

**Analysis**

**A Comparative Study of Personality  
Dimensions between Officers and  
Subordinates of Security Force Personnel and  
their Effects on their Occupational Stress**

**Anu singh Lather<sup>1</sup>    Vijita Aggarwal<sup>2</sup>**

**Lal Mohan Samantray<sup>3</sup>**

---

**Abstract**

*Realising an alarming increase in the number of suicide cases among the security force personnel, special emphasis has been given to occupational stress in policing, as its potential negative consequences affect performance in more direct and critical ways as compared to stress in many other occupations. This paper discuss about the differential effects of 20 personality dimensions over two categories (officers and subordinates) of personnel engaged in four different security forces and also measures how these occupational stress factors, as dependent variables, are influenced by these*

---

<sup>1</sup> Dean, University School of Management Studies, GGS Indraprastha University, Delhi. E-mail: [anusinghlather@gmail.com](mailto:anusinghlather@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> Reader, University School of Management Studies, GGS Indraprastha University, Delhi.

<sup>3</sup> Research Scholar

*personality dimensions independently or in combination. Four hundred samples (Officers: 200 & Subordinates: 200) were collected from four different security forces (100 samples from each force), including the local police, using stratified random sampling. The findings have revealed that officers of security forces are high, as compared to their subordinates, on 12 personality dimensions like adaptability, achievement motivation, competition, enthusiasm, general ability, innovation, leadership, maturity, self control, self sufficiency and social warmth. On the other hand, the subordinates of security forces were found to be high, as compared to their officers, on personality dimensions like guilt proneness, sensitivity, suspiciousness and tension.*

**Keywords:** Motivation, Personality, Innovation, Leadership

---

## **Introduction**

Stress can be defined as an adverse reaction people have to excessive pressure or other types of demand placed upon them. More than half a million people currently report experiencing stress associated with work at a level which makes them ill. Therefore, the security personnel working in adverse physical conditions, protecting the citizens and the countries sovereign rights, are no exceptions. They are very much prone to occupational stress or job stress in their respective fields, thus, needs an immediate attention.

Suicides and fratricidal killings in paramilitary forces in almost all the areas of their deployment have attracted attention of the concerned higher authorities as well as common people. What are the factors pushing the committed security personnel to the brink of fratricide and suicide is a moot question. Is it the workload or something else that compels them to turn the gun on their colleagues or to themselves in sheer distress or anger? Majority of the people including ex-servicemen underline the stress in uniform,

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

which is on the rise in areas of confrontation where they are engaged for fighting insurgencies, quelling civilian rioting or guarding a restive border. Unable to bear the stress, many of the jawans of major paramilitary forces including CRPF, BSF, CISF and even local police have committed suicide or fired at their superiors/compatriots with their service weapons at work place during duty hours or at their official accommodations.

Keeping in view the present internal security scenario in the country, these forces have 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. Security job is often regarded as an extremely stressful occupation, and officers typically suffer a variety of physiological, psychological and behavioural stress effects. Officers operating under severe and chronic stress may 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.<sup>4</sup>

The present research is an attempt to compare the personality dimensions of officers and subordinates of security forces and measure their effectiveness on their occupational stress. Both officers and subordinates of paramilitary forces as well as Local police, who are responsible for internal as well as the border security of the country, with varied range of experience were the target of this study.

---

<sup>4</sup> Jenkins Cordelia, livemint.com, The wall Street Journal, Wed,Mar 30,2011

## **Literature Review**

As per report in the media, the officers considered personal causes as prominent precursors of suicides and fratricides in armed forces, while personnel below officer rank considered occupational and familial factors as more important than personal ones. In a recent study on Army, where the job condition matches with that of security forces under study, on an average we have been encountering a figure of about 100 suicide cases a year in the past four to five years. Mainly it is in insurgency-hit areas, but suicides are also happening in areas where there is no insurgency. Deployment in such environments has resulted in a number of stress related incidents and cases of suicides and fratricides, which is definitely a cause of serious concern. While measures initiated to arrest such trend have yielded some positive results, a holistic approach to arrest this trend is definitely required. In general, causative issues of counter insurgency stress are occupational factors like increased workload, lack of adequate sleep and rest and non grant of timely leave which were highlighted before pressure from family front coupled with host of personal factors in order of priority.<sup>5</sup>

Work environment is one of the major sources of occupational stress for security personnel, which can be either internal or external. Psychological traits, working environment and self expectation all influence an officer/subordinates ability to solve the problems and address job related challenges and

---

<sup>5</sup> Optimising Stress in Sub-Conventional Warfare, IDSA Occasional Paper No. 16, 2011

family issues. The importance of informal interactions in increased organizational *performance* is stated by Faruk Sahin (2010) in “The interaction of self-leadership and psychological climate on job performance”. The results clearly showed that the interaction between self-leadership and psychological climate explained an additional variance in job performance scores over and above the effects of self-leadership and psychological climate alone. Self-leadership was positively related to job performance among employees reporting high levels of psychological climate.<sup>6</sup> A Comparative Study (2010) on Occupational Stress & Frustration Tolerance of Indian Security Forces: Delimited to BSF, CISF and Provincial armed constabulary revealed that provincial armed constabulary (PAC) endures highest level of occupational stress and BSF and CISF exhibit moderate level of occupational stress and each category of paramilitary forces has similar level of frustration tolerance which may be due to similar level of working atmosphere and transitions lifestyle.<sup>7</sup> 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](http://www.yahoo.com/news), accessed on 10/04/2008).

---

<sup>6</sup> The interaction of self-leadership and psychological climate on job performance, African Journal of Business Management Vol. 5(5), pp.1787-1794, 4 March, 2011

<sup>7</sup> Shirotriya, A.K. & Basumatary B. (July, 2010) ,Indian Journal of Psychometry and Education (ISSN 0378-1003), Vol.41 (2), pp. 214-218.

A study on “Management of Stress and Burnout of Police Personnel” has observed that police personnel as an occupation group endure particularly high levels of stress and burnout. The physiological, psychological and behavioral effects of stress and burnout in police can be severe and is a matter of great concern. The manifestation of stress and burnout in the form, of suicide and killings highlight the urgent need that these must be tackled.<sup>8</sup> Job stress or occupational stress has long been an important concept in the study of employees' responses to their work surroundings. As cited by Shane (2008) in” Occupational Stress, Work-related Wellbeing, and Organizational Performance”, using the survey data on 538 Turkish National Police (TNP) employees from seven cities in Turkey, to improve police performance, Officers should be given more decision-making authority and increased responsibility. Police managers should act in such a way that subordinates have more voice in decisions, especially those affecting them. Proving constructive feedback to their employees about their performance is also a vital step for supervisors.

Martinussen et al. (2007) found burnout to be one of the most important outcomes of work-related stress because of its exponential impact on professional relationships. 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 individual's occupational related stressors.

---

<sup>8</sup> Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, January 2008, Vol. 34, No.1, 29-39.

