200) were selected from four different security forces (100 employees from each force), including the local police, using stratified random sampling. Twelve occupational stress (OS) factors and four personality types have been taken into consideration while studying their occupational stress. The findings have revealed that out of 12 occupational stress factors, seven were heavy on subordinates and three were heavy on officers. The rest of the two OS factors have been found to be equally stressful for both the officers and subordinates. As regards personality types, there was no significant difference in the levels of stress in any pairs of personality type. However, the mean values indicated that the stress level of “B+” personality type was slightly higher as compared to the other three types of personalities.

Keywords: Occupational Stress, Personality Types, Internal Security, Security Forces, Police
Force

Introduction

The concept of “Internal security” refers to the overall security environment of the

society with an objective to establish good governance, ensuring cooperative administration and effective management of forces deployed for the safety of the public

life and property thereby reducing the possibility of exploitation by external powers of the grievances and the feelings of alienation of the people to achieve their strategic objectives. It is said that terrorism, communalism, illegal immigrants, organized crime, corruption and mal-administration are major threats to 'internal security'. Since the new strategic environment reduces the possibility of a full-fledged war, India's enemies are likely to adopt covert means to weaken the country. Factors that threaten internal security are bad governance, uncaring leadership, suppressed sentiments of aggrieved sections of the society, failure of political leadership, lack of moral integrity in the political leadership and administration, absence of statesmanship, poor management of forces deployed in internal security duties & absence of effective national security management .

While there is always a gradual processes of erosion within all institutions of government in the country dramatic transformations always takes place in the nature and range of the internal security threats that confront the modern state. The tectonic shift in the character and scale of these threats was brought home dramatically by the 9/11 attacks in USA, as also by

mounting evidence thereafter that many terrorists groups have been exploring the possibilities of the acquisition and use of a range of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). What are needed, consequently, is a comprehensive reappraisal of all contemporary threats to national security, and a refashioning of the nation's responses in terms of the legislative and institutional framework, and of executive action.

Indeed, in situations where the requirement of maintaining law and order , manning vital installations, providing security to general public/VVIPs at residence/public places, checking illegal entries at national/international airports, controlling the situations during communal/mass violence etc. are inevitable, the entire load of responsibility for ensuring effective 'internal security' system is shifted to uniformed services personnel of local police (FORCE-1) & the paramilitary forces like FORCE-2, FORCE-3, FORCE-4 etc. Although these forces perform with varying degrees of effectiveness, the intensity of job stress plays a major role on their physiological, psychological and on-duty performance.

keeping in view the present internal security scenario in the country, these forces

has got the most volatile role to play, thus, the burden of stress is cumulative not only on its lower ranks but also among the senior officers. Policing job is often regarded as an extremely stressful occupation, and officers typically suffer a variety of physiological, psychological and behavioural stress effects. It has been argued that particular attention should be given to occupational stress in policing, as its potential negative consequences affect performance in more direct and critical ways than stress in most other occupations. Officers operating under severe and chronic stress may well be at greater risk of error, accidents and over-reaction that can compromise their performance, jeopardize public safety and pose significant liability costs to the organization.

Occupational stress is the harmful physical and emotional response that occurs when there is a poor match between job demands and the capabilities, resources, or needs of the worker. Stress-related disorders encompass a broad array of conditions, including psychological disorders (e.g., depression, anxiety, post-traumatic stress disorder) and other types of emotional strain (e.g., dissatisfaction, fatigue, tension, etc.), maladaptive behaviours (e.g., aggression, substance abuse), and cognitive impairment

(e.g., concentration and memory problems). In turn, these conditions may lead to poor work performance or even injury. Job stress is also associated with various biological reactions that may lead ultimately to compromised health, such as cardiovascular disease. Occupational stress in one sense is a force which acts on a body, setting up strains within it according to its load-carrying capacity, flexibility and tolerance. It is also described as a condition arising from the interaction of people and their jobs and characterized by change within people that force them to deviate from normal functioning.'(Beehr & Newman, Organizational Behaviour). (Not listed in reference)

However, stress does not always originate outside the person. The stress is of varying degrees with different personality types among the police personnel which need to be taken care of while imparting training or assigning jobs to them. The personality dimension which is presumed to be related to stress is called Type A - Type B personality. When in stressful situations, all personality types display symptoms that are disadvantageous to others and unproductive for themselves. The kinds of circumstances that induce stress also vary

from type to type. Although any type can display any symptom from time to time, different types specialize in specific behaviours.

Type A is characterized as highly competitive, keenly ambitious, always in a hurry, and easily annoyed. Other characteristics of a Type A personality include a sense of being under constant time pressure, a suspicious nature and chronic impatience. Type –A tend to become easily upset, often for little reason. Although Type A's are frequently successful in their professions, they are never satisfied. They often try to do more than one thing at a time: they talk on the phone while working on the computer or driving the car or they read while eating.

