Chapter 6

DATA ANALYSIS

&

INTERPRETATION

CHAPTER - 6
DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

INTRODUCTION:

The data has been analyzed with the use of various statistical tools and techniques. The analysis of this study has been divided into six parts. The first part of the analysis focuses on the Demographic Profile of the respondents and the Cross Tabulation of the demographic Profile. The second part of the analysis deals with the Severity Index of Symptoms of Stress, Sources of Stress and Coping Strategies of Stress. The third part of the analysis focuses on the Regression Analysis, ANOVA and Post Hoc test. The fourth part of the analysis deals with the Correlation among the Attributes and the fifth part of the analysis deals with the Testing of Hypothesis followed by the Conclusions for this chapter.

Demographic Profile of the respondents (Table - 6.1) indicate that almost 75% of the respondents are 35 years of age or less while 36 years or above contains only 25% of the respondents. The maximum numbers of respondents were in the age range of 25 - 30 years while the minimum respondents fell between 58 and above or retired police personnel. The respondent's age breakup shows that the analysis and outcome of the study mainly depend on the perception and experience of the younger police personal. As table - 1 shows that 25% respondents are 25 years of age or below while the last 25% of the respondents are 36 years of age and above, rest of the 50% respondents are within the age group of 25 - 35 years.

The table confirms the gender bias towards police force as far as the total respondents are concerned. Female police personnel (2.9%) are less in comparison to male police personnel (97.1%). Level of education among the respondents (Table - 1) shows unequal distribution as was expected. In the police force recruitment, education is not considered a major criterion for the new entrant. 82% respondents were graduates or below while the post graduate and others had only 18% respondents which confirm that majority of the police personnel were not highly educated.

Table - 6.1: Demographic Profile of the Respondents			
		N	%
Age	Below 25	321	24.9
	25 -30	461	35.7
	31 -35	184	14.3
	36 – 40	114	8.8
	41 -45	70	5.4
	46 – 50	77	6.0
	51 -58	56	4.3
	58 & above Retd.	8	.6
	Total	**1291**	**100.0**
Gender	Male	1254	97.1
	Female	37	2.9
	Total	**1291**	**100.0**
Qualification	Up to HSC	339	26.3
	Graduate	722	55.9
	Post graduate	219	17.0
	Others	11	.9
	Total	**1291**	**100.0**
Religion	Hindu	1183	91.6
	Muslim	89	6.9
	Sikh	7	.5
	Christian	12	.9
	Total	**1291**	**100.0**
Category	General	523	40.5
	SEBC	429	33.2
	SC	234	18.1
	ST	105	8.1
	Total	**1291**	**100.0**
Place of Residence	Urban	765	59.3
	Town	243	18.8
	Rural-Village	283	21.9
	Total	**1291**	**100.0**
Marital Status	Married	947	73.4
	Unmarried	289	22.4
	Divorced	40	3.1
	Others	15	1.2
	Total	**1291**	**100.0**
Number of Dependants	Nil	579	44.8
	One	225	17.4
	Two	215	16.7
	Three	135	10.5
	Four	100	7.7
	Five & above	37	2.9
	Total	**1291**	**100.0**
Location of Police Station	Urban	859	66.5

	Town	220	17.0
	Village	177	13.7
	Out post	35	2.7
	Total	**1291**	**100.0**
Unit of Current Posting	Police Station	1129	87.5
	Police Chowki	162	12.5
	Total	**1291**	**100.0**
Rank in the Police Force	DG, ADG, IG, SPL, IG, DIG	3	.2
	DSP/DCP, DYSP/ACP	71	5.5
	PI	126	9.8
	PSI, JAMADAR, HEAD CONSTABLE, CONSTABLE	1091	84.5
	Total	**1291**	**100.0**
Experience	UP TO 5	641	49.7
	6 -10	360	27.9
	11 – 15	158	12.2
	16 – 20	63	4.9
	21 – 25	30	2.3
	26 -30	30	2.3
	Above 30	9	.7
	Total	**1291**	**100.0**
Income in Rupees	Below 1,00,000	726	56.2
	1,00,001 - 2,25,000	242	18.7
	2,25,001 - 3,00,000	189	14.6
	3,00,000 - 5,00,000	100	7.7
	Above 5,00,000	34	2.6
	Total	**1291**	**100.0**
Number of Family Members in Police Department	Nil	980	75.9
	One	192	14.9
	Two	73	5.7
	Three	30	2.3
	Four	10	.8
	Five & above	6	.5
	Total	**1291**	**100.0**
Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire			

The religion of the respondents is highly skewed towards Hinduism as it was expected because the contribution of Muslims and Christians in Indian police force was negligible and the Sikhs are more inclined towards military and paramilitary. Caste category of the respondents shows an equally proportionate distribution as per their division in general population pattern. The outcomes in Table – 6.1 confirm that the contribution of Schedule Tribe (8.1%) in this study is very low as compared

to the General category (40.5%) of police personnel. The places of residence of the respondents are divided into three categories i.e. Urban, Semi Urban (Town) and Rural (Village). More than half of the respondents reside in urban (59.3%) areas while 22% police personnel live rural areas. Rest of the respondents (19%) resides in semi urban (Town) areas.

Out of total respondents, 73% are married while 22% are unmarried and 3% are divorced. 579 respondents are those who don't have any dependent member on them whereas 225 and 215 respondents are such who have one and two dependents on them respectively. Number of dependents is inversely related with the number of respondents as shown in Table - 6.1. Out of total respondents 859 (66%) of the respondents are posted in urban police stations followed by semi urban (town) (17%), Rural (village) (14%) and outpost (3%) only.

Police Chowki and Police Station are two different units of posting where police Chowki is a subset of police station of that area. Among the total (1291) respondents, 87% are currently posted in police stations, where as only 13% are posted at police Chowki.

In this study, rank of the police force has been divided into four categories. The Lowest category of the police force comprises of PSI, Jamadar, Head Constable and Constable as shown in the table - 6.1 indicates that 84% respondents belong to that category. The highest category comprises of DG, Add. DG, IG, Spl. IG, DIG and only 0.2% respondents belonged to this category. As they hold the top position, their responsibilities are higher than the other categories so they don't have enough time to respond.

The Experience of the respondents is divided into seven categories as shown in the table - 6.1. Out of total respondents 49% are having experience up to 5 years where as 28%, 12% and 5% respondents belongs to 6-10 years, 11-15 years and 16-20 years of experience respectively. The 9 respondents out of total have 30 years or more

experience. The income of the respondents are divided into five category namely up to 1, 00,000, 1.0-2.25 lakhs, 2.25-3.0, 3.0 – 5.0 and 5 lakhs and above as shown in table – 1. The majority of the respondents fall in the lower category of income and a few numbers of respondents fall into the higher category of income. The number of family members in police department is inversely related the number of respondents.

The summary of the above table confirms that the majority of the respondents are young in age, means they are new entrants that validate the marital status of the respondents. Further, the marital status of the respondents validates the number of dependents of the respondents. Low income and less experience are also being validated with the age of the respondents.

Table - 6.2: Descriptive Statistics [Mental Symptoms of Stress]												
Attributes	Very Low		Low		Moderate		High		Very High		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Anxious	571	44.2	240	18.6	249	19.3	159	12.3	72	5.6	1291	100.0
Worry a lot	473	36.6	311	24.1	266	20.6	142	11.0	99	7.7	1291	100.0
Irritability	496	38.4	252	19.5	316	24.5	150	11.6	77	6.0	1291	100.0
Easily Frustrated	475	36.8	264	20.4	308	23.9	193	14.9	51	4.0	1291	100.0
Aggressive Outbursts	451	34.9	235	18.2	357	27.7	181	14.0	67	5.2	1291	100.0
Poor Concentration	445	34.5	229	17.7	370	28.7	171	13.2	76	5.9	1291	100.0
Forgetfulness	460	35.6	284	22.0	341	26.4	147	11.4	59	4.6	1291	100.0
Depression	477	36.9	260	20.1	289	22.4	179	13.9	86	6.7	1291	100.0
Poor Motivation	461	35.7	252	19.5	352	27.3	161	12.5	65	5.0	1291	100.0
Want to be alone always	487	37.7	256	19.8	328	25.4	143	11.1	77	6.0	1291	100.0
Poor Self Esteem	524	40.6	239	18.5	317	24.6	168	13.0	43	3.3	1291	100.0
Feel out of Control	556	43.1	252	19.5	270	20.9	135	10.5	78	6.0	1291	100.0
Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire												

To measure the mental symptoms of stress twelve attributes have been identified for this study with the help of existing literature. Out of total respondents (1291), 18% respondents reported higher anxiousness and 63% respondents have reported lower on anxiousness. Those respondents who do not have higher or lower anxiousness means they are in between i.e., (Moderate) and the it is 19%. As anxiety leads to loss of mental control and unseasonable/unusual, the data in table-6.2 validates that a few of the respondents have higher level of anxiousness. Out of total respondents (1291), 19% respondents reported higher on worry and 61% respondents have reported low on worry. Those respondents who do not feel higher or lower worry a lot means they are in between (Moderate) and they are 20%. Worry leads to an anxiety and also affects physical fitness. The data in Table-6.2 validates the relationship between anxiety and worry a lot.