Previous research indicates that occupational stress results from a negative workplace environment and also interactions at work have been recognised as a major problem for security personnel (Waters and Ussery, 2007; Maslach-Pines and Keinan, 2007). 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). 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. Self-leadership was positively related to job performance among employees reporting high levels of psychological climate. While some stress can be positive motivators, it is generally regarded as destructive and even life threatening (Kwak at al., 2006). Internal work environment include factors that are related to organizational structure and climate, shift schedules that disrupt normal sleep patterns and social life, authoritarian management styles, poor interpersonal relationships with

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

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 organizational stressors faced by members of security forces across its ranks and files (Jaramillo et al., 2005, Waters and Ussery, 2007). Many pressures experienced by the officers are a product of environmental factors alone (Jaramillo et al, 2005).

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).<sup>9</sup>

The attention to the negative aspects of stress is, however, one sided. Stress, if negotiated appropriately, can produce positive responses and outcomes (Nelson & Simmons, 2003). One hundred and forty four employees from three New Zealand security organizations completed a survey that assessed cognitive appraisals and coping processes used to deal with a stressful work-related event. Using structural equation modeling, a model was posited that proposed that appraisal and coping processes would be the precursors of work-related distress and eustress. The precursors of eustress were the

---

<sup>9</sup> Occupational Stress Among Police Officers: The Case of Botswana Police Service, Research Journal of Business Management, 2008

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

appraisal of a demand as a challenge and the use of task-focused coping strategies. Distress was related to threat appraisals and emotion-focused coping strategies. Results suggested that the model fit was reasonable and the hypothesised paths were all statistically significant and in the correct direction. The implications for the management of work-related stress are discussed. Research over the last decade has emphasised the negative consequences of excessive work-related demands on an individual's physical and psychological health and wellbeing.<sup>10</sup>

In the era of globalization where survival of firms particularly manufacturing ones depends on their ability to compete effectively, managers in these organizations would be working under highly stressful circumstances. The findings by Jestin and Gampel (2002) provide empirical support for this phenomenon.<sup>11</sup> Robbins (2001) defines stress as a dynamic condition in which the individual is confronted with an opportunity, constraint or demand related to what he or she desires and for which the outcome is perceived to be both uncertain and important. Stress can be caused by

---

<sup>10</sup> Positive And Negative Affective Outcomes Of Occupational Stress, Jennifer McGowan(Psychassessments), Dianne Gardener & Richard Fletcher(Massey University Of Auckland)

<sup>11</sup> Organizational And Personality Influences On Job Stress: The Case Of Malaysian

Managers By S Kumaresan - Intel Technology, Penang, Malaysia Dr Azzat Mohd Nasurdin

environmental, organizational and individual variables (Cook and Hunsaker, 2001).<sup>12</sup>

Although there are numerous organizational sources of stress, role conflict, blocked career, alienation, work overload and unfavourable work environment are some of the factors that stimulates occupational stress. Role conflict has been found to have a positive relationship with job stress (Roberts, Lapidus and Chonko, 1997). When individuals are required to play two or more roles that work against each other, they are likely to experience job stress. This is because role conflicts create expectations that may be hard to reconcile. Previous scholars (Rahim, 1996) discovered a positive relationship between barriers to career advancement and job stress. When employees perceived a lack of career opportunity, they are likely to feel uncertain about their future in the organization, which in turn, is likely to induce stress.

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). Working alone on one's job without social support from one's peers and supervisors would lead to job stress (Eugene, 1999).

Work overload, both quantitatively and qualitatively, has been empirically linked to a variety of physiological, psychological and behavioral strain symptoms (Miller and Ellis, 1990; Roberts et al., 1997). Additionally, a work

---

<sup>12</sup> Organizational Stressors And Job Stress Among Managers: The Moderating Role Of Neuroticism Azzat Mohd Nasurdin , T. Ramayah, S. Kemaesan

environment associated with unpleasant organizational climate, lack of privacy, a lot of hassle in conducting work and physical distractions can result in higher stress (Miller and Ellis, 1990; Eugene, 1999). The finding on the positive relationship between conflict and job stress is consistent with those obtained by Roberts et al. (1997). When employees are required to fulfill conflicting role requirements, they are likely to experience job stress. This is because role conflicts create expectations that may be hard to satisfy. The finding pertaining to the positive relationship between blocked career and job stress supports those by previous researchers (Foot and Venne, 1990; Rahim, 1996). Seeing one's opportunities for career advancement being diminished is perceived as a threat, which in turn, leads to increased job stress. Alienation at the workplace suggests that employees may not be able to fulfill their social needs. Thus, this sense of isolation is likely to be viewed as a threat to the individual resulting in stress. The finding pertaining to the positive relationship between poor working conditions and job stress supports those by previous researchers (Miller and Ellis, 1990; Eugene, 1999). The positive relationship between work overload and job stress as discovered in this study is consistent with those of prior scholars (Beehr and Newman, 1978; Miller and Ellis, 1990; Roberts et al., 1997). A heavy workload lowers one's psychological well being resulting in job stress.

### **Research Methodology**

Our current study has taken into consideration 20 personality dimensions like Adaptability, Achievement motivation, Boldness, Competition, Enthusiasm, General ability, Guilt proneness, Imagination, Innovation, Leadership, Maturity, Mental health, Morality, Self-control, Sensitivity, Shrewdness, Self-sufficiency, Suspiciousness, Social warmth,

## **DRISHTIKON**

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

and Tension. Apart from personality dimensions, 12 Occupational stress factors like Role overload, Role ambiguity, Role conflict, Unreasonable group & political pressure, Responsibility for persons, Under participation, Powerlessness, Poor peer relations, Intrinsic impoverishment, Low status, Strenuous working conditions and Un-profitability have also been studied to find out how and to what extent they, as dependant variable, are influenced by the above mentioned personality dimensions individually or in combination.

### **Design**

A sample design (4\*2\*5) was chalked out involving four security forces like 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 coverage of the entire population of the sampled security organizations.

### **Sample**

The present 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.

### **Sample Distribution**

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

| FORCE-1     |         | FORCE-2     |         | FORCE-3     |         | FORCE-4     |         |
|-------------|---------|-------------|---------|-------------|---------|-------------|---------|
| SUBORDINATE | OFFICER | SUBORDINATE | OFFICER | SUBORDINATE | OFFICER | SUBORDINATE | OFFICER |
| 10          | 10      | 10          | 10      | 10          | 10      | 10          | 10      |
| 10          | 10      | 10          | 10      | 10          | 10      | 10          | 10      |
| 10          | 10      | 10          | 10      | 10          | 10      | 10          | 10      |
| 10          | 10      | 10          | 10      | 10          | 10      | 10          | 10      |
| 10          | 10      | 10          | 10      | 10          | 10      | 10          | 10      |
| 50          | 50      | 50          | 50      | 50          | 50      | 50          | 50      |

**TOTAL =400**

### Standard Scales Used

Multi dimensional assessment of personality (psy-com services, 1973)

It is a 147 item questionnaire with 3 options to find out how one feel about certain situations. In all, 20 dimensions of personality are sought to be measured.