Type B is non-competitive, less driven, patient, easygoing, and never has outbursts of rage, out-of-control temper tantrums, or hostile episodes, as Type A's do. They are perfectly relaxed, at peace with themselves and their environs; their lack of anger stems from a sense of inner peace. Type B's, unlike Type A's, are able to express their emotions appropriately. Characteristics such as a pleasant demeanour, the conscious control of anger, and temporary fearlessness in the face of trauma allow them to cope with stress

effectively. Although they are not driven over-achievers, Type B's are often as successful in their professions as Type A's.

Literature Review

A survey in US army about the soldiers serving in Iraq and Afghanistan indicates that 27% of soldiers suffered anxiety, depression, post combat stress and other problems namely mental health. The survey further points that in 2007, 121 soldiers committed suicide which shows an increase of 20% over 2006 in suicide cases reported among serving combatants (www.yahoo.com/news, accessed on 10/04/2008). While some security personnel start their career in excellent physical health, some retire early or even die from job related stress disorders as the cumulative impact of stress exacts its toll (Waters and Ussery, 2007). Waters and Ussery (2007), Maslach-Pines and Keinan (2007) define stress as the adverse reaction people have to excessive pressure or other types of demands placed on them. Occupational stress or workplace stress in this context refers to stress experienced as direct result of individuals' occupational related stressors. Previous research indicates that occupational stress results from a negative workplace environment and interactions at

work have been recognised as a major problem for security personnel (Waters and Ussery, 2007; Maslach-Pines and Keinan, 2007). Many pressures experienced by the officers are a product of environmental factors alone (Jaramillo et al., 2005; Violanti and Aron, 1994; Kirkcaldy et al., 1995; Waters and Ussery, 2007) or a combination of psychological and environmental variables related to occupational stress (Bartol, 2004; Waters and Ussery, 2007). Researchers such as Waters and Ussery (2007), Malach-Pines and Keinan (2007) and Kwak et al., (2006) argue that before one designs any functional prevention programmes and treat security personnel at risk, it is important to understand the predisposing factors, the nature of the stressful life events experienced by the officers and both the transient and long term responses to these events. Although security personnel are given pre-service physical tests to determine their health status prior to employment, still there is evidence suggesting that the officers after joining the services develop stress disorders. Waters and Ussery (2007) posit that the longer the officer has been on the force, the more his resistance has been worn away. However, this could leave one wonder, since the expectations is that the longer the officer

have been in service, the more resilient the officers would be. This could mean the new recruits are more likely to fall prey to stress. Psychological traits, working environment and self-expectation all influence an officer/subordinates ability to solve the problems and address job related challenges and family issues. While some stress can be positive motivators, it is generally regarded as destructive and even life threatening (Kwak et al., 2006). Stress can be viewed as a reaction to an external stimuli or demand. Anything physically or mentally demanding or burdensome can create stressful condition. However, for this to happen the situation must have sufficient impact on the person to attract his or her attention, perhaps because it evokes feelings of disappointment, annoyance, anger or simply because the individual feels the situation should not exist (Rollinson, 2005). The highest level of occupational stress is related to organisational factors such as work overload, management style, poor communication, lack of support and inadequate resources (Kop et al., 1999).

Work environment is one of the major sources of occupational stress for security personnel, which can be either internal or external. Internal work environment include factors that are related

to organisational structure and climate (Cooper et al., 1982; Violanti and Aron, 1994; Kirkcaldy et al., 1995), shift schedules that disrupt normal sleep patterns and social life, authoritarian management styles, poor interpersonal relationships (Norvell et al., 1993; He et al., 2002) with supervisors, inter-unit politics, lack of adequate planning and resources, lack of promotion opportunities, frequent transfers, excessive paper work, lack of autonomy in performing duties and lack of recognition for work accomplishments are among the organisational stressors faced by members of security forces across its ranks and files (Jaramillo et al., 2005, Waters and Ussery, 2007; Cooper et al., 1982; Scotland and Pendleton, 1989).

Research Methodology

Our current project has taken into consideration 12 occupational stress factors and four types of personalities as below:

Occupational stress factors

- (i) Role overload
- (ii) Role ambiguity
- (iii) Role conflict
- (iv) Unreasonable Group & Political pressure

- (v) Responsibility for persons
- (vi) Under participation
- (vii) Powerlessness,
- (viii) Poor peer relations
- (ix) Intrinsic impoverishment
- (x) Low status
- (xi) Strenuous working conditions
- (xii) Un-profitability

Personality types

A, A-, B & B+

The study was objected at finding out how all these occupational stress factors independently influence the overall stress of “Officers” and “Subordinates”. An effort has also been made to establish a relationship between personality types (A, A-, B, B+) and occupational stress factors i.e. how personality types gets influenced by individual occupational stress factors.

A Quantitative research was conducted on four types of security forces deployed across the length and breadth of the country for internal/ border security duties. Two types of standard scales were used and they were administered to 400 respondents (officers=200 & subordinates=200). Samples were collected from security personnel with different levels of experience.

Research Design

A sample design (4*2*5) was chalked out involving four security forces i.e. FORCE-1, FORCE-2, FORCE-3 and FORCE-4. Each force was segregated into two categories i.e. officers and subordinates, who were further sub-divided into five levels of experience (entry/5 yrs/10 yrs/15 yrs/20 yrs), so as to ensure proportional coverage of the entire population of the sampled security organizations. The objective of the design was to effectively analyze the occupational stress factors of security personnel and measure their effectiveness on officers and subordinates, who are engaged in the security organizations responsible for maintaining internal as well as the border security of the country. The personality types of these security personnel were also linked to the occupational stress factors,

independently or in combination, to find how they get influenced by these OS factors.

