

A STUDY ON RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OCCUPATION STRESS INDEX DIMENSIONS AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES OF POLICE SUB INSPECTORS AND ASST. SUB INSPECTORS IN POLICE DEPARTMENT.

Smt.Rashmi Ram Hunnur

Research Scholar, Jain University, Bangalore

Asst.Professor, Dept .of Management Studies, Basaveshwar Engineering,College, Bagalkot

Dr.M .M. Bagali

Research Coordinator, Research in Management, Jain University, Bangalore.

Abstract

This research identified many of the stresses that are placed on police personnel, and various stressors and the relationship between the stress dimensions and the demographic variables like age, education qualification and work experience. Stress can easily be defined as a dynamic state within an organism in response to a demand for adaptation. The purpose of this research paper is to understand the stress on different demographic profile such as age, education qualification, and work experience. The research method used for this paper is relied upon survey, professional papers, articles, and internet sources. Research indicated that there is no significant relation between the occupational stress dimensions and the demographic variables of PSI/ASI personnel's.

Keywords: Occupational Stress, Role Overload, Role Ambiguity, and Role Conflict.

Introduction

Stress is the sum total of all non specific biological phenomenon elicited by adverse external influences. One feels stressed when one is overwhelmed by unexpected responses. It is a multi dimensional concept and has variety of usages in different fields which vary according to specific focus and purpose.

Cofer and Appley (1964)⁵ defined stress as a state of an organism where he perceives that his wellbeing is endangered and that he must direct all his energies to its protection. Lazarus (1966)⁶ referred stress a state of imbalance with in an organism that is elicited by an actual/perceived disparity between environmental demands and the organism's capacity to cope with these demands; and is manifested through variety of physiological, emotional and behavioural responses. McGrath (1970)⁷ defined stress as a perceived imbalance between demand and response capacity under conditions where failure to meet demand has important consequences. Cox (1978)⁸ has described three classes of definitions. Stress can be variously thought of as a response, *i.e.* the stress response to an extreme stimulus; as a stimulus *i.e.* as the stressor itself as an intervening variable. Spielberger (1979)⁹ defined stress in two different ways. According to him, it is a dangerous potentiality, harmful/unpleasant external situation/conditions (stressors) that produce stress reaction; and secondly to the internal thought, judgment, emotional state and physiological process that are evoked by stressful stimuli.

⁵ Cofer and Appley (1964), Motivation Theory and research, Axton, Virginia, United states.

⁶ Lazarus R.S(1966), Psychological stress and coping process, McGraw Hill, New York.

⁷ McGrath (1970)

⁸ Cox (1978), An inventory for the measurement of self-reported stress and arousal, British Journal of Social & Clinical Psychology, Vol.13 (3), pp 283-284

⁹ Spielberger (1979), Understanding stress and anxiety. Harper and Row Publishers, New York

Literature Review

Age: A study undertaken by Reddy and Ramamurthy (1991)¹⁰ analyzed the influence of age and stress experienced by a person. The sample consisted of 200 executives. The results revealed that executives in the age group of 41-50 experienced more stress than the age group of 51-60. Moderating variables among executives experiencing stress include not only age but also the years of service in the employment. Aminabhavi and Triveni (2000)¹¹ in their study found that age, sex, coping strategies of bank employees have no influence on their occupational stress. Virk *et al.* (2001)¹² conducted a study on occupational stress and work motivation in relation to age, job level and type-behaviour. He reported that age and job level can have strong influence on job stress.

Education: Education acts as a moderating force, either increases or reduces stress depending on the perception of the individuals. A study undertaken by Ansari (1991)¹³ had studied the nature and extent of stress in agriculture university teachers. Sample consisted of 235 respondents comprising 30 professors, 74 associate professors and 135 assistant professors. The result revealed that the correlation between the nature of stress and qualification of teachers in different cadres was found to be non significant. Chand and Monga (2007)¹⁴ examined the correlates of job stress and burn out among 100 faculty members from two universities. He found that, higher education can combat stress and burn out related problems among the faculty members.