Irritability has been identified as the third attributes to measure the mental symptoms of stress. 18% respondents reported that they have higher irritability, 24% moderate and 58% lower irritability. 19% respondents feel that they are easily frustrated to the extreme level, 24% frustrated moderately and 57% are less vulnerable to the easily frustration. Higher concentration is a sign of healthy and peaceful mind which leads to less forgetfulness and increase in the precision of task. As Table – 6.2 represents 19% respondents are highly poor in concentration, 29% concentrated moderately and 52% respondents reported that they are highly concentrated (Lower Poor Concentration) towards their task.

The level of forgetfulness is a function of poor concentration, worrying a lot and high anxiety. A person having a high level of forgetfulness suffers from poor concentration, high level of worry and an anxiety towards the task. Table - 6.2 confirm the logic and show the same trend. The study has included depression and poor motivations to measure the mental symptoms of stress of the respondents. 20% respondents have reported higher levels of depression, 22% are moderate and 58% have lower level of depression. 18% respondents reported that they feel high level of demotivation, 27% reported moderate and 55% reported experiencing lower poor motivation which means they are highly motivated toward their task.

Poor self esteem and wanting to be alone always has been used to measure the mental symptoms of stress in this study. 16% of the respondents strongly feel that they poor self esteem, 25% are moderate and 59% respondents feel they have self esteem. 17% respondents are strongly in favour of wanting to stay alone, 25% are moderate and 58% respondents prefer to stay with someone.

The descriptive statistics of mental Symptoms of Stress in Table - 6.2 reports that the responses of the respondents are skewed towards left which indicates the lower level of mental symptom among respondents. Similar trends have been noticed among all attributes in Table – 6.2 for measuring the mental symptoms of stress.

Table - 6.3: Descriptive Statistics [Physical Symptoms of Stress]												
Attributes	Very Low		Low		Moderate		High		Very High		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Headaches	529	41.0	302	23.4	267	20.7	103	8.0	90	7.0	1291	100.0
Spastic Colon	647	50.1	254	19.7	265	20.5	102	7.9	23	1.8	1291	100.0
Indigestion	563	43.6	275	21.3	290	22.5	127	9.8	36	2.8	1291	100.0
Ulcers	635	49.2	210	16.3	293	22.7	127	9.8	26	2.0	1291	100.0
High Blood Pressure	588	45.5	220	17.0	278	21.5	152	11.8	53	4.1	1291	100.0
Hyperventilation	578	44.8	239	18.5	306	23.7	122	9.5	46	3.6	1291	100.0
Asthma	665	51.5	222	17.2	283	21.9	86	6.7	35	2.7	1291	100.0
Stiff Sore Muscles	601	46.6	211	16.3	286	22.2	121	9.4	72	5.6	1291	100.0
Trouble Sleeping	506	39.2	253	19.6	331	25.6	149	11.5	52	4.0	1291	100.0
Decreased Immunity	583	45.2	248	19.2	301	23.3	128	9.9	31	2.4	1291	100.0
Change in Marriage Life	633	49.0	234	18.1	254	19.7	129	10.0	41	3.2	1291	100.0
Change in Appetite	590	45.7	206	16.0	332	25.7	126	9.8	37	2.9	1291	100.0
Palpitation	620	48.0	237	18.4	284	22.0	103	8.0	47	3.6	1291	100.0
Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire												

Physical fitness plays an important role and considered to be the first and an important parameter to get selected in the professional life of the police. Keeping in mind the importance of physical fitness in police profession, moderate, high and very high score of symptoms of stress are cause of concern in measuring the physical symptoms of stress. This study has identified thirteen attributes to measure the physical symptoms of stress. Out of the total respondents 36% respondents have reported a higher frequency of feeling a headache, while 64% feel headache occasionally. 35% respondents reported the higher incidence of indigestion where as 65% reported that indigestion problem occurs occasionally. Ulcer, one of the outcomes of frequent indigestion confirms the similar trend among the respondents as reported in Table - 6.3.

High Blood Pressure, an outcome of some attributes of mental symptoms of stress is positively related. High Blood Pressure affects sleep and marital life. 38% respondents have reported Blood Pressure problem frequently whereas 62% rarely have blood pressure problem. It means job pressure may be the cause of rare blood pressure. Table - 6.3 validates a similar trend for hyper ventilations. 32% of the respondents reported disturbed sleep, where as 68% respondents rarely felt

disturbed while sleeping. 33% of respondents agreed to disturbed marital life whereas 67% reported that it is not a regular phenomenon. Change in appetite is a function of headache, indigestion, Ulcer, High Blood Pressure and Trouble Sleeping. Table - 6.3 of the physical symptoms of stress confirms the similar trend among the attributes.

Table - 6.4: Descriptive Statistics [Other Symptoms of Stress]

Attributes	Very Low		Low		Moderate		High		Very High		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Smoking	789	61.1	225	17.4	185	14.3	63	4.9	29	2.2	1291	100.0
Medication	736	57.0	253	19.6	206	16.0	80	6.2	16	1.2	1291	100.0
Alcohol Consumption	819	63.4	155	12.0	200	15.5	72	5.6	45	3.5	1291	100.0

Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire

Other symptoms of stress contain a behavioural activity that forces the respondents to repeatedly perform, to relax and minimize the level of stress. Regular consumption of alcohol, unnecessary smoking habits and medication are the indicators of stress and experience of stress. Due to the nature of the questionnaire (5 Point Likert Scale), the respondents who do not smoke or consume alcohol at all have forcefully marked 1 due to the absence of an appropriate option for the non smoker/drinker category.

Due to social awareness and rules and regulations of the Gujarat Government, generally people hide information about their consumption of alcohol and even smoking habits. Despite the fact, data in Table - 6.4 shows that 21% respondents are regular smokers and 79% respondents are smokers but their frequency of smoking is low or even some of them are non smokers. 24% respondents are highly dependent on medication whereas 76% respondents occasionally take medication as and when they feel it is unavoidable or even some of them do not take medication at all. 26% respondents have reported that their frequency of consuming alcohol is higher and 74% respondents reported that they are occasional consumers of alcohol or some of

them are totally non consumers of alcohol. Table – 6.4 confirms the honest responses by the respondents towards their behavioural aspect.

In this study, four different variables have been identified to measure the sources of stress namely Personal Sphere, Interpersonal Sphere, Work Sphere and Recreational Sphere. Work Sphere as one of the sources of the stress has a direct or positive impact on personal and interpersonal sphere as a sources of stress.

Table – 6.5: Descriptive Statistics [Sources of Stress; Personal Sphere]

Attributes	Very Low		Low		Moderate		High		Very High		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Struggle to make Decision	527	40.8	252	19.5	308	23.9	136	10.5	68	5.3	1291	100.0
Worried about my health	262	20.3	476	36.9	295	22.9	151	11.7	107	8.3	1291	100.0
Burdened with unresolved issue in the past	358	27.7	383	29.7	339	26.3	148	11.5	63	4.9	1291	100.0
Suffer from low self esteem	375	29.0	372	28.8	330	25.6	149	11.5	65	5.0	1291	100.0
Suffer from Depression	404	31.3	284	22.0	378	29.3	167	12.9	58	4.5	1291	100.0
Unmotivated to take up Challenge	366	28.4	329	25.5	318	24.6	216	16.7	62	4.8	1291	100.0
Have to adapt to a new life style	374	29.0	315	24.4	317	24.6	197	15.3	88	6.8	1291	100.0

Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire

The struggle to make a decision has been used as one of the attributes to measure the personal sources of stress among the respondents. Out of the total respondents (1291), 40% of the respondents reported that they struggle to make decisions towards moderate to higher level and 60% respondents have reported that they experience low level of difficulty in making decisions. 43% respondents reported moderate to higher level of worry about their health, whereas 57% respondents are occasionally worried about their health. 41% respondents reported that they feel high level of stress due to unresolved issue in the past and its burden on them and 59% of the respondents are less sensible towards burden and unresolved issues in the past.

Depression, an extreme level of stress is mainly caused by the inability to take correct decision, frequent worry about health and not being able to resolve long pending issues successfully. Almost half of the respondents suffer from moderate to

high level of depression. Unmotivated behavior to take up new challenges, many a times, forces towards the adoption of a new life style. The responses in Table - 6.5 validate a similar trend for unmotivated behaviour and adoption of a new life style.

Table - 6.6: Descriptive Statistics [Sources of Stress; Interpersonal Sphere]

Attributes	Very low		Low		Moderate		High		Very high		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Difficulty in communicating	480	37.2	389	30.1	252	19.5	114	8.8	56	4.3	1291	100.0
Lose interest in others	340	26.3	420	32.5	297	23.0	191	14.8	43	3.3	1291	100.0
Difficulty in Controlling my anger	332	25.7	388	30.1	324	25.1	174	13.5	73	5.7	1291	100.0
Perfectionist in my expectations of others	283	21.9	363	28.1	405	31.4	176	13.6	64	5.0	1291	100.0
See that other use me as a doormat	387	30.0	346	26.8	293	22.7	185	14.3	80	6.2	1291	100.0

Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire

Communication in this globalized era has proved to be one of the important elements for success at the personal as well as interpersonal level in the professional life. Innovation in communication tools and techniques has converted whole world in a global village. Five attributes have been identified to measure the interpersonal sources of stress as shown in Table - 6.6. 32% respondents reported that they felt moderate to high level of difficulty in communicating. 41% of the respondents reported not having any interest in others whereas 59% showed some proximity and interest in others.

The trend in difficulty level of controlling anger (table - 6.6) shows a similar pattern of one of the attributes "feel out of control", of mental symptoms of stress (table-6.2). Out of the total respondents (1291), 43% of the respondents felt that they found difficulty in controlling their anger and 57% respondents reported that usually they were able to control their anger. Half of the respondents responded of being a perfectionist in their expectation of others as one of the major sources of interpersonal stress.