Sample

The study was conducted through stratified random sampling with a sample of 400, drawn from four security organizations (100 samples from each). Out of 100 samples allotted to each security force, 50 each were drawn from officers and subordinate category serving the same organization. Again, the 50 samples drawn from each category was picked up (10 each) from personnel with five levels of experience (entry/5 yrs/10 yrs/15 yrs./20 yrs). Thus, the samples could be drawn from all ranks, irrespective of their years of job experience. The table “Design of the sample” can be removed because the next table “sample distribution” gives same thing

Sample distribution

	FORCE-1		FORCE-2		FORCE-3		FORCE-4	
	SUBORDI NATE	OFFIC ER	SUBORDI NATE	OFFIC ER	SUBORDIN ATE	OFFIC ER	SUBORDIN ATE	OFFIC ER
ENT RY	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
5 Yr.	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10

10 Yr.	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
15 yr.	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
20yr.	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
TOT AL	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50

TOTAL =400

Instruments used

The following tests were used in the study:

Occupational stress index (Srivastava & Singh)

It is a 46 item questionnaire with five responses on a five point scale (to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement) (remove the red marked) to describe the nature and condition of (your) job and also (your own) experience and feelings about the job. dimensions of occupational stress are sought to be measured.

Type A-Type B self-test

It is a 7 item questionnaire with each question rated on 8-point scale.

Statistical tools used (Remove full section)

1. t-TEST (To compare the occupational stress level of two independent samples i.e. “officers” and “subordinates”)
2. DUNCAN’S Mean test (To compare the effect of individual OS factors on 4 types of personalities and find the significant pairs)

Table 1 : Comparison of dimensions of occupational stress (OS) between officers and subordinates of all the forces (Total sample)

DIMENSIONS OF OS	OFFICERs (N=200)		SUBORDINATEs (N=200)		t-value
	MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD	
ROLE OVERLOAD (OS1)	13.82	4.32	13.69	5.10	.29 ^{NS}
ROLE AMBIGUITY (OS2)	8.95	2.56	10.02	2.71	4.08**
ROLE CONFLICT (OS3)	10.40	2.91	11.55	3.79	3.40**
UNREASONABLE GROUP & POLITICAL PRESSURES (OS4)	11.59	3.67	9.93	2.58	5.23**
RESPONSIBILITY FOR PERSONS (OS5)	10.09	2.41	9.02	2.59	4.27**
UNDER-PARTICIPATION (OS6)	7.89	2.18	9.53	2.09	7.76**
POWERLESSNESS (OS7)	8.02	2.77	9.64	2.65	6.00**
POOR PEER RELATIONS (OS8)	8.2750	2.851	8.5350	2.212	1.02 ^{NS}
INTRINSIC IMPOVERISHMENT (OS9)	8.15	2.90	11.49	1.97	13.45**
LOW STATUS (OS10)	6.28	2.57	10.24	2.28	16.28**
STRENOUS WORKING CONDITIONS (OS11)	9.51	3.60	13.31	2.66	12.02**
UNPROFITABILITY (OS12)	6.33	2.27	5.16	1.71	5.82**

NS : NOT SIGNIFICANT

“*” : SIGNIFICANT AT .05 LEVEL

“” : SIGNIFICANT AT .01 LEVEL**

Interpretation (remove title and para below)

The t-test has been applied between the officers and subordinates in order to find the difference of 12 occupational stress factors. The interpretations of the results of each OS factor, as indicated in the table no.1, are given below:

Role overload (OS1):

The first t-value (see table-1) shows that there is no significant difference between the officers and subordinates. However, the mean value indicates that the mean is slightly more in case of officers i.e. the officers are slightly more stressed due to role overload.

Role overload refers to an imbalance between the role demands placed on the individual and the resources at the person's disposal to meet those demands (French & Caplan, 1973). Overloaded individuals must do more than they can do in the time available to them or require knowledge or skills that lie beyond their capabilities. There are several types of role overload. Quantitative overload (a large number of tasks in a given period of time) contrasts

with qualitative overload (a demand to perform at a level exceeding the resources available to the individual). An objective load can be measured objectively (for example, in terms of time), whereas a subjective load is experienced, perceived, and reported by the individual (French & Caplan, 1973).

In the forces, which are under study, every individual has an assigned role or charter of duties. Officers are more involved in the decision making process while the subordinates look after the implementation aspect of those decisions. The role of both the officers and the subordinates are well defined in such disciplined forces. Therefore, both these categories might be equally stressed due to their assigned jobs, without any significant difference. However, officers may be a bit more stressed due to the overall responsibility they handle.

ROLE AMBIGUITY (OS2):

The second t-value (see table-1) shows that there is a significant difference between officers and subordinates ($t=4.08$, significant at .01 level). The mean value indicates that the mean is more in case of subordinates i.e. subordinates are more stressed due to role ambiguity.