Occupation and position: A study undertaken by Ryhal and Singh (1996)¹⁵ studied the correlates of job stress among university faculty. A sample of 100 faculty members includes 30 professors, 31 associate and 39 assistant professors. Assistant professors experienced higher job stress than associate professors and professors. Aminabhavi and Triveni (2000)¹⁶ revealed that managers experience significantly higher occupational stress than clerks. The fact is that managers have greater responsibility in his position than the clerks.

Experience: A study undertaken by Blix *et al.* (1994)¹⁷ on occupational stress among university teachers, found that faculty having less than 10 years of experience had higher stress than faculty with more than 20 years of experience. Ryhal and Singh (1996)¹⁸ considered university faculty for their study whose sample comprised of 100 faculty members 30 professors, 31 associate and 39 assistant professors.

¹⁰Reddy and Ramamurthy (1991), The relation between stress experience on the job – age, personality and general ability, Psy.Stu., Vol.36, No.2, pp 87-95

¹¹Aminabhavi V.A, and Triveni.S (2000), Variables causing occupational stress on the nationalized and non-nationalized bank employees, J.Com, Gui. Res., Vol.17 No.1, pp 20-29

¹² Virk, J., Chhabra, J. and Kumar, R., (2001), Occupational stress and work motivation in relation to age, job level and type-A behaviour. Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, Vol.27.No.1&2, pp 51-55.

¹³Ansari M.R (1991), An investigation into the stress of agriculture university teachers, Ph.D Thesis, IARI, New Delhi.

¹⁴ Chand and Monga (2007), Correlates of job stress and burn out. J.Com. Gui.Res., vol.24 No.3, pp 243-252

¹⁵ Ryhal and Singh (1996), A study of correlates of job stress among university faculty. Indian Psy.Rev., Vol.46, No.1-2, pp 20-26

¹⁶ Aminabhavi V.A, and Triveni.S (2000), Variables causing occupational stress on the nationalized and non-nationalized bank employees, J.Com, Gui. Res., Vol.17 No.1, pp 20-29

¹⁷ Blix.A.G, Cruise.R.J,Blix G.G., (1994), Occupational stress among university teachers. Ednal. Res., 36, pp 157-169

¹⁸ Ryhal and Singh (1996), A study of correlates of job stress among university faculty. Indian Psy.Rev., Vol.46, No.1-2, pp 20-26

Results revealed that those with 26-35 years experience had higher job stress than those with teaching experience of 16-25 years and 5-15 years. Those with 16-25 years experience had higher job stress than those with teaching experience of 5-15 years. Bhagawan (1997)¹⁹ conducted a study on 100 teachers selected from 20 schools in Orissa. The sample consisted of 100 teachers (53 male and 47 female teachers). The study demonstrated that higher the teaching experience, lesser the perceived burn out.

Objective of the Study

To understand the stress on different demographic profile such as age, education qualification, and work experience, amongst the police personnel

Research Methodology:

The questionnaire framed for the research is based on the scales developed and used in different researches. In framing the questionnaire, item was covered with 5 point scale. Occupational Stress Index (Srivastava, 1981) was administered to both PSI and ASI. The PSI/ASI group consisted of 50 respondents of the Police department. The respondents were working in Police department in Bagalkot, Bijapur, Belgaum & Dharwad Districts, of Karnataka

A Pilot Study

A pilot study is carried before the actual study to establish the feasibility of the study and to identify any problems that may exist (Mauch & Birch; 1998).

The questionnaire was distributed to 20 respondents in Bagalkot district, before the actual study commenced.

Table 1: Showing the Sample for Pilot Survey

Occupation	Bagalkot	Amingad	Ilkal	Hungund	Total
PSI/ASI	9	2	4	5	20

The respondents were asked to identify any problems that they may have had with the questionnaire. After a discussion with these respondents and as well as discussion with the higher grade police officers (Police Inspectors, Deputy Superintendent of Police), the questionnaire was amended and the consequent concerns or additional contributions were taken into consideration.