### Statistical Tools Used

1. t-TEST
2. Regression Analysis (step wise)

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

| DIMENSIONS OF MAP             | OFFICER (N=200) |      | SUBORDINATE (N=200) |      | t-VALUE            |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|------|---------------------|------|--------------------|
|                               | MEAN            | SD   | MEAN                | SD   |                    |
| ADAPTABILITY (MAP1)           | 5.99            | 2.15 | 4.00                | 1.77 | 10.10**            |
| ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION (MAP2) | 5.48            | 2.07 | 4.28                | 1.95 | 6.00**             |
| BOLDNESS (MAP3)               | 4.65            | 2.00 | 4.43                | 1.55 | 1.22 <sup>NS</sup> |
| COMPETITION (MAP4)            | 5.08            | 1.90 | 4.11                | 1.86 | 5.16**             |
| ENTHUSIASM (MAP5)             | 5.60            | 1.74 | 4.15                | 1.98 | 7.81**             |
| GENERAL ABILITY (MAP6)        | 5.68            | 2.92 | 4.25                | 2.63 | 5.15**             |
| GUILTPRONENESS (MAP7)         | 5.34            | 1.81 | 7.25                | 1.87 | 10.41**            |
| IMAGINATION (MAP8)            | 5.57            | 2.19 | 5.19                | 1.77 | 1.91 <sup>NS</sup> |
| INNOVATION (MAP9)             | 6.24            | 2.04 | 3.79                | 1.53 | 13.60**            |
| LEADERSHIP (MAP10)            | 5.08            | 2.00 | 3.50                | 1.63 | 8.65**             |
| MATURITY (MAP11)              | 4.27            | 2.27 | 3.01                | 1.63 | 6.40**             |
| MENTAL HEALTH (MAP12)         | 5.92            | 2.06 | 3.92                | 1.75 | 10.47**            |
| MORALITY (MAP13)              | 4.98            | 1.80 | 4.16                | 1.73 | 4.64**             |
| SELF CONTROL (MAP14)          | 4.44            | 1.97 | 3.83                | 2.15 | 2.96**             |
| SENSITIVITY (MAP15)           | 5.98            | 2.21 | 6.25                | 1.97 | 1.29 <sup>NS</sup> |
| SHREWDNESS (MAP16)            | 4.86            | 2.86 | 4.38                | 2.12 | 1.91 <sup>NS</sup> |
| SELF SUFFICIENCY              | 5.90            | 1.89 | 3.42                | 1.44 | 14.77**            |

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

|                           |      |      |      |      |         |
|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|---------|
| (MAP17)                   |      |      |      |      |         |
| SUSPICIOUSNESS<br>(MAP18) | 3.64 | 2.20 | 6.23 | 2.60 | 10.72** |
| SOCIAL WARMTH<br>(MAP19)  | 6.20 | 2.06 | 4.47 | 1.99 | 8.55**  |
| TENSION (MAP20)           | 5.20 | 1.94 | 7.36 | 1.43 | 12.62** |

NOTE: NS: NOT SIGNIFICANT

“\*”: SIGNIFICANT AT .05 LEVEL

“\*\*”: SIGNIFICANT AT .01 LEVEL

The t-test has been applied between the officers and subordinates in order to find the difference of 20 dimensions of personality. The interpretations of the result, as indicated in the table no.1, are given below:

### ***Adaptability (Map 01)***

The t-value shows that there is a significant difference between the officers and subordinates ( $t= 10.10$ , significant at .01 level). The mean values indicate that the mean is more in the case of officers i.e. the adaptability of officers is more as compared to subordinates.

This word adaptability has been put to use as a specialised term in different disciplines and in business operations. Adaptability in the field of organisational management can in general be seen as an ability to change something or oneself to fit in occurring changes (Andresen and Gronau ).

According to the scale, a high score in adaptability is indicative of an individual or group of individual's tendency to accommodate and accept/adjust to situations easily. It may be interpreted that as officers can wield more power and freedom to exercise vis-à-vis the subordinates, they can afford to be flexible and thus adaptive to the changing needs of the forces. Thus, this may be one of the reasons why officers are high on adaptability than their subordinates.

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

### *Achievement Motivation (Map 02)*

The t-value shows that there is a significant difference between the officers and subordinates ( $t= 6.00$ , significant at .01 level). The mean values indicate that the mean is more in the case of officers i.e. the achievement motivation of officers is more as compared to subordinates.

Achievement motivation forms to be the basic for a good life. People who are oriented towards achievement, in general, enjoy life and feel in control. Being motivated keeps people dynamic and gives them self-respect. They set moderately difficult but easily achievable targets, which help them, achieve their objectives. Motivation is the basic drive for all of our actions. Motivation refers to the dynamics of our behaviour, which involves our needs, desires, and ambitions in life. Achievement motivation is based on reaching success and achieving all of our aspirations in life. Achievement goals can affect the way a person performs a task and represent a desire to show competence (Harackiewicz, Barron, Carter, Lehto, & Elliot, 1997).

According to the scale, a high score in achievement motivation is indicative of an individual or group of individuals tendency to become ambitious, overtly interested in career and a realistic involvement in life. It may be due to a trend that performance of officers is highlighted for successful completion of an operation, which is invariably a team effort. However, the subordinates, despite their crucial role in such operations, may or may not get their due share of recognition. This is why; the achievement motivation might be comparatively higher among the officers than their subordinates.

### *Boldness (Map 03)*

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

The t-value shows that there is no significant difference between officers and subordinates ( $t=1.22$ ). The mean value also indicates the same on personality dimension boldness.

Boldness is opposite of being shy. A bold person may be willing to risk shame or rejection in social situations, and willing to bend rules of etiquette or politeness. Excessive boldness may thus be regarded as impertinence or arrogance. Outside a social context, "boldness" can also refer to a willingness to get things done, even despite risks, and is therefore broadly synonymous with bravery.

According to the scale, a high score in boldness is indicative of an individual or group of individuals' tendency to be socially bold, adventurous, responsible and friendly. Perhaps, boldness factor of personality comparatively remains untouched by one's power, position or place of work.

### *Competition (Map 04)*

The t-value shows that there is a significant difference between officers and subordinates ( $t=5.16$ , significant at .01 level). The mean value indicates that the mean is more in case of officers i.e. the competitive spirit of officers is more as compared to subordinates.

Competition is a contest between individuals, groups, nations, animals, etc. for territory, a niche, or a location of resources. It arises whenever two or more parties strive for a goal which cannot be shared. Competition is the act of striving against others for the purpose of achieving dominance. It is a term that is commonly used in numerous fields, including business, ecology, economics, music, politics, and sports. Competition may be between two or more forces, systems, individuals, or groups, depending on the context in which the term is used.

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

According to the scale, a high score in competition is indicative of an individual or group of individuals' tendency to be independent minded, stern and assertive. In the forces, officers have better growth prospects. To climb up in their career ladder, after few promotions, they need to qualify through selection grade, based on their professional acumen and field performance. Thus the officers need to maintain a high degree of competitive spirit throughout their career. However, it is not true in case of subordinates, whose growth prospects are limited, with little scope to surpass officers professionally. This may be one of the reasons why the officers are high on competition vis-à-vis their subordinates.

### *Enthusiasm (Map 05)*

The t-value shows that there is a significant difference between the officers and subordinates ( $t= 7.81$ , significant at .01 level) The mean values indicate that the mean is more in the case of officers i.e the enthusiasm of officers is more as compared to subordinates.