Exploitation by others (others use me as a door mat) leads to various mental and physical problems like frustration, aggressive outburst, loss of motivation, poor self esteem, blood pressure and disturbed sleep. 43% respondents reported that they are

moderately to highly exploited by others and 57% respondents are either less exploited by others or not at all and experience this in their inter personal behaviour.

Table - 6.7: Descriptive Statistics [Sources of Stress; Work Sphere]

Attributes	Very low		Low		Moderate		High		Very high		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Feel Overloaded with work	410	31.8	287	22.2	300	23.2	180	13.9	114	8.8	1291	100.0
Struggle to meet deadline	323	25.0	378	29.3	323	25.0	186	14.4	81	6.3	1291	100.0
Carry a lot of responsibility	330	25.6	356	27.6	339	26.3	172	13.3	94	7.3	1291	100.0
Struggle to get along with superior	328	25.4	374	29.0	369	28.6	159	12.3	61	4.7	1291	100.0
Have to tolerate a lot of frustration	356	27.6	363	28.1	368	28.5	143	11.1	61	4.7	1291	100.0
Work Long Hours	303	23.5	312	24.2	329	25.5	205	15.9	142	11.0	1291	100.0
No Control over my work schedule	300	23.2	329	25.5	340	26.3	204	15.8	118	9.1	1291	100.0
Dissatisfied with my salary	249	19.3	280	21.7	256	19.8	218	16.9	288	22.3	1291	100.0
My work is boring and not challenging	375	29.0	342	26.5	335	25.9	173	13.4	66	5.1	1291	100.0
Perfectionist in the execution of my task	313	24.2	349	27.0	324	25.1	210	16.3	95	7.4	1291	100.0
Post retirement departmental issues	134	30.7	109	25.0	94	21.6	65	14.9	34	7.8	436	100.0

Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire

Work Sphere sources of stress are considered to be one of the key variables to study job stress. A total of eleven attributes have been identified to measure the Work sphere sources of stress. The eleventh attribute, Post retirement departmental issues, was responded by 436 respondents only. Out of the total respondents (1291), 46% respondents responded that they felt overloaded with work more frequently. But some of the respondents occasionally felt or never felt overloaded with work.

In professional life, finishing the task within an allotted time frame shows the ability, efficiency and the sense of responsibility of an individual in general but particularly from police force, these attributes are expected more with a high level of precision. The roles of police force are so crucial and important in terms of finishing their allotted task within the time frame so that it needs a proper execution of the allotted task, otherwise it may create serious problems.

The responses of the respondents show (Table - 6.7) that 45% struggled to meet a deadline, while rest of the respondents successfully completed their allotted task within the deadline. Table - 6.7 indicates that respondents struggle to meet a

deadline due to inefficiency, excessive work allotment and demand supply gap in the police force.

Generally it has been observed that a proper blend of discipline, code of conduct and healthy HR practices increases the efficiency of a person in particular and organisation in general. But in police force, presence of discipline and code of conduct are imposed with unproductive HR practices that lead to non-cordial and unhealthy environment. Half of the respondents who struggle to get along with their superiors, subordinates and peers, confirm the above statement.

Working long hours has been identified one of the attributes to measure the work sphere sources of stress. In general, it refers to excess workload, inefficiency, demand supply gap and sometimes mismatch of vacancies. Out of the total respondents, 52% work long hours which indicate that they are allotted excess work, they are inefficient, and supply is less than the demand of police force or mismatch of vacancies which leads to no control over work schedule of police force.

Descriptive statistics of Table - 6.7 shows that 2/3 respondents are moderately to very highly dissatisfied with their salaries which leads to making their job less interesting and challenging. 52% of the respondents reported that they were imperfect in the execution of their task. It may be due to the dissatisfaction with the salary and vice versa.

Out of the total 436 respondents in this category, 45% of the respondents believed that post retirement departmental issues are sources of stress from moderate to a very high level.

Table – 6.8: Descriptive Statistics [Sources of Stress; Recreational Sphere]												
Attributes	Very low		Low		Normal		High		Very high		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Spend a lot of time under the influence of drugs and alcohol	647	50.1	252	19.5	256	19.8	91	7.0	45	3.5	1291	100.0
Do not have any free time	407	31.5	332	25.7	302	23.4	131	10.1	119	9.2	1291	100.0
Too tired to use my free time constructively	429	33.2	341	26.4	307	23.8	150	11.6	64	5.0	1291	100.0
Have free time but no interest	451	34.9	322	24.9	282	21.8	152	11.8	84	6.5	1291	100.0
Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire												

To measure the recreational sources of stress, four attributes have been identified as mentioned in Table – 6.8. The descriptive statistics of the table shows that 21% of the respondents (moderate to very high) spent a lot of time under the influence of drugs and alcohol. As mentioned in Table – 6.7 due to long working hours, 42% of the respondents reported that they had less free time which has been validated in Table – 6.8.

Out of the total respondents (1291), 40% respondents responded that they were unable to use their free time constructively due to the tiredness. 41% respondents responded that due to the lack of interest they were not able to use their free time.

Table – 6.9: Descriptive Statistics: [Awareness about Coping with Stress]						
Attributes	Yes		No		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Do you know about Coping Strategy	1180	91.4	111	8.6	1291	100.0
Do you think this has helped you to reduce stress	909	77.0	271	23.0	1180	100.0
Did not help because do not have proper knowledge of coping strategy	81	29.9	190	70.1	271	100.0
Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire						

To check the awareness about the coping strategies of stress, a straight dichotomous question were asked to the respondents. 91% respondents reported that they were aware about the coping strategies of stress and 77% of (1180) respondents felt that it

helped in reducing the level of stress. A total of 271 respondents answered that coping strategy did not help to reduce the stress.

Table - 6.10: Descriptive Statistics: [Coping Strategies of Stress]

Attributes	Very low		Low		Moderate		High		Very high		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Maintain a Sense of Humour	389	33.0	182	15.4	332	28.1	125	10.6	152	12.9	1180	100.0
Meditate	236	20.0	465	39.4	305	25.8	101	8.6	73	6.2	1180	100.0
Get a Massage	196	16.6	310	26.3	442	37.5	139	11.8	93	7.9	1180	100.0
Exercise Regularly	176	14.9	322	27.3	367	31.1	171	14.5	144	12.2	1180	100.0
Eat more Sensibly	223	18.9	302	25.6	399	33.8	145	12.3	111	9.4	1180	100.0
Limit Intake of Alcohol	327	27.7	296	25.1	328	27.8	167	14.2	62	5.3	1180	100.0
Take refuge in family and Friend	277	23.5	284	24.1	392	33.2	165	14.0	62	5.3	1180	100.0
Delegate responsibility	271	23.0	331	28.1	338	28.6	175	14.8	65	5.5	1180	100.0
Quit	403	34.2	239	20.3	337	28.6	129	10.9	72	6.1	1180	100.0

Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire

According to Susan Folkman & Richard Lazarus, coping is extending conscious effort to solve personal and interpersonal problem and seeking to master, minimize or tolerate conflict. The study considered (Miller-1988) nine attributes to measure to what extent the participants considered themselves to be coping with stressful events.

Maintaining a sense of humour is an indicator of either a lower level of stress or a manageable level of stress. Sense of humour means living with fun in all situations, cordial attitude and behavior with others, absence of short temper and anxiousness. Humour is the tendency of particular cognitive experiences to provoke laughter and provide amusement.

Out of the total respondents (1291), 48%respondents have been responded that they maintained a low level of sense of humour and 52% respondents reported that they maintained a moderate to higher level of sense of humour. The data validates that majority of the respondents are aware and practice humour as one of the tools to overcome stressful situations in their personal and professional life.

Consumption of anti anxiety medicines is considered under medication. Almost 60% of the respondents reported that they did not consume or rely on medication to overcome the stressful or conflicting situation in their personal and professional life.

Massage is considered as one of the most practicable attributes to relax physically as well as mentally. Normally, an individual gets a massage when they feel mental and physical drain out. The data validates (Table - 6.10) that 60% of the respondents responded that they had a massage on a regular basis to reenergise themselves.

People normally prefer to do regular exercise for their fitness (metal and physical). This study has considered regular exercise as one of the attributes to measure to what extent the participants considered themselves coping with stressful situations in their personal and professional life. 58% respondents confirmed that they did regular exercise. 43% respondents reported that they not sensible in eating, in response to the attribute: "Eat more sensibly".

Conflicting response was noticed found in response of a question asked at two different places in different styles. At one place a direct question (Table - 6.4) was asked to the respondents and majority of them responded that they did not consume alcohol at all or occasionally. At another place, an indirect question (Table - 6.10) was asked to the respondents and a reverse trend was reported. Out of the total respondents (1291), 53% respondents reported, moderate to higher level; they preferred to stay with friends and family.

Transfer of stressful task from one person to another is referred to as the delegation of responsibility. Almost 51% respondents reported on the lower side. It meant that they did not delegate their responsibility. The last attribute for coping of stress is quitting stressful environment, stressful task or the job itself. 46% respondents reported that they quit from stressful environment, stressful task or job itself to reduce the level of stress.