The Research Sample

Table 2: Showing the Research Sample

Occupation	Bagalkot	Bijapur	Belgaum	Dharwad	Total
PSI/ASI	23	10	8	9	50

A prospective sample methodology was used, because of the need to study stress in police department at PSI and ASI level. Thus, the inclusion of sample at that level.

¹⁹ Bhagawan.S. (1997), Job stress and burn out in teachers of secondary school in Orissa. J.Ednal.Res.Extn., Vol.33 No.4, pp 218-234

Table 3: Showing Demographic Variables

Demographic Variables	PSI	ASI
Number of PSI / ASI	20	30
Age		
20-30 years	09	0
31-40 years	11	01
41-50 years	0	01
51-60 years	0	28
Education Qualification		
SSLC/10 th	0	13
PUC/12 th	0	16
Degree	15	01
PG	05	0
Work Experience		
0-10 years	17	0
11-20 years	03	02
21-30 years	0	01
31-40 years	0	27

Hypothesis Testing for Police Sub-Inspector (PSI) / Asst. Sub-Inspector (ASI)

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference between level of groups on various demographic variables such as age, experience, and education qualification

Alternative Hypothesis: There is significant difference between level of groups on various demographic variables such as age, experience, and education qualification.

Sub Hypothesis

Age and Stress for PSI/ASI

H₀: The occupation stress dimensions do not differ significantly for the two groups based on age.

H_A: The occupation stress dimensions differ significantly for the two groups based on age.

Table No. 4: Showing “t” test value for Stress Dimensions and Age

Occupation Stress Dimensions	Age Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	“t” value	sig value
Role Overload	< 40 years	21	22.14	3.35	0.73	-0.46	0.64
	> 40 years	29	22.59	3.31	0.61		
Role Ambiguity	< 40 years	21	10.62	2.73	0.60	-1.97	0.05*
	> 40 years	29	12.00	2.22	0.41		
Role Conflict	< 40 years	21	15.24	4.11	0.90	0.14	0.89

Occupation Stress Dimensions	Age Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	“t” value	sig value
	> 40 years	29	15.10	2.69	0.50		
Unreasonable group and political pressure	< 40 years	21	13.62	2.84	0.62	0.50	0.62
	> 40 years	29	13.21	2.88	0.54		
Responsibility for persons	< 40 years	21	10.14	2.10	0.46	2.15	0.04*
	> 40 years	29	9.00	1.65	0.31		
Under participation	< 40 years	21	12.57	2.64	0.58	-0.32	0.75
	> 40 years	29	12.83	2.90	0.54		
Powerlessness	< 40 years	21	9.62	2.44	0.53	-0.05	0.96
	> 40 years	29	9.66	2.32	0.43		
Poor peer relations	< 40 years	21	11.14	2.37	0.52	0.13	0.90
	> 40 years	29	11.07	1.69	0.31		
Intrinsic impoverishment	< 40 years	21	11.95	3.76	0.82	0.64	0.52
	> 40 years	29	11.38	2.53	0.47		
Low status	< 40 years	21	7.67	2.99	0.65	0.25	0.80
	> 40 years	29	7.48	2.25	0.42		
Strenuous working conditions	< 40 years	21	13.00	2.88	0.63	0.47	0.64
	> 40 years	29	12.62	2.78	0.52		
Unprofitable	< 40 years	21	7.00	1.73	0.38	-0.43	0.67
	> 40 years	29	7.21	1.63	0.30		
Occupational Stress Index	< 40 years	21	175.38	24.20	5.28	-0.04	0.97
	> 40 years	29	175.66	20.08	3.73		

Role Overload: The mean score for this dimension for the group with age less than 40 years is 22.14 and that for the group with age more than 40 is 22.59. The “t” statistic value is -0.46, with significance value 0.64 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Role Ambiguity: The mean score for this dimension for the group with age less than 40 years is 10.62 and that for the group with age more than 40 is 12.00. The “t” statistic value is -1.97 with the significance value 0.05 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis of significant difference of means is accepted.