Role ambiguity has been described by Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthal (1964) as the single or multiple roles that confront the role incumbent, which may not be clearly articulated (communicated) in terms of behaviours (the role activities or tasks/priorities) or performance levels (the criteria that the role incumbent will be judged by). Naylor, Pritchard and Ilgen (1980) state that role ambiguity exists when focal persons (role incumbents) are uncertain about product-to-evaluation contingencies and are aware of their own uncertainty about them. Breugh & Colihan (1994) have further refined the definition of role ambiguity to be job ambiguity and indicate that job ambiguity possesses three distinct aspects: work methods, scheduling, and performance criteria. Most research suggests that role ambiguity is indeed negatively correlated with job satisfaction, job involvement, performance, tension, propensity to leave the job and job performance variables (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman 1970; Van Sell, Brief, & Schuler 1981; Fisher & Gitelson 1983; Jackson & Schuler 1985; Singh 1998).

In security forces, where roles are well defined, perhaps chaos and confusion has crept in on account of the role that was initially defined for them and the role they

are being expected to deliver in the current day scenario, where security perceptions has undergone a sea change. Although officers are decision makers, it is the subordinates who have the onus of implementing them in the field, where they may encounter with various limitations. Moreover, they being less educated might remain more vulnerable to stress due to ambiguity in their assigned role. Officers are also prone to such ambiguity, but they have someone to blame in cases of any fiasco. Therefore, the stress effect due to “Role ambiguity” is found to be more pronounced among the subordinates than the officers.

Role conflict (OS3)

The third t-value (table-1) shows that there is a significant difference between officers and subordinates ($t=3.40$, significant at .01 level). The mean value indicates that the mean is more in case of subordinates i.e. subordinates are more stressed due to role conflict.

Role conflict is a special form of social conflict that takes place when one is forced to take on two different and incompatible roles at the same time. It is a conflict among the roles corresponding to two or more statuses. It refers to a situation in which a

person is expected to play two incompatible roles. For example, when the security forces are asked to combat terrorism risking their lives, they are always expected to maintain utmost restraint to placate the Human rights Organizations. In case of failure, they are subjected to strict action.

In the current context, when security forces are involved in fighting our internal as well as external enemies, officers end up delivering sometimes situational decisions which might be confusing in nature. As a result, the subordinates may fail to take on the command and thus its implementation gets tough. Perhaps, that is why, the subordinates are found to be more prone to “Role conflict” stress effect than the officers.

Unreasonable group and political pressure (OS4)

The fourth t-value (table-1) shows that there is a significant difference between officers and subordinates ($t=5.23$, significant at .01 level). The mean value indicates that the mean is more in case of officers i.e. officers are more stressed due to unreasonable group and political pressure.

In forces, officers being the sole decision makers, perhaps, invariably exposed to pressure from their seniors and political bosses, depending upon their position in the hierarchy or the responsibility they have been assigned with. On the other hand, the subordinate staffs mostly remain concerned only about the order of their supervising bosses. Therefore, the effect of “unreasonable group and political pressure” as an occupational stress factor appears to be more pronounced on officers than the subordinates.

Please put reference to table-1 in all other interpretations below.

Responsibility for persons (OS5)

The t-value shows that there is a significant difference between officers and subordinates ($t=4.27$, significant at .01 level). The mean value indicates that the mean is more in case of officers i.e. officers are more stressed due to this OS factor.

Although officers and subordinates have a demarcated charter of duties, officers are always held responsible for any laxity in duties by any of his subordinates. On the other hand, subordinate is only answerable

to his immediate supervising boss. Perhaps, that is why, officers always have the responsibility factor heavy on them and remain more susceptible to this occupational stress factor.

Under participation (OS6)

The t-value shows that there is a significant difference between officers and subordinates ($t=7.76$, significant at .01 level). The mean value indicates that the mean is more in case of subordinates i.e. subordinates are more stressed due to this OS factor.

In forces, officers generally get recognition/rewards for the better performance of their subordinates. But, the subordinates always remain apprehensive about getting their due recognition, as it is the prerogative of seniors to either cherry-pick his close confidants to reward or not to share the recognition with any of them. Thus, a sense of deprivation or under participation pricks the subordinates, which may lead to increase in their level of occupational stress (OS).

Powerlessness (OS7)

The t-value shows that there is a significant difference between officers and subordinates ($t=6.00$, significant at .01 level). The mean value indicates that the mean is more in case of subordinates i.e. subordinates are more stressed due to powerlessness.

In forces, the command and control generally lies with officers, as a matter of professional expediency. Every movement of subordinates are controlled by their officers, leading to a perpetual sense of “powerlessness” shadowing them. Perhaps, that is why, the subordinate force appears to be more prone to this occupational stress factor than the officers.

Poor peer relation (OS8)

The t-value shows that there is no significant difference between officers and subordinates ($t=1.02$). The mean value indicates that the mean is more or less equal in case of both subordinates and officers i.e. both these categories are equally stressed due to this OS factor “poor peer relation”.