Table – 6.11: Descriptive Statistics: [Smoker and Non Smoker of Cigarette]			
Attributes		**N**	**%**
Do you smoke a cigarette?	Yes	198	15.4
	No	1086	84.6
	Total	**1284**	**100.0**
At what age you have started smoking?	Below 25	148	74.7
	2 – 30	35	17.7
	31 – 35	7	3.5
	36 – 40	8	4.0
	41 and above	0	.0
	Total	**198**	**100.0**
How many cigarettes do you smoke in a day?	One	76	38.4
	Two	28	14.1
	Three	41	20.7
	Four	21	10.6
	Five and above	32	16.2
	Total	**198**	**100.0**
In which categories do you rate yourself as a cigarette smoker?	Occasionally	105	53.0
	Regular	78	39.4
	Chain smoker	15	7.6
	Total	**198**	**100.0**
Which factors force you to smoke?	Work pressure	65	32.8
	Tension	33	16.7
	Headache	24	12.1
	To be fresh	76	38.4
	Total	**198**	**100.0**
What do you feel after smoking a cigarette?	Nothing	64	32.3
	Meet ego	7	3.5
	Relieved from tension	67	33.8
	Feel energetic	60	30.3
	Total	**198**	**100.0**
Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire			

Table – 6.12: Descriptive Statistics: [Consumer and Non Consumer of Tobacco]			
Attributes		**N**	**%**
Do you chew any Tobacco product?	Yes	225	17.4
	No	1066	82.6
	Total	**1291**	**100.0**
I started chewing at the age of:	Below 25	168	74.7
	2 - 30	37	16.4
	31 - 35	6	2.7
	36 - 40	13	5.8
	41 and above	1	.4
	Total	**225**	**100.0**
How many tobacco products do you consume in a day?	One	61	27.1
	Two	38	16.9
	Three	69	30.7
	Four	34	15.1
	Five and above	23	10.2
	Total	**225**	**100.0**
In which category do you rate yourself?	Occasionally	83	36.9
	Regular	117	52.0
	Chain smoker	25	11.1
	Total	**225**	**100.0**
Which of the following forces you to consume tobacco products?	Work pressure	48	21.3
	Tension	30	13.3
	Headache	49	21.8
	To be fresh	98	43.6
	Total	**225**	**100.0**
What you feel after consuming tobacco products?	Nothing	51	22.7
	Meet ego	10	4.4
	Relieved from tension	42	18.7
	Feel energetic	122	54.2
	Total	**225**	**100.0**
Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire			

Table - 6.13:Percentile Among Variables									
		MSS	PSS	OSS	PSSS	IPSSS	WSSS	RSSS	CS
N	Valid	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1180
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111
Percentiles	33	20.00	19.00	3.00	12.00	9.00	20.00	6.00	19.00
	66	34.00	32.00	6.00	20.00	14.00	31.00	10.72	26.00
MSS = Mental Symptoms of Stress; PSS = Physical Symptoms of Stress; OSS = Other Symptoms of Stress; PSSS = Personal Sphere of Sources of Stress; IPSSS = Interpersonal Sphere of Sources of Stress; WSSS = Work Sphere of Sources of Stress; RSSS = Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; CS = Coping Strategies.									
Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire									

To find out the rate of response, the data is divided into three groups on the basis of percentile. The overall responses of the respondents are divided into three categories i.e. Low, Moderate and High. Low Category has been defined as 33% or below of the total score while the moderate has been defined as 66% or below of the total score & More than 66% is considered as high level of response.

Under Mental Symptoms of Stress if a respondent score is 20 or below, they are considered in the lower rate of response up to 33 percentile while the increase in score up to 34 respondents is treated as moderate with a 66 percentile and more than 34 is considered as the high rate of response.

Under physical symptoms of stress if a respondent score is 19 or below, they are considered in the lower rate of response up to 33 percentile while if the scores increase up to 32 respondents it is treated as moderate with a 66 percentile and more than 32 is considered as the high rate of response.

Under other symptoms of stress if a respondent score is 3 or below, they are considered in the lower rate of response up to 33 percentile while if the scores increase up to 6 respondents it treated as moderate with a 66 percentile and more than 6 is considered as a high rate of response.

In Personal Sources of Stress if a respondents score is 12 or below, they are considered in the lower rate of response up to 33 percentile, and when the scores

increase up to 20 respondents it is treated as moderate with a 66 percentile and more than 20 is considered as the high rate of response.

In Inter Personal Sources of Stress if a respondents score is 9 or below, they are considered in the lower rate of response up to 33 percentile, and when the scores go up to 14 respondents it is treated as moderate with a 66 percentile and more than 14 is considered as the high rate of response.

In Work (Sphere) Sources of Stress if a respondents score is 20 or below, they are considered in the lower rate of response up to 33 percentile, and when the scores inch up to 31 respondents it is treated as moderate with a 66 percentile and more than 31 is considered as the high rate of response.

In Recreational (Sphere) Sources of Stress if a respondents score is 6 or below, they are considered in lower rate of response up to 33 percentile, while the increase in scores up to 10.72 respondents is treated as moderate with a 66 percentile and more than 10.72 is considered as the high rate of response.

In Coping Strategies if a respondents score is 19 or below, they are considered in lower rate of response up to 33 percentile, when the scores increase up to 26 respondents it is treated as moderate with a 66 percentile and more than 26 is considered as the high rate of response.

Table - 6.14: Cross Tabulation [Mental Symptoms of Stress Vs. Demographic Profile]

		Mental Symptoms of Stress							
		LOW		MODERATE		HIGH		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age	Below 25	139	43.3	112	34.9	70	21.8	321	100.0
	25 -30	209	45.3	152	33.0	100	21.7	461	100.0
	31 -35	38	20.7	74	40.2	72	39.1	184	100.0
	36 - 40	19	16.7	42	36.8	53	46.5	114	100.0
	41 -45	8	11.4	10	14.3	52	74.3	70	100.0
	46 - 50	2	2.6	35	45.5	40	51.9	77	100.0
	51 -58	11	19.6	23	41.1	22	39.3	56	100.0
	58 & above Retd.	3	37.5	2	25.0	3	37.5	8	100.0
Gender	Male	417	33.3	429	34.2	408	32.5	1254	100.0
	Female	12	32.4	21	56.8	4	10.8	37	100.0
Qualification	up to HSC	21	6.2	146	43.1	172	50.7	339	100.0
	Graduate	330	45.7	225	31.2	167	23.1	722	100.0
	Post graduate	77	35.2	75	34.2	67	30.6	219	100.0
	Others	1	9.1	4	36.4	6	54.5	11	100.0
Religion	Hindu	396	33.5	396	33.5	391	33.1	1183	100.0
	Muslim	27	30.3	46	51.7	16	18.0	89	100.0
	Sikh	6	85.7	0	.0	1	14.3	7	100.0
	Christian	0	.0	8	66.7	4	33.3	12	100.0
Category	General	149	28.5	178	34.0	196	37.5	523	100.0
	SEBC	97	22.6	186	43.4	146	34.0	429	100.0
	SC	154	65.8	48	20.5	32	13.7	234	100.0
	ST	29	27.6	38	36.2	38	36.2	105	100.0
Place of Residence	Urban	294	38.4	264	34.5	207	27.1	765	100.0
	Town	63	25.9	108	44.4	72	29.6	243	100.0
	Rural-Village	72	25.4	78	27.6	133	47.0	283	100.0
Marital Status	Married	331	35.0	319	33.7	297	31.4	947	100.0
	Unmarried	95	32.9	114	39.4	80	27.7	289	100.0
	Divorced	3	7.5	15	37.5	22	55.0	40	100.0
	Others	0	.0	2	13.3	13	86.7	15	100.0
Number of Dependant	Nil	259	44.7	152	26.3	168	29.0	579	100.0
	One	51	22.7	64	28.4	110	48.9	225	100.0
	Two	57	26.5	99	46.0	59	27.4	215	100.0
	Three	28	20.7	68	50.4	39	28.9	135	100.0
	Four	23	23.0	51	51.0	26	26.0	100	100.0
	Five & above	11	29.7	16	43.2	10	27.0	37	100.0
Location of Police Station	Urban	326	38.0	296	34.5	237	27.6	859	100.0
	Town	59	26.8	93	42.3	68	30.9	220	100.0
	Village	27	15.3	50	28.2	100	56.5	177	100.0
	Out post	17	48.6	11	31.4	7	20.0	35	100.0
Unit of Current Posting	Police Station	393	34.8	399	35.3	337	29.8	1129	100.0
	Police Chowky	36	22.2	51	31.5	75	46.3	162	100.0

Rank in the Police Force	DG, ADG, IG, SPL, IG, DIG	2	66.7	0	.0	1	33.3	3	100.0
	DSP/DCP, DYSP/ACP	23	32.4	29	40.8	19	26.8	71	100.0
	PI	33	26.2	48	38.1	45	35.7	126	100.0
	PSI, JAMADAR, HEAD CONSTABLE, CONSTABLE	371	34.0	373	34.2	347	31.8	1091	100.0
Experience	UP TO 5	246	38.4	245	38.2	150	23.4	641	100.0
	6 -10	136	37.8	87	24.2	137	38.1	360	100.0
	11 - 15	18	11.4	56	35.4	84	53.2	158	100.0
	16 - 20	15	23.8	22	34.9	26	41.3	63	100.0
	21 - 25	6	20.0	15	50.0	9	30.0	30	100.0
	26 -30	5	16.7	21	70.0	4	13.3	30	100.0
	Above 30	3	33.3	4	44.4	2	22.2	9	100.0
Income in Rupees	Below 1,00,000	263	36.2	264	36.4	199	27.4	726	100.0
	1,00,001 - 2,25,000	102	42.1	70	28.9	70	28.9	242	100.0
	2,25,001 - 3,00,000	33	17.5	77	40.7	79	41.8	189	100.0
	3,00,000 - 5,00,000	21	21.0	26	26.0	53	53.0	100	100.0
	above 5,00,000	10	29.4	13	38.2	11	32.4	34	100.0
Number of Family Members in Police Department	Nil	349	35.6	305	31.1	326	33.3	980	100.0
	One	57	29.7	89	46.4	46	24.0	192	100.0
	Two	14	19.2	39	53.4	20	27.4	73	100.0
	Three	6	20.0	11	36.7	13	43.3	30	100.0
	Four	2	20.0	4	40.0	4	40.0	10	100.0
	Five & above	1	16.7	2	33.3	3	50.0	6	100.0
	Total	**429**	**33.2**	**450**	**34.9**	**412**	**31.9**	**1291**	**100.0**
Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire									

Table - 6.14 contains the value of Cross Tabulation of Percentile (Rate of Response) of Mental Symptoms of Stress with Demographic Variables of the study. The table has three categories Low, Moderate and High which have a value of 33, 66 & 100 percentile respectively.