Role Conflict: The mean score for this dimension for the group with age less than 40 years is 15.24 and that for the group with age more than 40 is 15.10. The “t” statistic value is 0.14 with significance value 0.89 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted

Unreasonable group and political pressure: The mean score for this dimension for the group with age less than 40 years is 13.62 and that for the group with age more than 40 is 13.21. The “t” statistic value is 0.50 with significance value 0.62 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted

Responsibility for persons: The mean score for this dimension for the group with age less than 40 years is 10.14 and that for the group with age more than 40 is 9.00. The “t” statistic value is 2.15 with the significance value 0.04 which is < 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis of significant difference of means is accepted.

Under participation: The mean score for this dimension for the group with age less than 40 years is 12.57 and that for the group with age more than 40 is 12.83. The “t” statistic value is -0.32 with significance value 0.75 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Powerlessness: The mean score for this dimension for the group with age less than 40 years is 9.62 and that for the group with age more than 40 is 9.66. The “t” statistic value is -0.05 with significance value 0.96 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Poor peer relations: The mean score for this dimension for the group with age less than 40 years is 11.14 and that for the group with age more than 40 is 11.07. The “t” statistic value is 0.13 with significance value 0.90 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Intrinsic impoverishment: The mean score for this dimension for the group with age less than 40 years is 11.95 and that for the group with age more than 40 is 11.38. The “t” statistic value is 0.64 with significance value 0.52 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Low status: The mean score for this dimension for the group with age less than 40 years is 7.67 and that for the group with age more than 40 is 7.48. The “t” statistic value is 0.25 with significance value 0.80 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Strenuous working conditions: The mean score for this dimension for the group with age less than 40 years is 13.00 and that for the group with age more than 40 is 12.62. The “t” statistic value is 0.47 with significance value 0.64 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Unprofitable: The mean score for this dimension for the group with age less than 40 years is 7.00 and that for the group with age more than 40 is 7.21. The “t” statistic value is -0.43 with significance value

0.67 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Occupational Stress Index: The mean score for OSI index for the group with age less than 40 years is 24.20 and that for the group with age more than 40 is 20.08. The “t” statistic value is -0.04 with significance value 0.97 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted, which means that the occupation stress dimensions do not differ significantly based on age. Hence, it may be concluded that Role ambiguity and Responsibility for persons are the only two dimensions where the mean score of two groups of respondents differ significantly.

Education Qualification and Stress

H₀: The occupation stress dimensions do not differ significantly for the graduates and undergraduates.

H_A: The occupation stress dimensions differ significantly for the graduates and undergraduates.

Table No 5: Showing ‘t’ test value for stress dimensions and education qualification for PSI/ASI

Occupation Stress Dimensions	Qualification Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	“t” value	sig value
Role Overload	Below Degree	29	22.52	3.26	0.61	0.20	0.84
	Degree	21	22.31	3.48	0.87		
Role Ambiguity	Below Degree	29	12.07	2.22	0.41	1.71	0.09
	Degree	21	10.81	2.59	0.65		
Role Conflict	Below Degree	29	15.14	2.71	0.50	0.37	0.71
	Degree	21	14.75	4.28	1.07		
Unreasonable group and political pressure	Below Degree	29	13.31	2.97	0.55	0.07	0.95
	Degree	21	13.25	2.96	0.74		
Responsibility for persons	Below Degree	29	9.00	1.65	0.31	-2.32	0.02
	Degree	21	10.31	2.09	0.52		
Under participation	Below Degree	29	12.93	2.96	0.55	0.87	0.39
	Degree	21	12.19	2.29	0.57		
Powerlessness	Below Degree	29	9.86	2.25	0.42	0.67	0.51
	Degree	21	9.38	2.53	0.63		
Poor peer relations	Below Degree	29	11.10	1.72	0.32	-0.04	0.97
	Degree	21	11.13	2.31	0.58		
Intrinsic	Below	29	11.38	2.53	0.47	-1.10	0.28