Hard working condition and far flung locations are the greatest challenge the security forces encounter. These challenges equally affects both the officers and subordinates, thereby asking for ensuring a good inter personal relation among the colleagues for survival and effective

functioning. Perhaps, this might be the reason why OS8 is equally stressful for both the officers and subordinates.

Intrinsic impoverishment (OS9)

The t-value shows that there is a significant difference between officers and subordinates ($t=13.45$, significant at .01 level). The mean value indicates that the mean is more in case of subordinates i.e. subordinates are more stressed due to intrinsic impoverishment.

In forces, the people joining the subordinate cadre might be from a poor socio-economic and educational background. However, this may not always be a case for majority of officers joining the forces. Thus, intrinsic impoverishment on account of poor socio-economic condition and meagre pay package/lack of facilities at the subordinate level may lead to increase their stress.

Low status (OS10)

The t-value shows that there is a significant difference between officers and subordinates ($t=16.28$, significant at .01 level). The mean value indicates that the mean is more in case of subordinates i.e.

subordinates are more stressed due to Low status.

Poor socio-economic condition, inadequate pay package, lack of facilities etc. vis-a-vis officers might be the cause for the heightened stress level among the subordinate staff.

Strenuous working condition (OS11)

The t-value shows that there is a significant difference between officers and subordinates ($t=12.02$, significant at .01 level). The mean value indicates that the mean is more in case of subordinates i.e. subordinates are more stressed due to strenuous working condition.

The subordinate staffs are perhaps more exposed to physical exertions in comparison to their officers. Far flung locations, adverse climatic conditions and survival threats might be causing a lot of stress for the subordinate forces. It is perceived that stress—in the form of abysmal work conditions, atomised lives, long hours of work, constant mobility, marital disharmony, coupled with a constant threat to life—is the single biggest challenge they are facing. “The constant social pressures compounded by work pressure, loneliness and inability to meet one’s family frequently lead to suicides,”

Un-profitability (OS12)

The t-value shows that there is a significant difference between officers and subordinates (t=5.82, significant at .01 level). The mean value indicates that the mean is more in case of officers i.e. officers are more stressed due to Un-profitability. Higher the education and experience higher the expectations. This is applicable to the officers in the forces, who are well educated, well groomed and keep on adding

to their profiles during their service period. They always aspire for a hefty pay package from MNC's and an opportunity to stay in cities. Over the years, the economic boom due to MNC's setting shops in India and offering hefty pay packages to their top brass, the aspiring officers are tend to draw comparisons between the pay packages. Therefore, this might be one of the reasons, why officers are stressed due to a feeling of un-profitability.

Table 2: Occupational Stress in relations to types of personality- DUNCAN'S Mean test

Occupational Stress factors	B (N=116)		B+ (N=155)		A- (N=31)		A (N=98)		Significant pairs (*)	F-value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
ROLE OVERLOAD (OS1)	13.47	4.84	13.70	4.21	13.32	4.51	14.31	5.39	—	.67
ROLE AMBIGUITY (OS2)	9.76	2.64	9.62	2.80	9.06	2.92	9.07	2.43	—	1.57
ROLE CONFLICT (OS3)	11.03	3.50	11.21	3.30	10.61	3.18	10.63	3.61	—	.69
UNREASONABLE GROUP & POLITICAL PRESSURES (OS4)	11.10	3.22	11.06	3.41	9.48	2.77	10.28	3.16	B+ V/S A- B V/S A-	3.2*

RESPONSIBILITY FOR PERSONS (OS5)	9.79	2.71	9.55	2.57	9.48	1.73	9.28	2.58	--	.73
UNDER-PARTICIPATION (OS6)	8.61	2.32	8.86	2.07	8.90	2.51	8.50	2.50	--	.63
POWERLESSNESS (OS7)	8.82	2.80	8.99	2.88	9.77	2.96	8.29	2.65	A- V/S A	2.55*
POOR PEER RELATIONS (OS8)	8.33	2.36	8.39	2.68	9.65	2.70	8.12	2.44	A- V/S A A- V/S B A- V/S B+	2.91*
INTRINSIC IMPOVERISHMENT (OS9)	9.59	2.83	9.48	3.08	11.39	2.43	10.13	3.04	A- V/S B+ A- V/S B A- V/S A	4.22*
LOW STATUS (OS10)	8.41	3.04	8.38	3.01	7.26	3.26	8.20	3.37	—	1.23
STRENUOUS WORKING CONDITIONS (OS11)	11.40	3.51	11.53	3.93	10.94	4.02	11.38	3.44	—	.23
UNPROFITABILITY (OS12)	5.62	1.99	5.94	2.11	5.55	2.45	5.64	2.07	—	.76
TOTAL STRESS	115.9	17.4	116.7	15.7	115.4	15.3	113.8	15.5	—	.65
	3	6	1	1	2	2	3	1		

***: SIGNIFICANT AT .05 LEVEL**

**** : SIGNIFICANT AT .01 LEVEL**

Interpretation of table 2

Role overload (OS1)

There is no significant difference in the levels of stress in any pairs of personality

type due to occupational stress factor “Role overload” (table-2). However, the mean values indicate that the stress level among the “A”-type personalities, due to “Role

overload”, is slightly more as compared to other three types of personalities.