Out of total respondents (1291), 461 respondents belong to age group of 25-30 and only 8 respondents belong to age group of 58 and Above (Retired). Table 6.14 indicates that the majority of the respondents in this study are young in age. In the age group of 25-30, 31-35 and below 25, 100 respondents out of 461, 72 respondents out of 184 and 70 respondents out of 321 have reported high rate of mental symptoms of stress respectively. 74.3% respondents within the age group of 41-45,

51.9% respondents within the age group of 46-50 and 46.5% respondents within the age group of 36-40 have reported high rate of mental symptoms of stress.

In terms of the number of respondents belonging to 25-30 age group, more respondents have reported high mental symptoms of stress which indicate that the younger police personnel experience high level of mental symptoms of stress and in terms of percentage the respondents belonging to the age group of 41-45 have reported high level of mental symptoms of stress.

Out of the total respondents, only 37 respondents are female and majority of them have reported moderate level of mental symptoms of stress. Amongst the male respondents, the levels of mental symptoms of stress are distributed in equal proportion.

Out of the total respondents, more than half of the respondents are graduates, in which 167 respondents reported high level of mental symptoms of stress and 330 respondents reported low level of mental symptoms of stress. 11 respondents belong to the other category of educational qualification in which 6 respondents have reported high levels of mental symptoms of stress. Amongst all educational categories, respondents who have education up to HSC have reported higher levels of mental symptoms of stress, while more Post Graduate respondents have reported less mental symptoms of stress.

Out of the total respondents, 196 respondents belonging to the general category have reported high level of mental symptoms of stress, followed by SEBC. In terms of percentage respondents of general category have reported higher levels of mental symptoms of stress followed by ST.

Out of total respondents, 297 respondents of married category have reported high level of mental symptoms of stress. 55% of respondents in the divorced category

have reported high level of mental symptoms of stress and only 7.5% have reported low level of mental symptoms of stress.

Out of the 110 respondents, those who have one dependent member have reported high level of mental symptoms of stress and as the number of dependents increase, there is a negative relationship among the number of dependents and number of respondents who have high level of mental symptoms of stress. But if we consider it in terms of percentage there is not much variation in the response of respondents as shown in Table - 6.14. Out of the total respondents belonging to the location of urban police station, 237 have been reported high level of mental symptoms of stress and in terms of percentage within the group location of village police stations, 56.5% respondents reported high level of mental symptoms of stress. There is not much variation in the level of mental symptoms of stress reported in the place of police station of the respondents' response for unit of current posting but there is a variation in police Chowki. 46.3% respondents within the group have reported high level of mental symptoms of stress.

Out of total respondents, 35.7% respondents within the group of PI reported high level of mental symptoms of stress followed by DG, Add. DG, IG, Spl. IG and DIG. Under the category of PSI, Jamadar, Head constable and Constable 347 respondents reported high level of mental symptoms of stress and 371 respondents have reported low level of mental symptoms of stress.

Out of total respondents, 360 respondents belong to 6-10 years of experience, 137 respondents have reported high level of mental symptoms of stress but in terms of percentage within the group, 53.2% respondents, belong to 11-15 years of experience have reported high level of mental symptoms of stress followed by respondents having experience of 16-20 years.

This study considered the income of respondents as one of the demographic variables in which respondents having income ranging between 3-5 lakhs, 53% of the

respondents have reported high level of mental symptoms of stress followed by respondents' whose income ranged between 2.25-3.0 lakhs. In the lower category of income, the responses of the respondents with reference to the level of mental symptoms of stress have less variation in terms of the rate of response.

Table - 6.14 indicates that there is a strong negative association between the number of family member in the police department and the number of respondents' who respond to higher level of mental symptoms of stress. But the case reported inversely in the lower level of mental symptoms of stress.

Table - 6.15: Cross Tabulation [Physical Symptoms of Stress Vs. Demographic Profile]

		Physical Symptoms of Stress							
		LOW		MODERATE		HIGH		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age	Below 25	134	41.7	93	29.0	94	29.3	321	100.0
	25 -30	226	49.0	111	24.1	124	26.9	461	100.0
	31 -35	49	26.6	60	32.6	75	40.8	184	100.0
	36 - 40	12	10.5	58	50.9	44	38.6	114	100.0
	41 -45	1	1.4	42	60.0	27	38.6	70	100.0
	46 - 50	5	6.5	31	40.3	41	53.2	77	100.0
	51 -58	17	30.4	17	30.4	22	39.3	56	100.0
	58 & above Retd.	4	50.0	2	25.0	2	25.0	8	100.0
Gender	Male	438	34.9	394	31.4	422	33.7	1254	100.0
	Female	10	27.0	20	54.1	7	18.9	37	100.0
Qualification	up to HSC	5	1.5	127	37.5	207	61.1	339	100.0
	Graduate	348	48.2	205	28.4	169	23.4	722	100.0
	Post graduate	93	42.5	82	37.4	44	20.1	219	100.0
	Others	2	18.2	0	.0	9	81.8	11	100.0
Religion	Hindu	415	35.1	376	31.8	392	33.1	1183	100.0
	Muslim	24	27.0	33	37.1	32	36.0	89	100.0
	Sikh	6	85.7	0	.0	1	14.3	7	100.0
	Christian	3	25.0	5	41.7	4	33.3	12	100.0
Category	General	138	26.4	191	36.5	194	37.1	523	100.0
	SEBC	103	24.0	158	36.8	168	39.2	429	100.0
	SC	163	69.7	44	18.8	27	11.5	234	100.0
	ST	44	41.9	21	20.0	40	38.1	105	100.0
Place of Residence	Urban	280	36.6	219	28.6	266	34.8	765	100.0
	Town	69	28.4	83	34.2	91	37.4	243	100.0
	Rural-Village	99	35.0	112	39.6	72	25.4	283	100.0
Marital Status	Married	340	35.9	306	32.3	301	31.8	947	100.0

	Unmarried	105	36.3	88	30.4	96	33.2	289	100.0
	Divorced	2	5.0	17	42.5	21	52.5	40	100.0
	Others	1	6.7	3	20.0	11	73.3	15	100.0
Number of Dependants	Nil	260	44.9	116	20.0	203	35.1	579	100.0
	One	59	26.2	100	44.4	66	29.3	225	100.0
	Two	59	27.4	100	46.5	56	26.0	215	100.0
	Three	38	28.1	46	34.1	51	37.8	135	100.0
	Four	24	24.0	37	37.0	39	39.0	100	100.0
	five & above	8	21.6	15	40.5	14	37.8	37	100.0
Location of Police Station	Urban	338	39.3	234	27.2	287	33.4	859	100.0
	Town	52	23.6	84	38.2	84	38.2	220	100.0
	Village	33	18.6	91	51.4	53	29.9	177	100.0
	Out post	25	71.4	5	14.3	5	14.3	35	100.0
Unit of Current Posting	Police Station	415	36.8	371	32.9	343	30.4	1129	100.0
	Police Chowky	33	20.4	43	26.5	86	53.1	162	100.0
Rank in the Police Force	DG, ADG, IG, SPL, IG, DIG	1	33.3	0	.0	2	66.7	3	100.0
	DSP/DCP, DYSP/ACP	23	32.4	19	26.8	29	40.8	71	100.0
	PI	26	20.6	45	35.7	55	43.7	126	100.0
	PSI, JAMADAR, HEAD CONSTABLE, CONSTABLE	398	36.5	350	32.1	343	31.4	1091	100.0
Experience	UP TO 5	271	42.3	180	28.1	190	29.6	641	100.0
	6 -10	139	38.6	102	28.3	119	33.1	360	100.0
	11 - 15	8	5.1	78	49.4	72	45.6	158	100.0
	16 - 20	15	23.8	24	38.1	24	38.1	63	100.0
	21 - 25	4	13.3	12	40.0	14	46.7	30	100.0
	26 -30	6	20.0	15	50.0	9	30.0	30	100.0
	Above 30	5	55.6	3	33.3	1	11.1	9	100.0
Income in Rupees	Below 1,00,000	291	40.1	199	27.4	236	32.5	726	100.0
	1,00,001 - 2,25,000	101	41.7	60	24.8	81	33.5	242	100.0
	2,25,001 - 3,00,000	27	14.3	94	49.7	68	36.0	189	100.0
	3,00,000 - 5,00,000	20	20.0	48	48.0	32	32.0	100	100.0
	above 5,00,000	9	26.5	13	38.2	12	35.3	34	100.0
Number of Family Members in Police Department	Nil	369	37.7	281	28.7	330	33.7	980	100.0
	One	54	28.1	78	40.6	60	31.3	192	100.0
	Two	17	23.3	36	49.3	20	27.4	73	100.0
	Three	5	16.7	11	36.7	14	46.7	30	100.0
	Four	0	.0	6	60.0	4	40.0	10	100.0
	Five & above	3	50.0	2	33.3	1	16.7	6	100.0
	Total	448	34.7	414	32.1	429	33.2	1291	100.0

Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire

Table - 6.15 shows the output rate of response between physical symptoms of stress and the demographic variables of respondents (Low, Moderate and High) on the

basis of Table - 6.13. Out of the total respondents (1291), 461 respondents belong to the age group of 25-30, out of which 124 respondents reported higher level of physical symptoms of stress, followed by the age group of 25 and below with a total of 94 respondents in this category. In terms of percentage, 53.2% of respondents belonging to the age group 46-50 reported higher level of physical symptoms of stress within that group, followed by the age group of 31-35 with a 40.8% of the respondents.