impoverishment	Degree						
	Degree	21	12.38	3.52	0.88		
Low status	Below Degree	29	7.41	2.26	0.42	-0.88	0.38
	Degree	21	8.13	3.12	0.78		
Strenuous working conditions	Below Degree	29	12.62	2.78	0.52	-0.14	0.89
	Degree	21	12.75	3.17	0.79		
Unprofitable	Below Degree	29	7.28	1.62	0.30	1.13	0.27
	Degree	21	6.69	1.78	0.44		
Occupational Stress Index	Below Degree	29	176.24	20.52	3.81	0.26	0.80
	Degree	21	174.50	24.14	6.04		

Role Overload: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with qualification below graduation degree is 22.52 while that for the group with graduation degree and more as their qualification is 22.31. The “t” statistic value is 0.20 with significance value 0.84 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Role Ambiguity: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with qualification below graduation degree is 12.07 while that for the group with graduation degree and more as their qualification is 10.81. The “t” statistic value is 1.71 with significance value 0.09 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Role Conflict: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with qualification below graduation degree is 15.14 while that for the group with graduation degree and more as their qualification is 14.75. The “t” statistic value is 0.37 with significance value 0.71 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Unreasonable group and political pressure: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with qualification below graduation degree is 13.31 while that for the group having graduation degree and more as their qualification is 13.25. The “t” statistic value is 0.07 with significance value 0.95 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Responsibility for persons: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with qualification below graduation degree is 9.00 while that for the group graduation degree and more as their qualification is 10.31. The “t” statistic value is -2.32 with significance value 0.02 which is < 0.05 which indicates that

difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted.

Under participation: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with qualification below graduation degree is 12.93 while that for the group with graduation degree and more as their qualification is 12.19. The “t” statistic value is 0.87 with significance value 0.39 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Powerlessness: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with qualification below graduation degree is 9.86 while that for the group having graduation degree and more as their qualification is 9.38. The “t” statistic value is 0.67 with significance value 0.51 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Poor peer relations: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with qualification below graduation degree is 11.10 while that for the group having graduation degree and more as their qualification is 11.13. The “t” statistic value is -0.04 with significance value 0.97 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Intrinsic improvement: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with qualification below graduation degree is 11.38 while that for the group with graduation degree and more as their qualification is 12.38. The “t” statistic value is -1.10 with significance value 0.28 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Low status: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with qualification below graduation degree is 7.41 while that for the group having graduation degree and more as their qualification is 8.13. The “t” statistic value is -0.88 with significance value 0.38 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Strenuous working conditions: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with qualification below graduation degree is 12.62 while that for the group having graduation degree and more as their qualification is 12.75. The “t” statistic value is -0.14 with significance value 0.89 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Unprofitable: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with qualification below graduation degree is 7.28 while that for the group having graduation degree and more as their qualification is 6.69. The “t” statistic value is 1.13 with significance value 0.27 which is > 0.05 which indicates that

difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Occupational Stress Index: The mean score for the OSI for the group of with qualification below graduation degree is 176.24 while that for the group having graduation degree and more as their qualification is 174.50. The “t” statistic value is 0.26 with significance value 0.80 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant.

Hence the null hypothesis is accepted, which means that the occupation stress dimensions do not differ significantly based on education qualification.

Work Experience and Stress

H₀: The occupational stress dimensions do not differ significantly for the respondents with less than 20 years of experience from those with more than 20 years of experience.

H_A: The occupational stress dimensions differ significantly for the respondents with less than 20 years of experience from those with more than 20 years of experience.