The word 'enthusiasm' comes from Greek and means "God within" (entheos). It refers to a divine spark or fire that burns within the breast of those with a passion for a cause, job, or life in general. "Enthusiasm," according to Henry Ford, "is the yeast that makes your hopes shine to the Stars". Enthusiasm is the sparkle in your eyes, the swing in your gait, the grip of your hand, the irresistible surge of will and energy to execute your ideas." Enthusiasm is all that and a lot more. Years may wrinkle the skin, but the absence of enthusiasm wrinkles the soul. For this reason, Malcolm S. Forbes said, "People who never get carried away should be!" According to the scale, a high score in enthusiasm is indicative of an individual or group of individuals' tendency to be cheerful, talkative, expressive and candid. As power lies with

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

responsibility, officers may afford to remain in high spirit or enthusiastic. On the other hand, the subordinates being confined to strict regimen of command and control may likely to remain less enthusiastic.

### *General Ability (Map 06)*

The t-value shows that there is a significant difference between the officers and subordinates ( $t= 5.15$ , significant at .01 level) The mean values indicate that the mean is more in the case of officers i.e. the general ability of officers is more as compared to subordinates. According to the scale, a high score in general ability is indicative of an individual or group of individuals tendency to high abstract thinking , intelligent and sensitive to minute details .This may be due to the fact that in forces, officers are comparatively better educated and drawn from a higher social strata than their subordinates. Thus, obviously the general ability of officers will be more as compared to their subordinates.

### *Guilt Proneness (Map 07)*

The t-value shows that there is a significant difference between the officers and subordinates ( $t= 10.41$ , significant at .01 level) The mean values indicate that the mean is more in the case of subordinates i.e the guilt proneness of subordinate is more as compared to officers.

**Guilt** is a cognitive or an emotional experience that occurs when a person realizes or believes—accurately or not—that they have violated a moral standard, and bear sole responsibility for that violation. It is closely related to the concept of remorse, guilt and externalization representing emotions that may be linked with self-evaluation concerning gender norms (Erikson, 1950/1985; Jordan, 1989; Lynd, 1958). Guilt, in psychology, a term denoting an unpleasant

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

feeling associated with unfulfilled wishes. Freud felt that guilt was often confused with remorse, the former being an emotion signaling the presence of aggressive wishes, the latter a self-imposed punishment which occurs if the aggressive wish is fulfilled.

According to the scale, a high score in guilt proneness is indicative of an individual or group of individuals' tendency to be escapist, shrinking responsibility, unsecured and depressed. The subordinate population in forces being bound by stricter guidelines may tend to violate one or other inadvertently. Thus, they might be prone to a perpetual sense of guilt. However, officers are comparatively free from such feelings. Therefore, the subordinates may be higher on guilt proneness factor than the officers.

IMAGINATION (MAP 08):

The t-value shows that there is no significant difference between the officers and subordinates ( $t=1.91$ ). The mean values also indicate the same. **Imagination**, also called the faculty of **imagining**, is the ability of forming mental images, sensations and concepts, in a moment when they are not perceived through sight, hearing or other senses. Imagination is considered "a power of the mind," "a creative faculty of the mind," "the mind itself when in use and a process of the mind used for thinking, scheming, contriving, remembering, creating, fantasizing and forming opinion. As a medium, imagination is a world where thought and images are nested in the mind to "form a mental concept of what is not actually present to the senses." In the sense of the word as a process, imagination is a form of mediation between what is considered "externalized" reality.

According to the scale, a high score in imagination is indicative of an individual or group of individuals' tendency to be self observed, impractical and untraditional in ideas. This may be due

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

to the fact that the imagination gives someone a scope or freedom to think the way they love to do, without any bindings. Thus, this dimension of individual personality may not get influenced by one's power or position, thereby providing a brief respite from any sort of positional bindings. Thus, this personality factor is not significant on neither the officers nor the subordinates.

### *Innovation (Map 09)*

The t-value shows that there is a significant difference between the officers and subordinates ( $t= 13.60$ , significant at .01 level). The mean values indicate that the mean is more in the case of officers i.e. the innovation of officers is more as compared to subordinates.

**Innovation** is a change in the thought process for doing something or "new stuff that is made useful". It may refer to an incremental emergent or radical and revolutionary changes in thinking, products, processes or organizations. Following Schumpeter (1934), contributors to the scholarly literature on innovation typically distinguish between invention, an idea made manifest, and innovation, ideas applied successfully in practice. In many fields, such as the arts, economics and government policy, something new must be substantially different to be innovative.

According to the scale, a high score in innovation is indicative of an individual or group of individuals' tendency to be experimental in thinking, liberal in ideas and analyse concepts swiftly. Officers, who are in a commanding position in security forces, might have a better scope to experiment their innovative power in respect of planning and execution of the work. However, the subordinates may have little scope for the

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

same. This may be the reason, why the officers are higher on innovation than the subordinates.

### *Leadership (Map 10)*

The t-value shows that there is a significant difference between the officers and subordinates ( $t=8.65$ , significant at .01 level) The mean values indicate that the mean is more in the case of officers i.e. the leadership of officers is more as compared to subordinates.

Leadership is stated as the "process of social influence, in which one person can enlist the aid and support of others in the accomplishment of a common task". Definitions more inclusive of followers have also emerged. Alan Keith of Genentech stated that, "Leadership is ultimately about creating a way for people to contribute to making something extraordinary happen". Tom DeMarco says that leadership needs to be distinguished from posturing. Leadership remains one of the most relevant aspects of the organizational context. However, defining leadership has been challenging and definitions can vary depending on the situation. According to Ann Marie E. McSwain, Assistant Professor at Lincoln University, "leadership is about capacity: the capacity of leaders to listen and observe, to use their expertise as a starting point to encourage dialogue between all levels of decision-making, to establish processes and transparency in decision-making, to articulate their own value and visions clearly but not impose them. Leadership is about setting and not just reacting to agendas, identifying problems, and initiating change that makes for substantial improvement rather than managing change."

According to the scale, a high score in leadership is indicative of an individual or group of individuals' tendency to be in control, direct and initiate actions for a group, power to influence others and achieve goals. In forces, Officers are

44

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

trained how to gain the confidence of the subordinates and lead them in times of crisis. Moreover, the nature of work in such forces provides enough scope for officers to develop leadership quality. This may be one of the reasons why leadership is found more pronounced among officers as compared to their subordinates.

### *Maturity (Map 11)*

The t-value shows that there is a significant difference between the officers and subordinates ( $t= 6.40$ , significant at .01 level). The mean values indicate that the mean is more in the case of officers i.e. the maturity of officers is more as compared to subordinates.

Maturity is the ability to control anger and settle differences without violence or destruction. Maturity is patience. It is the willingness to pass up immediate pleasure in favour of the long-term gain. Maturity is perseverance, the ability to sweat out a project or a situation in spite of heavy opposition and discouraging set-backs. Maturity is the capacity to face unpleasantness and frustration, discomfort and defeat, without complaint or collapse. It is the ability to make a decision, stand by it and means dependability, keeping one's word, coming through in a crisis. In an individual, it develops to the extent he organizes his consciousness on the basis of his empirical experiences and verification of facts and to the extent he is free from his irrational thoughts, beliefs, prejudices, notions and emotions.