Role ambiguity (OS2)

There is no significant difference in the levels of stress in any pairs of personality type due to occupational stress factor “Role ambiguity”. However, the mean values indicate that the stress level among the “B”-type personalities, due to “Role ambiguity”, is slightly more as compared to the other three types of personalities.

Role conflict (OS3)

There is no significant difference in the levels of stress in any pairs of personality type due to occupational stress factor “Role conflict”. However, the mean values indicate that the stress level among the “B”-type personalities, due to “Role conflict”, is slightly more as compared to the other three types of personalities.

Unreasonable group and political pressure (OS4)

There is a significant difference in the levels of stress between “B” & “B+” vis-à-vis “A-” types of personality due to occupational stress factor “Unreasonable group and

political pressure”. The mean values indicate that the stress levels of “B” and “B+” types of personalities, due to the above OS factor, is significantly higher than people of “A-” type personality.

Responsibility for persons (OS5)

There is no significant difference in the levels of stress in any pairs of personality type due to occupational stress factor “Responsibility for persons”. However, the mean values indicate that the stress level among the “B”-type personalities, due to the above OS factor, is slightly higher as compared to the other three types of personalities.

Under-participation (OS6)

There is no significant difference in the levels of stress in any pairs of personality type due to occupational stress factor “Under participation”. However, the mean values indicate that the stress level among the “A-” type personalities, due to “Under participation”, is slightly more as compared to the other three types of personalities.

Powerlessness (OS7)

There is a significant difference in the levels of stress between “A-” and “A” types of personality due to occupational stress factor “Powerlessness”. The mean values indicate that the stress level of “A-” type of personality, due to the above OS factor, is significantly higher as compared to the other three types of personalities.

Poor peer relation (OS8)

There is a significant difference in the levels of stress between “A-” vis-à-vis “B”, “B+” & “A” types of personalities due to occupational stress factor “Poor peer relation”. The mean values indicate that the stress levels of “A-” type of personality, due to the above OS factor, is significantly higher as compared to the people of other three types of personality.

Intrinsic Impoverishment (OS9):

There is a significant difference in the levels of stress between “A-” vis-à-vis “B”, “B+” & “A” types of personalities due to occupational stress factor “Intrinsic Impoverishment”. The mean values indicate that the stress level of “A-” type of personality, due to the above OS factor, is

significantly higher as compared to the people of other three types of personality.

Low status (OS10)

There is no significant difference in the levels of stress in any pairs of personality type due to occupational stress factor “Low status”. However, the mean values indicate that the stress level among the “B” type personalities, due to this stress factor, is slightly more as compared to the other three types of personalities.

Strenuous working condition (OS11)

There is no significant difference in the levels of stress in any pairs of personality type due to occupational stress factor “Strenuous working condition”. However, the mean values indicate that the stress level among the “B+” personality-type, due to this OS factor, is slightly more as compared to the other three types of personalities.

Un-profitability (OS12)

There is no significant difference in the levels of stress in any pairs of personality type due to occupational stress factor “Un-profitability”. This OS factor has

comparatively less stress effects on all the four types of personalities.

Total Stress

There is no significant difference in the levels of stress in any pairs of personality type due to the combined effect of all the 12 occupational stress factors (OS). However, the mean values indicate that the stress level of “B+” personality-type, due to the overall stress effect, is slightly higher as compared to the other three types of personalities. All the personality types slightly differ among themselves as regards their stress levels.

Results (These are already stated above, can be removed)

The study has revealed that out of the twelve occupational stress (OS) factors that were subjected to test with 400 samples, drawn equally from officers and subordinates of four types of security forces deployed for internal security duties, factors like “Role overload” & “Poor peer relation” were found to be equally stressful for both the officers and subordinates. The rest of the ten OS factors were observed to be significantly effective on the overall stress of either the officers or subordinates or both

in one way or the other. Occupational stress (OS) factors like “Low status” & “Intrinsic impoverishment”, which are influenced mainly by social background of an individual, were observed to be heavy on subordinate category. Other OS factors like “Role ambiguity”, “Role conflict”, “Under participation”, “Powerlessness”, “Strenuous working condition” etc. are also significantly heavier on the subordinate side i.e. the subordinates are more stressed due to the above OS factors. However, OS factors like “Unreasonable group and political pressure”, “Responsibility for persons” and “Un-profitability” are heavier on the officers category i.e. officers are significantly stressed due to the above factors.

There is no significant difference in the levels of stress in any pairs of personality type due to the combined effect of all the 12 occupational stress factors (OS). However, the mean values indicate that the stress level of “B+” personality-type, due to the overall stress effect, is slightly higher as compared to the other three types of personalities. However, all these personality types slightly differ among themselves as regards their stress levels vis-à-vis individual OS factors.