Table No 6: Showing ‘t’ test value for stress dimensions and work experience of PSI/ASI

Occupation Stress Dimensions	Experience Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	“t” value	sig value
Role Overload	< 20 years	22	22.23	3.29	0.70	-0.32	0.75
	> 20 years	28	22.54	3.36	0.64		
Role Ambiguity	< 20 years	22	10.77	2.76	0.59	-1.64	0.11
	> 20 years	28	11.93	2.23	0.42		
Role Conflict	< 20 years	22	15.32	4.03	0.86	0.30	0.77
	> 20 years	28	15.04	2.71	0.51		
Unreasonable group and political pressure	< 20 years	22	13.77	2.86	0.61	0.86	0.39
	> 20 years	28	13.07	2.84	0.54		
Responsibility for persons	< 20 years	22	10.18	2.06	0.44	2.40	0.02*
	> 20 years	28	8.93	1.63	0.31		
Under participation	< 20 years	22	12.73	2.68	0.57	0.02	0.99
	> 20 years	28	12.71	2.89	0.55		
Powerlessness	< 20 years	22	9.73	2.43	0.52	0.23	0.82
	> 20 years	28	9.57	2.32	0.44		
Poor peer relations	< 20 years	22	11.18	2.32	0.50	0.26	0.80
	> 20 years	28	11.04	1.71	0.32		
Intrinsic impoverishment	< 20 years	22	12.05	3.70	0.79	0.86	0.39
	> 20 years	28	11.29	2.52	0.48		
Low status	< 20 years	22	7.59	2.94	0.63	0.07	0.94
	> 20 years	28	7.54	2.27	0.43		
Strenuous	< 20 years	22	13.00	2.81	0.60	0.49	0.63

Occupation Stress Dimensions	Experience Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	“t” value	sig value
working conditions	> 20 years	28	12.61	2.83	0.54		
Unprofitable	< 20 years	22	7.09	1.74	0.37	-0.11	0.91
	> 20 years	28	7.14	1.63	0.31		
Occupational Stress Index	< 20 years	22	176.55	24.24	5.17	0.29	0.77
	> 20 years	28	174.75	19.84	3.75		

Role overload: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with work experience less than 20 years is 22.23 while that for the group having work experience 20 years or more is 22.54. The “t” statistic value is -0.32 with significance value 0.75 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Role Ambiguity: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with work experience less than 20 years is 10.77 while that for the group having work experience 20 years or more is 11.93. The “t” statistic value is -1.64 with significance value 0.11 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Role Conflict: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with work experience less than 20 years is 15.32 while that for the group having work experience 20 years or more is 15.04. The “t” statistic value is 0.30 with significance value 0.77 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Unreasonable group & political pressure: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with work experience less than 20 years is 13.77 while that for the group having work experience 20 years or more is 13.07. The “t” statistic value is 0.86 with significance value 0.39 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Responsibility for persons: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with work experience less than 20 years is 10.18 while that for the group having work experience > 20 years is 8.93. The “t” statistic value is -2.40 with significance value 0.02 which is < 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is significant. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative of significant difference in the mean scores is accepted.

Under participation: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with work experience less than 20 years is 12.73 while that for the group having work experience 20 years or more is 12.71. The “t” statistic value is 0.02 with significance value 0.99 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of

mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Powerlessness: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with work experience less than 20 years is 9.73 while that for the group having work experience 20 years or more is 9.57. The “t” statistic value is 0.23 with significance value 0.82 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Poor peer relations: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with work experience less than 20 years is 11.18 while that for the group having work experience 20 years or more is 11.04. The “t” statistic value is 0.26 with significance value 0.80 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Intrinsic improvement: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with work experience less than 20 years is 12.05 while that for the group having work experience 20 years or more is 11.29. The “t” statistic value is 0.86 with significance value 0.39 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Low status: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with work experience less than 20 years is 7.59 while that for the group having work experience 20 years or more is 7.54. The “t” statistic value is 0.07 with significance value 0.94 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Strenuous working conditions: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with work experience less than 20 years is 13.00 while that for the group having work experience 20 years or more is 12.61. The “t” statistic value is 0.49 with significance value 0.63 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Unprofitable: The mean score for this dimension for the group of with work experience less than 20 years is 7.09 while that for the group having work experience 20 years or more is 7.14. The “t” statistic value is -0.11 with significance value 0.91 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Occupational Stress Index: The mean score for OSI for the group of with work experience less than 20 years is 176.55 while that for the group having work experience 20 years or more is 174.75. The “t” statistic value is 0.29 with significance value 0.77 which is > 0.05 which indicates that difference of mean scores of the two groups for this dimension is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted, which means that the occupation stress dimensions do not differ significantly based on work experience.