The response rate of the respondents among male category is almost equal in all the three categories of the response, while among female the majority of the respondents reported a moderate level of physical symptoms of stress as reported in Table - 6.15.

Out of the total respondents (1291), 339 respondents have educational qualification up to HSC, out of which 207 respondents have reported higher level of physical symptoms of stress. There is an inverse relationship between educational qualification and high level of physical symptoms of stress. In the other category of educational qualification, 9 respondents out of 11 have reported high level of physical symptoms of stress.

In the caste category of the respondents, 194 (out of 523) respondents in the general category have reported high level of physical symptoms of stress, followed by SEBC, ST category having 168 respondents (out of 429), 40 respondents (out of 105) reporting high level of physical symptoms of stress respectively.

Married respondents in this study have reported an equal rate of physical symptoms of stress while in the divorced and other category of marital status 21 out of 40 respondents, 11 out of 15 respondents have reported high level of physical symptoms of stress respectively. The highest numbers of respondents in the unmarried category have reported low level of physical symptoms of stress.

The level of physical symptoms of stress is high among respondents who do not have any dependents and it decreases with an increase in the number of dependents up to two dependents but when dependents increase up to three or more, the level of physical symptoms of stress starts increasing as reported in Table - 6.15.

The location of police station and the level of physical symptoms of stress has some association among them as reported in Table - 6.15. 338 respondents from police stations located in urban areas, have reported low level of physical symptoms of stress while 287 respondents within the same group have reported high level of physical symptoms of stress. From police station located at outpost, the highest numbers of respondents (25 out of 35) have reported low level of physical symptoms of stress.

Among the unit of current posting, respondents posted at police chowki have reported high level of physical symptoms of stress while a high number of respondents in police stations have reported a low level of stress.

With regard to the designation of the respondents, the highest level of physical symptoms of stress has been reported by the police personnel on top positions (DG, Add. DG, IG Spl. IG & DIG) followed by Police Inspector (PI). Among the lower designations of police personnel, the levels of physical symptoms of stress have been equally reported in all three categories.

Experience in the police force and the level of physical symptoms of stress vary differentially in categories 271 respondents out of 640 having an experience up to five years, have reported low level of physical symptoms of stress. In terms of percentage, experience of 21-25 years, 46% respondents within this group have reported a high level of physical symptoms of stress followed by respondents having an experience 11-15 years, 16-20 years respectively. A majority of respondents having an experience 30 years and above (retired) have reported low level of physical symptoms of stress. There is not much impact of income on high and low

levels of physical symptoms of stress in the responses of the respondents as reported in Table – 6.15 while moderate level of physical symptoms of stress varies as income varies.

The number of family members in the police department and the level of physical symptoms of stress are equally distributed among all three categories but about low level of physical symptoms of stress, 369 respondents out of 448 have responded that they do not have any family members in the police department and the same trend been reported in moderate and high level of physical symptoms of stress.

Table – 6.16: Cross Tabulation [Other Symptoms of Stress Vs. Demographic Profile]

		Other Symptoms of Stress							
		LOW		MODERATE		HIGH		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age	Below 25	175	54.5	93	29.0	53	16.5	321	100.0
	25 -30	266	57.7	99	21.5	96	20.8	461	100.0
	31 -35	85	46.2	54	29.3	45	24.5	184	100.0
	36 – 40	42	36.8	24	21.1	48	42.1	114	100.0
	41 -45	19	27.1	3	4.3	48	68.6	70	100.0
	46 – 50	36	46.8	8	10.4	33	42.9	77	100.0
	51 -58	24	42.9	22	39.3	10	17.9	56	100.0
	58 & above Retd.	4	50.0	1	12.5	3	37.5	8	100.0
Gender	Male	621	49.5	301	24.0	332	26.5	1254	100.0
	Female	30	81.1	3	8.1	4	10.8	37	100.0
Qualification	up to HSC	146	43.1	72	21.2	121	35.7	339	100.0
	Graduate	394	54.6	189	26.2	139	19.3	722	100.0
	Post graduate	107	48.9	43	19.6	69	31.5	219	100.0
	Others	4	36.4	0	.0	7	63.6	11	100.0
Religion	Hindu	597	50.5	263	22.2	323	27.3	1183	100.0
	Muslim	44	49.4	36	40.4	9	10.1	89	100.0
	Sikh	7	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	7	100.0
	Christian	3	25.0	5	41.7	4	33.3	12	100.0
Category	General	219	41.9	133	25.4	171	32.7	523	100.0
	SEBC	201	46.9	112	26.1	116	27.0	429	100.0
	SC	171	73.1	39	16.7	24	10.3	234	100.0
	ST	60	57.1	20	19.0	25	23.8	105	100.0
Place of Residence	Urban	424	55.4	170	22.2	171	22.4	765	100.0
	Town	104	42.8	92	37.9	47	19.3	243	100.0
	Rural-Village	123	43.5	42	14.8	118	41.7	283	100.0
Marital Status	Married	514	54.3	179	18.9	254	26.8	947	100.0

	Unmarried	121	41.9	106	36.7	62	21.5	289	100.0
	Divorced	12	30.0	13	32.5	15	37.5	40	100.0
	Others	4	26.7	6	40.0	5	33.3	15	100.0
Number of Dependant	Nil	329	56.8	138	23.8	112	19.3	579	100.0
	0ne	92	40.9	58	25.8	75	33.3	225	100.0
	Two	101	47.0	55	25.6	59	27.4	215	100.0
	Three	74	54.8	20	14.8	41	30.4	135	100.0
	Four	39	39.0	21	21.0	40	40.0	100	100.0
	Five & above	16	43.2	12	32.4	9	24.3	37	100.0
Location of Police Station	Urban	456	53.1	205	23.9	198	23.1	859	100.0
	Town	109	49.5	72	32.7	39	17.7	220	100.0
	Village	59	33.3	25	14.1	93	52.5	177	100.0
	Out post	27	77.1	2	5.7	6	17.1	35	100.0
Unit of Current Posting	Police Station	570	50.5	269	23.8	290	25.7	1129	100.0
	Police Chowky	81	50.0	35	21.6	46	28.4	162	100.0
Rank in the Police Force	DG, ADG, IG, SPL, IG, DIG	0	.0	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	100.0
	DSP/DCP, DYSP/ACP	34	47.9	22	31.0	15	21.1	71	100.0
	PI	39	31.0	52	41.3	35	27.8	126	100.0
	PSI, JAMADAR, HEAD CONSTABLE, CONSTABLE	578	53.0	228	20.9	285	26.1	1091	100.0
Experience	UP TO 5	329	51.3	178	27.8	134	20.9	641	100.0
	6 -10	193	53.6	59	16.4	108	30.0	360	100.0
	11 - 15	48	30.4	42	26.6	68	43.0	158	100.0
	16 - 20	39	61.9	11	17.5	13	20.6	63	100.0
	21 - 25	15	50.0	7	23.3	8	26.7	30	100.0
	26 -30	20	66.7	6	20.0	4	13.3	30	100.0
	Above 30	7	77.8	1	11.1	1	11.1	9	100.0
Income in Rupees	Below 1,00,000	399	55.0	179	24.7	148	20.4	726	100.0
	1,00,001 - 2,25,000	128	52.9	47	19.4	67	27.7	242	100.0
	2,25,001 - 3,00,000	75	39.7	49	25.9	65	34.4	189	100.0
	3,00,000 - 5,00,000	36	36.0	15	15.0	49	49.0	100	100.0
	above 5,00,000	13	38.2	14	41.2	7	20.6	34	100.0
Number of Family Members in Police Department	Nil	501	51.1	218	22.2	261	26.6	980	100.0
	One	87	45.3	55	28.6	50	26.0	192	100.0
	Two	42	57.5	18	24.7	13	17.8	73	100.0
	Three	15	50.0	7	23.3	8	26.7	30	100.0
	Four	4	40.0	2	20.0	4	40.0	10	100.0
	Five & above	2	33.3	4	66.7	0	.0	6	100.0
	Total	651	50.4	304	23.5	336	26.0	1291	100.0

Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire

In other symptoms of stress, a majority of the respondents have responded to a low rate of response for identified attributes like smoking, medication and alcohol. All

the demographic variables have a similar trend as far as the response rate of the respondents is concerned for other symptoms of stress except in the category of divorced under marital status of the respondents as shown in the Table - 6.16.