Discussion

A survey report based on police performance reveals that, the inability to effectively manage police stress has its most dangerous consequences in the line of duty. Police work often places officers in situations where reaction speed, coordination, the capacity to make rapid decisions and accurate judgments under pressure is critical, inefficient mental and emotional responses to stress can significantly impair these abilities. In the extreme condition, occupational stress can cause officers to lose balance and composure to the degree that they employ inappropriate or excessive force in dealing with subjects. Recent years have seen the wide publicity of incidents of police brutality and homicides committed by individual officers throughout the world. Errors made in the line of duty can have grievous consequences not only on the officers and the particular suspects they encounter, but also on the public's perception of the individual, an entire department and even the entire profession. These consequences may include vehicle accidents, injury, death, lawsuits, loss of credibility and even city-wide riots in reaction to officer's behaviour in highly-charged situations.

Most of the security personnel who were questioned, wanted pre-incident education to deal with stress and policies ensuring debriefing and intervention. It is incumbent upon administrators of the Forces to prepare for eventualities and provide their personnel with the training and services necessary for a favourable outcome of the situation.

It is widely acknowledged that all first responders will be exposed to circumstances and incidents of a critical nature, which could evoke adverse emotional reactions and affect their job performance, health, decision-making and family life. It is also recognized that most responses to the potentially detrimental effects of stress induced by traumatic incidents can be dealt with successfully, when identified early and referred to the appropriate care. Incredible amount of time and effort are spent on background investigations by Law Enforcement agencies during the hiring process. Aspirants for Police services and security forces are exposed to months of written, oral, psychological and agility tests as well as a physical examination. Agencies desire the most physically and psychologically sound people to endure the hours of demanding instruction at the academies. Researchers

and practisers explain why work of any security personnel is inherently stressful. One explanation is that the conventional view about the nature and extent of police stress is self-serving. For example, it can be argued that police officers are able to set themselves apart from other occupational groups and legitimize the professionalism and value of their occupation by perpetuating the notion that police work is very stressful.

Members of the general community are frequently exposed to stereotypic images that show the dangerous aspect of police work. Police officers are often depicted in risky roles in movies and fictional literature. When confronted with these images a person would not like to find themselves in these situations.

It should be remembered that those who choose the profession of police, are mostly well aware of the nature of duties and responsibilities. They are expected to have a fair idea about the occupational hazards they are likely to encounter. But once becoming a part of the force, some start enjoying the job while many others find it difficult to continue. Although the doors are always open to the distraught personnel, many continue against their wishes given the job crunch and other compulsions which

becomes the genesis of their occupational stress.

Occupational stress perceptions also varies from individual to individual and forces to forces, the differences in their perceptions and experiences are likely to be high when the task assignment boils down to individual level. In other words, stress being appraised differently by different individuals depending upon their personality types, no singular stress reduction strategy can be effective. This calls for different stress reduction sessions for different group of officers. Failure to withstand interventions in their jobs is likely to put their psychological and physical health at risk. Officers should be encouraged to share their work experiences with their colleagues or seek the support of the psychologists, if they feel stressed. Regular medical check up should be administered to monitor their pulse rate and other vital bodily clues for the possible symptoms of stress. Simultaneously, commanding officers must be trained on career counselling in order to help their junior officers and subordinates to cope with the demand of their duties.

A separate training programme needs to be devised for the subordinate staffs, which constitutes the majority of the stressed elements in the fighting forces.

Separate training packages, with practical classes, must be designed to minimise the effects of occupational stress factors like “role ambiguity”(OS2), “role conflict” (OS3), “under participation” (OS6), “powerlessness” (OS7), strenuous working condition (OS11) etc. which are significantly heavier on the subordinate side.

In order to improve the security personnel coping skills, attention should be paid to convergent factors that lead to their stress. Every force needs to design a stress management program to fit in to their specific needs. On the other hand, the program should assess their employees’ physical and psychological stress, monitor their adaptive coping skills and make use of peer counselling (He et al., 2002). All the security personnel are supposed to be strong, resilient and must remain unaffected by the violent and vicious behaviours that they encounter every day, so they should go for screening, training, ongoing prevention programs and early interventions (Waters and Ussery, 2007).

Security personnel deployed with internal security duties assumes a full-time occupational responsibility to enforce the law or interrupt the processes that cause such breaches. They do so with training that begins at an academy and continues

throughout their career. The training delineates professional standards that an officer must follow, including those pertaining to restraint when using force, adherence to the letter and spirit of the law and control in exercising the formal and informal authority inherent in status as a security officer.

Training is an integral part of any security organisation and what is ideally expected of it is to mould the cadets to produce individuals equipped with a better endurance level to withstand occupational stress hazards. Thus, the programme for any security organization needs to stress upon personality development of the cadet instead of harping on a regimental pattern that mixes up strenuous physical activities with a plethora of tiresome lectures on subjects replete with theories and practical aspects associated with the service. Most of the training programs lack the required lustre that allow the cadet to grow as an individual along with the course curriculum, who, at the end of the course, ought to discover himself as a suave person, carrying no prejudices and preferences and the same time, tough enough to fight the work hazards effectively. The training course curriculum of security organisations includes personality development programmes, but

they are not implemented meticulously. No doubt, occupational stress grows without any exception to any particular profession, but, it can be kept under control only when the security personnel are aware of its plausible threats and possible means to tackle it.