Therefore, it can be concluded that for, PSI/ASI, the occupation stress dimensions do not differ significantly on the basis of demographic variables such as age, education qualification, and work experience.

Findings

Demographic Variables

Age: The results observed from the analysis as cited in the study, have demonstrated that among the 50 respondents majority of them are in the age group of 51-60, followed by 31-40. The reason for this might be because, the majority of the respondents i.e., 60% are Asst. Police Sub-Inspectors (ASI). There is no direct appointment for ASI post. They are the people who joined Police Department as Police Constables than promoted as Head Constables and then as ASI. So they fall in age group of 51-60. Most of the PSI are in the age group of 20-30 and 31-40. This is because the number of PSI respondents were only 40%. For PSI post the minimum qualification required is degree and for this post there is direct appointment. The hypothesis test was made to know various dimensions causing stress differs significantly on the basis of age. The two age groups were greater than 40 years and less than 40 years. The result revealed that the stress dimensions do not differ significantly for the two groups based on age. But, Role ambiguity and Responsibility for persons are the only two dimensions where the mean score of two groups of respondents differ significantly.

Education Qualification: The analysis depicted that, majority of the ASI's education qualification is PUC followed by SSLC, and very few of them are degree holders. But in case of PSI, majority of them are degree holders, followed by Post Graduation as cited in the study. As the ASI's were promoted from PC to HC than to ASI, the minimum qualification for PC is SSLC, that might be the reason why most of the ASI' education qualification is SSLC and PUC. But for PSI the minimum qualification required is Degree, so most of them are degree holders. If we consider as a group (PSI/ASI), among 50 respondents, majority i.e., 32% of the respondents education qualification is PUC and Degree respectively, followed by SSLC 26%, and further 10% respondents are Post graduates. The hypothesis testing was carried to find does the various dimensions causing stress differs significantly on the basis of education qualification. The education qualification considered was graduates and undergraduates. The results revealed that the stress causing dimensions do not differ drastically for the graduates and undergraduates. But, responsibility for persons is the only dimension where the mean score of two groups of respondents differ significantly.

Work Experience: The analysis shows that, majority of the respondents work experience is from 31-40 years. As more number of respondents are from age group of 51-60, therefore work experience is also more. Majority of the PSI respondents work experience is 0-10 years. Put together majority of the respondents i.e., 54% are having 31-40 years of experience in police department, followed by 1-10 years (34%). The "t" test was carried out to find if the various dimension causing stress differs significantly on the basis of years of work experience. The results revealed that the stress causing dimension do not differ severely for the employees having less than 20 years of work experience and greater than 20 years of work experience. But, responsibility for persons is the only dimension where the mean score of two groups of respondents differ significantly.

In the overall study it is found that for PSI/ASI, the occupation stress dimensions do not differ significantly on the basis of demographic variables such as age, education qualification, and work experience.

Conclusion

The productivity of the work force is the most decisive factor as far as the success of an organization is considered. The productivity in turn dependent on the psychological well being of the employees. In the present era, man is exposed to all kind of stressors that can affect him on all realm of life. Normal work stress is necessary to carry out their routine work smoothly in the work place. The violent outbursts take place when the stress level is high among the employees.