In the category of village, under location of police station, more than 50% of the respondents have responded highly for the other symptoms of stress. The point to be noted here is that the study is conducted among police personnel, who are in public life; they are very reluctant to provide accurate information regarding their smoking and drinking habits for various reasons.

Table - 6.17: Cross Tabulation [Sources of Stress; Personal Sphere Vs. Demographic Profile]

		Personal Sphere of Sources of Stress							
		LOW		MODERATE		HIGH		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age	Below 25	147	45.8	101	31.5	73	22.7	321	100.0
	25 -30	192	41.6	155	33.6	114	24.7	461	100.0
	31 -35	35	19.0	83	45.1	66	35.9	184	100.0
	36 - 40	23	20.2	53	46.5	38	33.3	114	100.0
	41 -45	6	8.6	32	45.7	32	45.7	70	100.0
	46 - 50	12	15.6	18	23.4	47	61.0	77	100.0
	51 -58	15	26.8	14	25.0	27	48.2	56	100.0
	58 & above Retd.	4	50.0	2	25.0	2	25.0	8	100.0
Gender	Male	416	33.2	444	35.4	394	31.4	1254	100.0
	Female	18	48.6	14	37.8	5	13.5	37	100.0
Qualification	up to HSC	34	10.0	120	35.4	185	54.6	339	100.0
	Graduate	332	46.0	240	33.2	150	20.8	722	100.0
	Post graduate	66	30.1	93	42.5	60	27.4	219	100.0
	Others	2	18.2	5	45.5	4	36.4	11	100.0
Religion	Hindu	407	34.4	401	33.9	375	31.7	1183	100.0
	Muslim	22	24.7	47	52.8	20	22.5	89	100.0
	Sikh	2	28.6	4	57.1	1	14.3	7	100.0
	Christian	3	25.0	6	50.0	3	25.0	12	100.0
Category	General	149	28.5	171	32.7	203	38.8	523	100.0
	SEBC	90	21.0	191	44.5	148	34.5	429	100.0
	SC	154	65.8	62	26.5	18	7.7	234	100.0
	ST	41	39.0	34	32.4	30	28.6	105	100.0
Place of Residence	Urban	298	39.0	228	29.8	239	31.2	765	100.0
	Town	70	28.8	112	46.1	61	25.1	243	100.0
	Rural-Village	66	23.3	118	41.7	99	35.0	283	100.0
Marital Status	Married	334	35.3	333	35.2	280	29.6	947	100.0

	Unmarried	95	32.9	103	35.6	91	31.5	289	100.0
	Divorced	2	5.0	18	45.0	20	50.0	40	100.0
	Others	3	20.0	4	26.7	8	53.3	15	100.0
Number of Dependants	Nil	250	43.2	149	25.7	180	31.1	579	100.0
	One	55	24.4	100	44.4	70	31.1	225	100.0
	Two	62	28.8	96	44.7	57	26.5	215	100.0
	Three	26	19.3	64	47.4	45	33.3	135	100.0
	Four	28	28.0	42	42.0	30	30.0	100	100.0
	Five & above	13	35.1	7	18.9	17	45.9	37	100.0
Location of Police Station	Urban	331	38.5	274	31.9	254	29.6	859	100.0
	Town	56	25.5	96	43.6	68	30.9	220	100.0
	Village	31	17.5	76	42.9	70	39.5	177	100.0
	Out post	16	45.7	12	34.3	7	20.0	35	100.0
Unit of Current Posting	Police Station	393	34.8	400	35.4	336	29.8	1129	100.0
	Police Chowky	41	25.3	58	35.8	63	38.9	162	100.0
Rank in the Police–Force	DG, ADG, IG, SPL, IG, DIG	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	3	100.0
	DSP/DCP, DYSP/ACP	26	36.6	29	40.8	16	22.5	71	100.0
	PI	26	20.6	49	38.9	51	40.5	126	100.0
	PSI, JAMADAR, HEAD CONSTABLE, CONSTABLE	381	34.9	379	34.7	331	30.3	1091	100.0
Experience	UP TO 5	223	34.8	262	40.9	156	24.3	641	100.0
	6 -10	144	40.0	96	26.7	120	33.3	360	100.0
	11 – 15	18	11.4	60	38.0	80	50.6	158	100.0
	16 – 20	20	31.7	18	28.6	25	39.7	63	100.0
	21 – 25	15	50.0	4	13.3	11	36.7	30	100.0
	26 -30	9	30.0	15	50.0	6	20.0	30	100.0
	Above 30	5	55.6	3	33.3	1	11.1	9	100.0
Income in Rupees	Below 1,00,000	250	34.4	275	37.9	201	27.7	726	100.0
	1,00,001 - 2,25,000	106	43.8	57	23.6	79	32.6	242	100.0
	2,25,001 - 3,00,000	41	21.7	72	38.1	76	40.2	189	100.0
	3,00,000 - 5,00,000	22	22.0	45	45.0	33	33.0	100	100.0
	above 5,00,000	15	44.1	9	26.5	10	29.4	34	100.0
Number of Family Members in Police Department	Nil	335	34.2	331	33.8	314	32.0	980	100.0
	One	58	30.2	81	42.2	53	27.6	192	100.0
	Two	29	39.7	24	32.9	20	27.4	73	100.0
	Three	7	23.3	15	50.0	8	26.7	30	100.0
	Four	0	.0	6	60.0	4	40.0	10	100.0
	Five & above	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	.0	6	100.0
	Total	434	33.6	458	35.5	399	30.9	1291	100.0
Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire									

In personal sources of stress 461 respondents out of 1291, belong to the age group of 25 – 30 years, out of them 114 respondents have reported a high rate of response

while 192 respondents have reported a low rate of response to personal sources of stress. Out of 77 respondents in the age group of 46 - 50, 47 respondents reported a high rate of response to personal sources of stress while 12 respondents reported a low rate of response. The level of rate of response is indifferent to gender as shown in the Table - 6.17.

The educational qualification of the respondents and their rate of response towards personal sources of stress vary from each other. Up to HSC category, out of 339, 185 respondents have reported a high rate of response while 34 respondents have reported a low rate of response. Among the graduate respondents the number of response and the level of rate of response are inversely related.

In the caste category 523 respondents belong to the general category, out of which 203 respondents reported high rate of response for personal source of stress, followed by SEBC category as shown in Table - 17. In SC category out of 234, 154 respondents reported a low rate of response followed by the ST category.

Regarding marital status of the respondents in each category, a majority of the respondents reported moderate and high rate of response towards personal sources of stress. The number of dependents on the respondents and the response rate for moderate and high level in personal sources of stress are directly related with each others. Among the respondents, those who have only two dependents, 96 respondents out of 215 reported a moderate rate of response for personal sources of stress.

Location of a police station and the level of rate of response for personal sources of stress are inversely related with the low rate of response and the number of respondents. Among the respondents who are posted in village police station, 146 respondents out of 177 reported a moderate and high rate of response for the personal sources of stress and a similar trend is observed in town and urban areas.

Of the total respondents (1291), 126 belong to PI category out of which 51 respondents have reported a high rate of response, while 26 respondents have reported a low rate of response for personal sources of stress. The number of respondents in the high rate of response is decreasing with an increase in the experience of the respondents as reported in Table – 6.17.

Respondents who fall in the below Rs 1,00,000 income category respond in a similar way in all the three levels of the rate of response for personal sources of stress whereas with an increase in income from Rs 2.25 lakhs and above the response rate in high rate of response are increasing.

Table – 6.18: Cross Tabulation [Sources of Stress; Interpersonal Sphere Vs. Demographic Profile]

		Interpersonal Sphere of Sources of Stress							
		LOW		MODERATE		HIGH		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age	Below 25	145	45.2	109	34.0	67	20.9	321	100.0
	25 -30	210	45.6	140	30.4	111	24.1	461	100.0
	31 -35	47	25.5	65	35.3	72	39.1	184	100.0
	36 – 40	21	18.4	49	43.0	44	38.6	114	100.0
	41 -45	9	12.9	26	37.1	35	50.0	70	100.0
	46 – 50	10	13.0	24	31.2	43	55.8	77	100.0
	51 -58	24	42.9	14	25.0	18	32.1	56	100.0
	58 & above Retd.	3	37.5	2	25.0	3	37.5	8	100.0
Gender	Male	448	35.7	417	33.3	389	31.0	1254	100.0
	Female	21	56.8	12	32.4	4	10.8	37	100.0
Qualification	up to HSC	56	16.5	112	33.0	171	50.4	339	100.0
	Graduate	326	45.2	240	33.2	156	21.6	722	100.0
	Post graduate	86	39.3	75	34.2	58	26.5	219	100.0
	Others	1	9.1	2	18.2	8	72.7	11	100.0
Religion	Hindu	425	35.9	393	33.2	365	30.9	1183	100.0
	Muslim	33	37.1	33	37.1	23	25.8	89	100.0
	Sikh	6	85.7	1	14.3	0	.0	7	100.0
	Christian	5	41.7	2	16.7	5	41.7	12	100.0
Category	General	161	30.8	184	35.2	178	34.0	523	100.0
	SEBC	123	28.7	157	36.6	149	34.7	429	100.0
	SC	133	56.8	68	29.1	33	14.1	234	100.0
	ST	52	49.5	20	19.0	33	31.4	105	100.0
Place of Residence	Urban	304	39.7	247	32.3	214	28.0	765	100.0
	Town	79	32.5	84	34.6	80	32.9	243	100.0