According to the scale, a high score in maturity is indicative of an individual or group of individuals' tendency to be realistic about life and emotionally stable. The maturity of officers might be more on account of their job requirement, better field exposure, adequate training facilities, regular refresher courses etc.

*Mental Health (Map 12)*

The t-value shows that there is a significant difference between the officers and subordinates ( $t=10.47$ , significant at .01 level) The mean values indicate that the mean is more in the case of officers i.e. the mental health of officers is more as compared to subordinates. Although both officers and subordinates operate in similar job environment, it is observed that the occupational stress factor is always heavy on the subordinate side.

According to Medilexicon's medical dictionary, mental health is "emotional, behavioral, and social maturity or normality; the absence of a mental or behavioral disorder; a state of psychological well-being in which one has achieved a satisfactory integration of one's instinctual drives acceptable to both oneself and one's social milieu; an appropriate balance of love, work, and leisure pursuits". According to WHO (World Health Organization), mental health is "a state of well-being in which the individual realizes his or her own abilities, can cope with the normal stresses of life, can work productively and fruitfully, and is able to make a contribution to his or her community". WHO stresses that mental health "is not just the absence of mental disorder".

According to the scale, a high score in mental health is indicative of an individual or group of individuals tendency to be zestful, well adjusted and has a positively harmonious state of mind .officers are invariably drawn from higher social strata, thus better nourished and educated vis- a-vis the subordinates. Therefore, the probability of officers' mental health in a better condition is higher than the subordinates. Hence, there is a

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

significant difference on the mental health aspect between these two categories, officers being on the heavier side.

### *Morality (Map 13)*

The t-value shows that there is a significant difference between the officers and subordinates ( $t=4.64$ , significant at .01 level) The mean values indicate that the mean is slightly more in the case of officers i.e the morality of officers is more as compared to subordinates.

In its "descriptive" sense, morality refers to personal or cultural values, code of conduct or social mores that distinguish between right and wrong in the human society. Describing morality in this way is not making a claim about what is objectively right or wrong, but only referring to what is considered right or wrong by people. Morality is one of humanity's main philosophical preoccupations but it doesn't belong so much to philosophy as to religion; it is what gives religions their universal power. The very concept of morality is different for each; no philosophy serves morality but for philosophers morality should serve philosophy.

According to the scale, a high score in morality is indicative of an individual or group of individuals' tendency to hire a high sense of duty, attentive to people, emotionally disciplined and responsible. Officers are better educated and invariably have a cultured social background. That is why, it is always expected that officers maintain a good moral value base, to effectively command their subordinates. This might be the reason why officer's morality is higher than the subordinates.

SELF CONTROL (MAP 14): The t-value shows that there is a significant difference between the officers and subordinates ( $t=2.96$ , significant at .01 level) The mean values indicate that the mean is more in the case of officers i.e the self control of officer is more as compared to subordinates.

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

Self control is the ability to control one's emotions, behaviour and desires in order to efficiently manage one's future. In psychology it is sometimes called self-regulation. Exerting self-control through the executive functions in decision making is thought to deplete a resource in the ego. Many things affect one's ability to exert self-control, but self-control particularly requires sufficient glucose levels in the brain. Exerting self-control depletes glucose.

According to the scale, a high score in self control is indicative of an individual or group of individuals' tendency to have a high self image, socially conscious and a strong will power. Education, post and power to take decisions not only demands for a better self control on the part of the officers, but also induces self control among them to a greater extent. These qualities help the officers to ensure a clean administration and command respect. Thus, the opportunity to command might have enhanced the self control among the officers vis-a-vis their subordinates.

### *Sensitivity (Map 15)*

The t-value shows that there is no significant difference between the officers and subordinates ( $t=1.29$ ). However, The mean values indicate that the mean is slightly more in the case of subordinates i.e the sensitivity of subordinates is slightly more as compared to officers.

Sensitivity refers to one's ability to respond to external stimuli or one's faculty of sensation towards physical or emotional stimuli. It varies from person to person and the organisations they are attached to and nature of work etc.

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

According to the scale, a high score in sensitivity is indicative of an individual or group of individuals' tendency to be over protected, dependent, impatient and attention seeker. The prevailing security scenario with lots of terror hype might be equally stressful for both the officers and subordinates. Therefore, they might be equally sensitive to such developments. However, subordinates are slightly high on sensitivity factor, which can be attributed to their direct involvement.

### *Shrewdness (Map 16)*

The t-value shows that there is no significant difference between the officers and subordinates ( $t=1.91$ ). The mean values also indicate the same. Shrewdness is characterized by keen awareness, sound judgement, sharp intelligence, and often a sense of pragmatism. It is also disposed to artful and cunning practices i.e. tricky. Shrewd suggests a sharp intelligence and often an intuitive grasp of practical considerations.

According to the scale, a high score in shrewdness is indicative of an individual or group of individuals' tendency to be calculative, immaculate and socially alert. Shrewdness being an inborn quality might not be influenced by your position, power or work environment.

### *Self Sufficiency (Map 17)*

The t-value shows that there is a significant difference between the officers and subordinates ( $t= 14.77$ , significant at .01 level). The mean values indicate that the mean is more in the case of officers i.e. the self sufficiency of officers is more as compared to subordinates.

Self-sufficiency refers to the state of not requiring any outside aid, support, or interaction, for survival. It is therefore a type of personal

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

or Collective autonomy. On a large scale, a totally self-sufficient economy that does not trade with the outside world is called an autarky.

According to the scale, a high score in self sufficiency is indicative of an individual or group of individuals' tendency to be independent, manipulating and enterprising. The officers are more self-sufficient may be because they get better pay and perks and stay with their families in field stations but the subordinates, who are invariably drawn from poor economic background, get a meagre pay and are forced to keep their families away. This might be the factor behind subordinates lacking self sufficiency.

### *Suspiciousness (Map 18)*

The t-value shows that there is a significant difference between the officers and subordinates ( $t= 10.72$ , significant at .01 level). The mean values indicate that the mean is more in the case of subordinates i.e the suspiciousness of subordinates is more as compared to officers.

Suspiciousness means a person who is openly distrustful and unwilling to confide. It is a haunting feeling of mistrust. Paranoia, a term also used diagnostically, is the ongoing feeling that someone is after you and may involve other intrusive thoughts. Paranoia can interfere with every aspect of your life as you fear intimacy, and isolate yourself. The veteran may move away from family, friends and all supports in an effort to feel safe because of suspicions and paranoid feelings. In fact, being alone can increase feelings of paranoia. The anxiety, depression and other symptoms of PTSD (Post traumatic stress disorder) requires support and understanding. Without intervention, fear from memories and trauma of the past will only haunt the veteran.