It has been observed that those who become victim of the negative consequences of stress tend to hide their mental status, considering it as a social stigma. As a result, they avoid seeking professional psychiatric help, allowing themselves delve deep into the abysmal depth of depression. To argue, we can't point at the security personnel solely for this attitudinal anomaly, rather the organisational outlook needs a revamping in this matter. It has been noticed that the personnel who dare to visit a psychologist for professional help, are marginalised by their seniors, keeping them away from important assignments. Such attitudinal problems on the part of the seniors adversely impact the subject forcing him keep the stressed elements untreated and confined to the unit. This leads to an umpteen number of suicides and cases of turning gun on their seniors/colleagues on the slightest provocation over trivial issues.

Police training should be based on fundamental values of a democracy, Rule of law and protection of human rights. Training should aim at making the staff generalists rather than specialists. Training should be as open as possible towards society. Society being diverse, training must account for this diversity if members of society are to be well served.

Security personnel are typically trained to deal with misdemeanors and felonies, which can range from petty theft and verbal assault through murder, rape, simple and aggravated assault, domestic disputes, kidnapping, hostage taking, theft of defense information and materials jeopardizing the national security, theft of office equipment, drug trafficking, assault on Government owned facilities, arson and bomb threats, crowd control, and other conditions involving violations of law and threats to human life. Thus, the training of security forces needs to incorporate elements of responsibility and expertise, not only to perform duties but also to keep their occupational stress within limits.

Special care must be taken to strengthen the personality dimensions of the security personnel, as they tend to influence the level of their occupational stress.

Inculcate a positive security culture

In order to establish a positive culture, security forces must educate their officers and subordinates on the department's overall mission and on the benefits of setting goals that contribute to the mission. They should ensure that recruits can find this information in their blue books, orientation manuals, or recruit objective guides.

When this instruction process exists, recruits adopt objectives that apply across the board to all security personnel, regardless of assignment. In the absence of this education process, the functioning of the forces loses its propellant force to achieve the desired objectives.

Instil self-esteem

Recent studies confirm the value of enhancing self-esteem through employee recognition and support for employee development programs. Enhancing self-esteem results in a positive influence on employees' commitment to the organization and on their willingness to further those organizational goals and objectives that appear consistent with their own. For this reason, organizations should work to enhance the self-esteem of their employees,

and they should, at the same time, foster trust, openness, and commitment. In this aspect, increased and open interaction between an officer and subordinates would help in boosting the sagging morals of subordinates. Officer needs to become more accommodative and sensitive towards the needs and problems of subordinates. The wide gap between facilities made available to the officers and subordinates needs to be reduced to instil self esteem.

Induce management skills

Security personnel must also use managerial strategies to accomplish shared objectives and goals. For example, they should ensure that the task needs of the organization and the personal needs of employees complement each other. Security personnel may take recourse to some of the following management techniques:

- Putting right person in the right job: this will not only propel efficiency but also keep the spirit of subordinates high.

Accommodate employee's voice in decision making process: This will negate the adverse effect of under-participation (OS Factor) and boost the

morale of the force, ensuring commitment to the organization.

Instil self esteem among the employees through regular encouragements and reposing faith on them through new assignments.

Encourage democratic leadership in the organization.

Give due recognition to merit and infuse confidence among the subordinates. This will ensure a good rapport with the workforce.

Creating better career growth prospects for the subordinates, providing an opportunity to the worthy employees come out of the gnawing feeling of joining subordinate services due to various compulsions.

The definition of security is no longer confined to “lock and key” and physical security has almost lost its significance, as any destruction can be carried out remotely. Therefore, the training programs needs to be dynamic and result oriented, keeping in view the tectonic shift in the character and scale of security threats brought home dramatically by the 9/11 attacks in USA and the mounting pressure on security forces to counter the evil designs of anti-national elements.

References

Malta. Stress at Work. A Concept in Stress. Human Factors Limited. Business Psychology and Strategy Development - 2004. (Where is it referred in text?)

Mead R. What is Stress? Roger Mead Associates, Stress Management, Coaching and Training for Individuals and Groups - 2000. . (Where is it referred in text?)

Murphy, S. L. Sauter, Occupational Stress Issues & Development in Research. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc. (Year?) . (Where is it referred in text?)

Parikh P, Taukari A, Bhattacharya T. Occupational Stress and Coping among Nurses. J Health Manag, 2004; 6: 115-27. . (Where is it referred in text?)

Robbins, S.P (1996). Organizational Behavior . (International edition) New York: Prentice- Hall, Inc. . (Where is it referred in text?)

Schultz, D. & Schultz, E.S. (2002). Psychology and Work Today. (8th ed.). India:Pearson Education, Inc . (Where is it referred in text?)

Siegrist, J. (1996), Adverse Health effects of high – effort / low reward conditions. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 1, 27 – 41. . (Where is it referred in text?)

NIOSH Working Group DHHS
(NIOSH) Protect Worker Safety And
Health, Publication No. 99-101 (Year?) .
(Where is it referred in text?)

S. Hansen, Ph.D Managing Job Stress:
10 Strategies for Coping and Thriving at
Work by Randall (Year?) . (Where is it
referred in text?)

The references appearing in the text are
not listed above and the list given above
is not referred any where.