The present study is an attempt to determine the causes for stress in police department at PSI/ASI level, as well as to understand the stress on different demographic profile.

Among the PSI/ASI level of employees the occupational stress dimensions do not significantly depend on the demographic variables such as age, education qualification, and work experience.

Recommendations

The police reforms should be made on the working hours of the employees, and it should be followed properly. The study results shows that most of the violent outbursts are because of long working hours and not getting leaves as per the rules mentioned in the Police manual. The system should be changed, that is, day police officers to be different and night police officers different.

The police establishment board is already in practice in Karnataka State Police. That has to be activated and all the transfers should be based on the performances of the employees rather than the minit of political leaders.

The employees found it's difficult to adopt new technologies in the department. This is mainly because of the lack of education. Now, the person who is of age 56 or above will not feel comfortable to work with computer which is very new to him. While selection process the technical aspects should also be considered in the applicants. If any new techniques are implemented a proper training should be provided, for the existing employees. Police Information Technology has to be implemented in entire Karnataka State Police with proper training programs.

Stress in inevitable in Police department because of their job profile. It is very difficult to make the police department stress free, but proper training programmes can be organized to reduce stress among the employees of police department.

References

1. Alex.M.Wood, Stephen Joseph, and P.Alex Linley (2007), Coping style as a psychological resource of grateful people, *Journal of social & clinical psychology*. Vol.26, No.9, PP 1076-1093
2. Aminabhavi V.A, and Triveni.S (2000), Variables causing occupational stress on the nationalized and non-nationalized bank employees, *J.Com, Gui. Res.*, Vol.17 No.1, pp 20-29
3. Aminabhavi V.A and Kamble S.V (2004), 2004, A study on work motivation and stress coping behavior of technical personnel at a railway work shop. *J.Com, Gui. and Res.*, Vol.21 No.3, pp321-329.

4. Ansari M.R (1991), An investigation into the stress of agriculture university teachers, Ph.D Thesis, IARI, New Delhi
5. Bhagawan.S. (1997), Job stress and burn out in teachers of secondary school in Orissa. J.Ednal.Res.Extn., Vol.33 No.4, pp 218-234
6. Bhattacharya and Guha (2006), Stress and Coping: A study on lady criminal lawyers of Kolkata city.I.P.R., Special issue 67, pp 227-234
7. Blix.A.G, Cruise.R.J,Blix G.G., (1994), Occupational stress among university teachers. Ednal. Res., 36, pp 157-169
8. Chand and Monga (2007), Correlates of job stress and burn out. J.Com. Gui.Res., vol.24 No.3, pp 243-252
9. Cofer and Appley (1964), Motivation Theory and research, Axton, Virginia, United states.
10. Cox (1978), An inventory for the measurement of self-reported stress and arousal, British Journal of Social & Clinical Psychology, Vol.13 (3), pp 283-284
11. Lazarus R.S(1966), Psychological stress and coping process, McGraw Hill, New York.
12. Marilda E.Novaes Lipp (2009), Stress and Quality of Life of Senior Brazilian Police Officers, The Spanish Journal of Psychology, Vol.12, no.2, pp 593-603
13. Reddy and Ramamurthy (1991), The relation between stress experience on the job – age, personality and general ability, Psy.Stu., Vol.36, No.2, pp 87-95
14. Ryhal and Singh (1996), A study of correlates of job stress among university faculty. Indian Psy.Rev., Vol.46, No.1-2, pp 20-26
15. Spielberger (1979), Understanding stress and anxiety. Harper and Row Publishers, New York
16. Virk, J., Chhabra, J. and Kumar, R., (2001), Occupational stress and work motivation in relation to age, job level and type-A behaviour. Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, Vol.27.No.1&2, pp 51-55.
17. Wolf, H.G. and Goodell, H., 1968, Stress and Disease. In: Ryhal, P.C. and Singh, K., 1996, A study of correlates of job stress among university faculty. Indian Psy. Rev., Vol.46, No.1-2, pp 20-26