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

According to the scale, a high score in suspiciousness is indicative of an individual or group of individual's tendency to live on frustration, sceptical, jealous and irritable. Arduous working conditions, stricter regimen, geographical distance from families might have enhanced the susceptibility of the subordinate forces to feelings of guilt consciousness, suspiciousness etc. The reported incidents of indiscriminate firing by an erratic jawan, mutual firing of shots over a trivial altercation etc. may be the manifestations of such negative feelings.

### *Social Warmth (Map 19)*

The t-value shows that there is a significant difference between the officers and subordinates ( $t= 8.55$ , significant at .01 level). The mean values indicate that the mean is more in the case of officers i.e. the social warmth of officers is more as compared to subordinates.

People who are perceived as warm elicit uniformly positive emotions and behaviour, whereas those perceived as lacking warmth elicit uniform negativity. The social warmth parameters generally includes good-natured, trustworthy, tolerant, friendly etc. Cutting-edge studies of social cognition firmly established that people everywhere differentiate each other by liking (warmth, trustworthiness). According to recent theory and research in social cognition, the warmth dimension captures traits that are related to perceived intent, including friendliness, helpfulness, sincerity, trustworthiness and morality,

According to the scale, a high score in social warmth is indicative of an individual or group of individuals tendency to be outgoing, participative, good natured and warm hearted. Officers being better equipped with facilities to entertain their guests can afford to

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

maintain a greater degree of social warmth. On the other hand, subordinates lack such facilities.

### *Tension (Map 20)*

The t-value shows that there is a significant difference between the officers and subordinates ( $t= 12.62$ , significant at .01 level). The mean values indicate that the mean is more in the case of subordinates i.e the tension of subordinates is more as compared to officers.

Tension refers to Mental, emotional, or nervous strain. It refers to the consequence of the failure of an organism – human or animal – to respond appropriately to emotional or physical threats, whether actual or imagined. Suspense may operate in any situation where there is a lead up to a big event or dramatic moment, with tension being a primary emotion felt as part of the situation.

According to the scale, a high score in tension is indicative of an individual or group of individuals' tendency to remain excited, tense, anxious and frustrated. Given the nature of duties, the subordinates might be more Prone to occupational stress than their officers. In most of the reported killing/suicide incidents in security forces, invariably the subordinates commits suicide or are involved in killing their fellow being or controlling officer on certain trivial issues. Thus, the tension might be more with the subordinates as compared to officers.

### **Interpretation of Table 2-15**

#### **(Regression analysis)**

The regression analysis (step-wise) was administered to determine the effect of personality dimensions (independent variable), independently and in combination, on the occupational stress factors (dependant variable). The overall

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

stress and 12 other occupational stress factors have been taken into consideration during the data analysis.

| <b>Table 2: MAP Determinants of overall stress (total sample)<br/>(N=400)</b> |             |                 |                |
|---|-------------|-----------------|----------------|
| <b>Dependent variable: Overall stress</b>                                     |             |                 |                |
| <b>Independent variables (MAP)</b>  | <b>Beta</b> | <b>Simple r</b> | <b>t-value</b> |
| MAP20   | .20**       | .2986**         | 4.01           |
| MAP10   | -.21**      | -.2198**        | 4.08           |
| MAP7  | .15*        | .2173**         | 3.06           |
| MAP3  | .13**       | .1313**         | 2.71           |
| MAP15   | .10*        | .0991*          | 2.17           |
| MAP6  | -.10*       | -.1507**        | 2.02           |
| <b>Multiple R=.42</b>   |             |                 |                |
| <b>R square=.18</b>   |             |                 |                |

\* Significant at .05 level

\*\* Significant at .01 level

The table no.2 indicates that there are six personality dimensions that contribute significantly to the overall stress, contributed by twelve occupational stress factors. Their contribution amounts to 18%, which means that the overall stress depends up to the extent of 18% on these six personality dimensions. These dimensions are : Tension (MAP20), Leadership (MAP10), Guilt proneness (MAP7),

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

Boldness (MAP3), Sensitivity (MAP15) and General Ability (MAP6).

| <b>Table 3: MAP Determinants of OS1(Role overload)<br/>(N=400)</b> |             |                 |                |
|--|-------------|-----------------|----------------|
| <b>Dependent variable: Role overload</b>                           |             |                 |                |
| <b>Independent variables (MAP)</b>                                 | <b>Beta</b> | <b>Simple r</b> | <b>t-value</b> |
| MAP1   | .20**       | .2254**         | 4.03           |
| MAP3   | .23**       | .2146**         | 4.76           |
| MAP20  | .15**       | .1125*          | 2.98           |
| MAP18  | -.18**      | -.0952          | 3.47           |
| MAP15  | .13**       | .1028*          | 2.50           |
| MAP10  | -.16**      | -.0173          | 3.14           |
| MAP6   | .13**       | .1632**         | 2.48           |
| <b>Multiple R=.41<br/>R square=.16</b>                             |             |                 |                |

\* Significant at .05 level

\*\* Significant at .01 level

The table no.3 indicates that there are seven personality dimensions that contribute significantly to the role overload. Their contribution amounts to 16%, which means that the role overload depends up to the extent of 16% on these seven

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

personality dimensions. These dimensions are : Adaptability(MAP1),Boldness(MAP3),Tension(MAP20), Suspiciousness (MAP18), Sensitivity (MAP15), Leadership (MAP10) and General ability (MAP6).

| <b>Dependent variable: Role ambiguity</b> |             |                 |                |
|---|-------------|-----------------|----------------|
| <b>Independent variables (MAP)</b>        | <b>Beta</b> | <b>Simple r</b> | <b>t-value</b> |
| MAP14                                     | .22**       | .2087**         | 4.45           |
| MAP20                                     | .14**       | .1567**         | 2.76           |
| MAP9                                      | - .14**     | -.1584**        | 2.87           |
| MAP8                                      | .11*        | .1686**         | 2.22           |
| MAP6                                      | -.10*       | -.0849          | 2.04           |
| <b>Multiple R=.34</b>                     |             |                 |                |
| <b>R square=.12</b>                       |             |                 |                |

\* Significant at .05 level

\*\* Significant at .01 level

The table no.4 indicates that there are five personality dimensions that contribute significantly to the role ambiguity. Their contribution amounts to 12%, which means that the role overload depends up to the extent of 12% on these five personality dimensions. These dimensions are : Self control, Tension, Innovation, Imagination and general ability.

| <b>Table 5: MAP Determinants of OS3 (Role conflict)<br/>(N=400)</b> |             |                 |                |
|---|-------------|-----------------|----------------|
| <b>Dependent variable: Role conflict</b>                            |             |                 |                |
| <b>Independent variables (MAP)</b>                                  | <b>Beta</b> | <b>Simple r</b> | <b>t-value</b> |
| MAP3  | .16**       | .2368**         | 3.14           |
| MAP15   | .11*        | .1762**         | 2.24           |
| MAP7  | .13**       | .2054**         | 2.71           |
| MAP14   | .15**       | .2365**         | 2.90           |
| MAP20   | .11*        | .1590**         | 2.08           |
| <b>Multiple R=.37<br/>R square=.14</b>                              |             |                 |                |

\* Significant at .05 level

\*\* Significant at .01 level

The table no.6 indicates that there are five personality dimensions that contribute significantly to the role conflict. Their contribution amounts to 14%, which means that the role conflict depends up to the extent of 14% on five personality dimensions. These dimensions are : Boldness, Sensitivity, Guilt proneness, Self control and Tension.

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, a boss will suffer role conflict if forced to fire an employee who is also a close friend.

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

| <b>Table 6: MAP Determinants of OS4 (Unreasonable group and political pressure) (N=400)</b> |             |                 |                |
|---|-------------|-----------------|----------------|
| <b>Dependent variable: Unreasonable group and political pressure</b>                        |             |                 |                |
| <b>Independent variables (MAP)</b>  | <b>Beta</b> | <b>Simple r</b> | <b>t-value</b> |
| MAP1  | .26**       | .3057**         | 5.52           |
| MAP3  | .24**       | .2326**         | 5.05           |
| MAP8  | .11*        | .2114**         | 2.40           |
| MAP16   | -.12*       | -.0430*         | 2.44           |
| MAP4  | -.13**      | -.1057*         | 2.52           |
| MAP9  | .10*        | .1315**         | 2.10           |
| MAP15   | .14**       | .0773           | 2.97           |
| MAP18   | -.14**      | -.0996*         | 2.72           |
| MAP5  | -.10*       | .0346           | 1.98           |
| <b>Multiple R=.46</b>   |             |                 |                |
| <b>R square=.21</b>   |             |                 |                |

\* Significant at .05 level

\*\* Significant at .01 level

The table no.6 indicates that there are nine personality dimensions that contributes significantly to the OS4 (unreasonable group and political pressure). Their contribution amounts to 21%, which means that the overall stress depends up to the extent of 21% on these nine personality dimensions. These dimensions are: Adaptability, Boldness, Imagination, Shrewdness, Competition, Innovation, Sensitivity, Suspiciousness and Enthusiasm.

| <b>Table 7: MAP Determinants of OS5 (Responsibility for persons) (N=400)</b> |             |                 |                |
|--|-------------|-----------------|----------------|
| <b>Dependent variable: Responsibility for person</b>                         |             |                 |                |
| <b>Independent variables (MAP)</b>   | <b>Beta</b> | <b>Simple r</b> | <b>t-value</b> |

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

|                       |       |         |      |
|-----------------------|-------|---------|------|
| MAP14                 | .12*  | .2319** | 2.20 |
| MAP19                 | .13** | .2087** | 2.57 |
| MAP15                 | .20** | .2191** | 4.17 |
| MAP5                  | .12*  | .2271** | 2.43 |
| MAP3                  | .10*  | .2050** | 1.97 |
| MAP1                  | .13** | .1796** | 2.58 |
| MAP6                  | -.11* | .0179   | 2.19 |
| <b>Multiple R=.41</b> |       |         |      |
| <b>R square=.17</b>   |       |         |      |

\* Significant at .05 level

\*\* Significant at .01 level

The table no.7 indicates that there are seven personality dimensions that contribute significantly to the responsibility for persons. Their contribution amounts to 17%, which means that the responsibility for persons depends up to the extent of 17% on these seven personality dimensions. These dimensions are : Self control, Social warmth, Sensitivity, Enthusiasm, Boldness, Adaptability and general ability.

| <b>Table 8: MAP Determinants of OS6 (Under participation) (N=400)</b> |             |                 |                    |
|---|-------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| <b>Dependent variable: Under participation</b>                        |             |                 |                    |
| <b>Independent variables (MAP)</b>                                    | <b>Beta</b> | <b>Simple r</b> | <b>t-value</b>     |
| MAP7  | .18**       | .2135**         | 3.57 <sup>58</sup> |
| MAP10   | -.17**      | -.1893**        | 3.61               |
| MAP20   | .13**       | .2062**         | 2.68               |
| <b>Multiple R=.31</b>   |             |                 |                    |
| <b>R square=.10</b>   |             |                 |                    |

\* Significant at .05 level

\*\* Significant at .01 level

The table no.8 indicates that there are three personality dimensions that contributes significantly to the under

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

participation. Their contribution amounts to 10%, which means that the under participation depends up to the extent of 10% on these three personality dimensions. These personality dimensions are: Guilt proneness, Leadership and Tension.

| <b>Table 9: MAP Determinants of OS7 (Powerlessness)<br/>(N=400)</b> |             |                 |                |
|---|-------------|-----------------|----------------|
| <b>Dependent variable: Powerlessness</b>                            |             |                 |                |
| <b>Independent variables (MAP)</b>                                  | <b>Beta</b> | <b>Simple r</b> | <b>t-value</b> |
| MAP17   | -.21**      | -.1939**        | 3.67           |
| MAP13   | -.20**      | -.1579**        | 3.87           |
| MAP20   | .13**       | .1600**         | 2.61           |
| MAP1  | .13**       | -.0329          | 2.36           |
| <b>Multiple R=.30<br/>R square=.09</b>                              |             |                 |                |

\* Significant at .05 level

\*\* Significant at .01 level

The table no.9 indicates that there are four personality dimensions that contribute significantly to the powerlessness. Their contribution amounts to 9%, which means that the powerlessness depends up to the extent of 9% on these four personality dimensions. These dimensions are : Self sufficiency, Morality, Tension and Adaptability.

| <b>Table 10: MAP Determinants of OS8 (Poor peer relations)<br/>(N=400)</b> |             |                 |                |
|--|-------------|-----------------|----------------|
| <b>Dependent variable: Poor peer relations</b>                             |             |                 |                |
| <b>Independent variables (MAP)</b>   | <b>Beta</b> | <b>Simple r</b> | <b>t-value</b> |
| MAP14  | -.21**      | -.1627**        | 4.11           |
| MAP4   | .19**       | .0779           | 3.70           |

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

|                       |        |         |      |
|-----------------------|--------|---------|------|
| MAP10                 | -.16** | -.1239* | 3.11 |
| MAP19                 | .23**  | .0816   | 4.22 |
| MAP18                 | .16**  | .0578   | 3.00 |
| MAP13                 | -.11*  | -.1047* | 2.30 |
| <b>Multiple R=.33</b> |        |         |      |
| <b>R square=.11</b>   |        |         |      |

\* Significant at .05 level

\*\* Significant at .01 level

The table no.10 indicates that there are six personality dimensions that contribute significantly to the poor peer relations. Their contribution amounts to 11%, which means that the poor peer relation depends up to the extent of 11% on these six personality dimensions. These dimensions are: Self control, Competition, Leadership, Social warmth, Suspiciousness and Morality.

| <b>Dependent variable: Intrinsic impoverishment</b> |             |                 |                |
|---|-------------|-----------------|----------------|
| <b>Independent variables (MAP)</b>                  | <b>Beta</b> | <b>Simple r</b> | <b>t-value</b> |
| MAP11   | -.31**      | -.3732**        | 6.92           |
| MAP18   | .22**       | .2717**         | 4.65           |
| MAP9  | -.20**      | -.3638**        | 4.35           |
| MAP6  | -.18**      | -.3179**        | 4.14           |
| MAP20   | .12**       | .2249**         | 2.72           |
| MAP4  | .10*        | -.0054          | 2.27           |
| <b>Multiple R=.58</b>                               |             |                 |                |
| <b>R square=.33</b>                                 |             |                 |                |

\* Significant at .05 level

\*\* Significant at .01 level

The table no.11 indicates that there are six personality dimensions that contributes significantly to the intrinsic

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

impoverishment. Their contribution amounts to 33%, which means that the intrinsic impoverishment depends up to the extent of 33% on these six personality dimensions. These dimensions are: Maturity, Suspiciousness, Innovation, General ability, Tension and competition.

| <b>Table 12: MAP Determinants of OS10 (Low status)</b><br>(N=400) |             |                 |                |
|---|-------------|-----------------|----------------|
| <b>Dependent variable: Low status</b>                             |             |                 |                |
| <b>Independent variables (MAP)</b>                                | <b>Beta</b> | <b>Simple r</b> | <b>t-value</b> |
| MAP17   | -.22**      | -.4527**        | 4.72           |
| MAP19   | -.13**      | -.3721**        | 3.07           |
| MAP20   | .21**       | .3366**         | 5.14           |
| MAP3  | -.16**      | -.1875**        | 3.88           |
| MAP6  | -.15**      | -.3201**        | 3.50           |
| MAP5  | -.10*       | -.2797**        | 2.42           |
| MAP1  | -.10*       | -.3852**        | 2.29           |
| MAP2  | -.10*       | -.2807**        | 2.42           |
| MAP7  | .10*        | .2255**         | 2.41           |
| <b>Multiple R=.65</b>   |             |                 |                |
| <b>R square=.42</b>   |             |                 |                |

\* Significant at .05 level

\*\* Significant at .01 level

The table no.12 indicates that there are 9 personality dimensions that contribute significantly to the Low status. Their contribution amounts to 42%, which means that the low status depends up to the extent of 42% on these 9 personality dimensions. These dimensions are : personality dimensions like Self sufficiency, Social warmth, Tension, Boldness, General ability, Enthusiasm, Adaptability, Achievement motivation and Guilt proneness.

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

| <b>Table 13: MAP Determinants of OS11 (Strenuous working condition)</b><br>(N=400) |             |                 |                |
|--|-------------|-----------------|----------------|
| <b>Dependent variable: Strenuous working condition</b>                             |             |                 |                |
| <b>Independent variables (MAP)</b>   | <b>Beta</b> | <b>Simple r</b> | <b>t-value</b> |
| MAP17  | -.25**      | -.3525**        | 4.62           |
| MAP3   | -.19**      | -.2048**        | 4.16           |
| MAP5   | -.15**      | -.2429**        | 3.19           |
| MAP15  | -.13**      | -.1213*         | 2.73           |
| MAP20  | .14**       | .1755**         | 3.00           |
| MAP11  | -.14**      | -.3034**        | 2.65           |
| <b>Multiple R=.49</b><br><b>R square=.25</b>                                       |             |                 |                |

\* Significant at .05 level

\*\* Significant at .01 level

The table no.13 indicates that there are six personality dimensions that contribute significantly to the strenuous working condition. Their contribution amounts to 25%, which means that the strenuous working condition depends up to the extent of 25% on these six personality dimensions. These dimensions are: Self sufficiency, Boldness, Enthusiasm, Sensitivity, Tension and Maturity.

| <b>Table 14: MAP Determinants of OS12 (Unprofitability)</b><br>(N=400) |             |                 |                |
|--|-------------|-----------------|----------------|
| <b>Dependent variable: Unprofitability</b>                             |             |                 |                |
| <b>Independent variables (MAP)</b>                                     | <b>Beta</b> | <b>Simple r</b> | <b>t-value</b> |
| MAP1   | .16**       | .1804**         | 3.17           |

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

|                       |       |         |      |
|-----------------------|-------|---------|------|
| MAP4                  | .14** | .1564** | 2.91 |
| MAP9                  | .11*  | .1556** | 2.12 |
| <b>Multiple R=.26</b> |       |         |      |
| <b>R square=.07</b>   |       |         |      |

\* Significant at .05 level

\*\* Significant at .01 level

The table no.15 indicates that there are three personality dimensions that contribute significantly to the un-profitability. Their contribution amounts to 7%, which means that the Un-profitability depends up to the extent of 7% on these three personality dimensions. These dimensions are : Adaptability, Competition and innovation.

### Recommendation

Only the 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. That training delineates professional standards that an officer must follow, including those pertaining to restraint when using force, adherence to the spirit and letter 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 process cadets to produce individuals equipped with a better endurance level to withstand occupational stress hazards. Thus, the programme for any security organization need 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, who, at the end of the course, ought to discover himself as a suave person tough enough to fight the work hazards effectively. The curriculum of security organisations includes personality development programmes, but they are not seriously administered. No doubt, occupation 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 keep a tab on it.

It has been observed that those who are prey to its negative consequences tend to hide their mental status, considering it as a social stigma. As a result, they avoid seeking professional help allowing them to delve deep into the abysmal depth of depression. To argue, we can't solely finger the security personnel for this attitudinal anomaly, rather the organisational outlook needs a revamping in this matter. It has been noticed that the personnel who dares to visit a psychologist for professional help are sidelined by their seniors, keeping them away from responsible assignments. These attitudinal problems on the part of the seniors negatively help keep the stressed elements untreated and confined to the organisation, leading to a umpteen number of suicides and cases of turning gun on their seniors/fellow beings 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.

## DRISHTIKON

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

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 national defense information and materials, theft of office equipment, drug trafficking, assault on Government 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.

### *Educate Officers*

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 that 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 objective.

### *Build 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.

### *Develop Management Strategies*

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 promote this type of situation when they:

- Provide meaningful job assignments (Place the right person in the right job.)

## **DRISHTIKON**

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

- Broaden employees' spans of control (This, in turn, enhances employees' self-esteem and motivates them to respond to the trust placed in them.)
- Give employees a voice in operations (Employees' commitment to their departments tends to increase when they have a voice in decisions that affect them).
- Allow democratic leadership (Allow all Security personnel to share in the decision making process).
- Develop a rapport with subordinates (Security personnel should recognize the good work of employees, and they should develop good listening skills.)

## **REFERENCES**

- Malta. Stress at Work. A Concept in Stress. Human Factors Limited. Business Psychology and Strategy Development 2004.
- Mead R. What is Stress? Roger Mead Associates, Stress Management, Coaching and Training for Individuals and Groups 2000.
- Murphy, S. L. Sauter, Occupational Stress Issues & Development in Research. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

## **DRISHTIKON**

Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD

Vol 3, No. 2

Parikh P, Taukari A, Bhattacharya T. Occupational Stress and Coping among Nurses. *J Health Manag*, 2004; 6: 115-27.

Robbins, S.P (1996). *Organizational Behavior* . (International edition) New York: Prentice- Hall, Inc. Schultz, D. & Schultz, E.S. (2002). *Psychology and Work Today*. (8th ed.). India:Pearson Education, Inc

Siegrist, J. (1996) Adverse Health effects of high – effort / low reward conditions.

**The design of the sample is shown in Figure below:**

**Design of the sample**

**TOTAL SAMPLE**