	Rural-Village	86	30.4	98	34.6	99	35.0	283	100.0
Marital Status	Married	347	36.6	327	34.5	273	28.8	947	100.0
	Unmarried	115	39.8	82	28.4	92	31.8	289	100.0
	Divorced	7	17.5	12	30.0	21	52.5	40	100.0
	Others	0	.0	8	53.3	7	46.7	15	100.0
Number of Dependants	Nil	254	43.9	152	26.3	173	29.9	579	100.0
	One	58	25.8	98	43.6	69	30.7	225	100.0
	Two	79	36.7	78	36.3	58	27.0	215	100.0
	Three	38	28.1	50	37.0	47	34.8	135	100.0
	Four	34	34.0	37	37.0	29	29.0	100	100.0
	Five & above	6	16.2	14	37.8	17	45.9	37	100.0
Location of Police Station	Urban	357	41.6	267	31.1	235	27.4	859	100.0
	Town	60	27.3	82	37.3	78	35.5	220	100.0
	Village	38	21.5	66	37.3	73	41.2	177	100.0
	Out post	14	40.0	14	40.0	7	20.0	35	100.0
Unit of Current Posting	Police Station	430	38.1	365	—32.3	334	29.6	1129	100.0
	Police Chowky	39	24.1	64	39.5	59	36.4	162	100.0
Rank in the Police Force	DG, ADG, IG, SPL, IG, DIG	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	3	100.0
	DSP/DCP, DYSP/ACP	30	42.3	21	29.6	20	28.2	71	100.0
	PI	25	19.8	55	43.7	46	36.5	126	100.0
	PSI, JAMADAR, HEAD CONSTABLE, CONSTABLE	413	37.9	352	32.3	326	29.9	1091	100.0
Experience	UP TO 5	270	42.1	210	32.8	161	25.1	641	100.0
	6 -10	126	35.0	104	28.9	130	36.1	360	100.0
	11 – 15	16	10.1	72	45.6	70	44.3	158	100.0
	16 – 20	22	34.9	24	38.1	17	27.0	63	100.0
	21 – 25	20	66.7	3	10.0	7	23.3	30	100.0
	26 -30	11	36.7	14	46.7	5	16.7	30	100.0
	Above 30	4	44.4	2	22.2	3	33.3	9	100.0
Income in Rupees	Below 1,00,000	276	38.0	232	32.0	218	30.0	726	100.0
	1,00,001 - 2,25,000	104	43.0	68	28.1	70	28.9	242	100.0
	2,25,001 - 3,00,000	53	28.0	72	38.1	64	33.9	189	100.0
	3,00,000 - 5,00,000	17	17.0	49	49.0	34	34.0	100	100.0
	above 5,00,000	19	55.9	8	23.5	7	20.6	34	100.0
Number of Family Members in Police Department	Nil	369	37.7	291	29.7	320	32.7	980	100.0
	One	63	32.8	81	42.2	48	25.0	192	100.0
	Two	23	31.5	35	47.9	15	20.5	73	100.0
	Three	7	23.3	17	56.7	6	20.0	30	100.0
	Four	4	40.0	2	20.0	4	40.0	10	100.0
	Five & above	3	50.0	3	50.0	0	.0	6	100.0
	Total	469	36.3	429	33.2	393	30.4	1291	100.0
Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire									

Of the total respondents (1291), a majority of the respondents have reported moderate and high rate of response for interpersonal source of stress and the same trend continues with an increase in the age of respondents as shown in Table - 6.18. In the category of male respondents, more number of respondents within the group has reported low rate of response followed by moderate and high rate of response for inter personal sources of stress.

In the category of educational qualification i.e., upto HSC 171 (out of 339) respondents have reported high rate of response for inter personal sources of stress whereas in graduate and post graduate category, more number of respondents, within the group, have reported low rate of response for inter personal sources of stress. Among other category's 8 respondents out of 11 have reported a high rate of response for inter personal sources of stress.

Among the caste category of the respondents, a majority of the respondents have reported moderate and high rate of response for inter personal sources of stress whereas in the SC & ST category, a majority of the respondents within the group have reported a low rate of response for inter personal sources of stress.

Regarding the marital status of the respondents in each category, the majority of respondents reported moderate and high rate of response towards personal sources of stress. The number of dependents on the respondents and the number of respondents towards moderate and high rate of response for interpersonal sources of stress are directly related with each other.

The location of a police station and the level of rate of response for inter personal sources of stress are inversely related with low rate of response and the number of respondents. Out of the 177 respondents who are posted in village police station 139 respondents reported moderate and high rate of response for the inter personal sources of stress and a similar trend is observed in town and urban.

In the PI category of rank in the police force, 55 respondents have reported a moderate rate of response followed by a high rate of response within the group, whereas in PSI category of rank in police force, 413 respondents have reported low rate of response for inter personal sources of stress, followed by moderate and high within the group. The number of respondents among the high rate of response is decreasing with an increase in the experience of the respondents as reported in Table - 6.18 for inter personal sources of stress.

The income categories and the number of respondents in the various levels of inter personal stress are varied. 276 respondents whose income fall below Rs. 10,000 have reported low rate of response followed by moderate and high rate of response for inter personal sources of stress. Respondents belonging to the income category of 2.25-5.0 lakhs, a majority of the respondents have reported moderate and high level of rate of response for interpersonal sources of stress.

Table - 6.19: Cross Tabulation [Sources of Stress; Work Sphere Vs. Demographic Profile]

		Work Sphere of Sources of Stress							
		LOW		MODERATE		HIGH		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age	Below 25	150	46.7	110	34.3	61	19.0	321	100.0
	25 -30	191	41.4	144	31.2	126	27.3	461	100.0
	31 -35	50	27.2	79	42.9	55	29.9	184	100.0
	36 - 40	21	18.4	42	36.8	51	44.7	114	100.0
	41 -45	9	12.9	25	35.7	36	51.4	70	100.0
	46 - 50	12	15.6	23	29.9	42	54.5	77	100.0
	51 -58	22	39.3	18	32.1	16	28.6	56	100.0
	58 & above Retd.	3	37.5	4	50.0	1	12.5	8	100.0
Gender	Male	435	34.7	435	34.7	384	30.6	1254	100.0
	Female	23	62.2	10	27.0	4	10.8	37	100.0
Qualification	up to HSC	43	12.7	171	50.4	125	36.9	339	100.0
	Graduate	353	48.9	187	25.9	182	25.2	722	100.0
	Post graduate	61	27.9	83	37.9	75	34.2	219	100.0
	Others	1	9.1	4	36.4	6	54.5	11	100.0
Religion	Hindu	418	35.3	400	33.8	365	30.9	1183	100.0
	Muslim	29	32.6	43	48.3	17	19.1	89	100.0
	Sikh	6	85.7	0	.0	1	14.3	7	100.0
	Christian	5	41.7	2	16.7	5	41.7	12	100.0

Category	General	171	32.7	173	33.1	179	34.2	523	100.0
	SEBC	87	20.3	186	43.4	156	36.4	429	100.0
	SC	163	69.7	45	19.2	26	11.1	234	100.0
	ST	37	35.2	41	39.0	27	25.7	105	100.0
Place of Residence	Urban	328	42.9	241	31.5	196	25.6	765	100.0
	Town	76	31.3	99	40.7	68	28.0	243	100.0
	Rural-Village	54	19.1	105	37.1	124	43.8	283	100.0
Marital Status	Married	346	36.5	308	32.5	293	30.9	947	100.0
	Unmarried	106	36.7	107	37.0	76	26.3	289	100.0
	Divorced	6	15.0	23	57.5	11	27.5	40	100.0
	Others	0	.0	7	46.7	8	53.3	15	100.0
Number of Dependants	Nil	256	44.2	202	34.9	121	20.9	579	100.0
	One	68	30.2	65	28.9	92	40.9	225	100.0
	Two	60	27.9	79	36.7	76	35.3	215	100.0
	Three	28	20.7	53	39.3	54	40.0	135	100.0
	Four	38	38.0	32	32.0	30	30.0	100	100.0
	Five & above	8	21.6	14	37.8	15	40.5	37	100.0
Location of Police Station	Urban	354	41.2	278	32.4	227	26.4	859	100.0
	Town	63	28.6	107	48.6	50	22.7	220	100.0
	Village	22	12.4	49	27.7	106	59.9	177	100.0
	Out post	19	54.3	11	31.4	5	14.3	35	100.0
Unit of Current Posting	Police Station	419	37.1	383	33.9	327	29.0	1129	100.0
	Police Chowky	39	24.1	62	38.3	61	37.7	162	100.0
Rank in the Police Force	DG, ADG, IG, SPL, IG, DIG	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	3	100.0
	DSP/DCP, DYSP/ACP	32	45.1	21	29.6	18	25.4	71	100.0
	PI	34	27.0	45	35.7	47	37.3	126	100.0
	PSI, JAMADAR, HEAD CONSTABLE, CONSTABLE	391	35.8	378	34.6	322	29.5	1091	100.0
Experience	UP TO 5	232	36.2	245	38.2	164	25.6	641	100.0
	6 -10	151	41.9	94	26.1	115	31.9	360	100.0
	11 - 15	25	15.8	59	37.3	74	46.8	158	100.0
	16 - 20	21	33.3	26	41.3	16	25.4	63	100.0
	21 - 25	13	43.3	7	23.3	10	33.3	30	100.0
	26 -30	13	43.3	11	36.7	6	20.0	30	100.0
	Above 30	3	33.3	3	33.3	3	33.3	9	100.0
Income in Rupees	Below 1,00,000	254	35.0	301	41.5	171	23.6	726	100.0
	1,00,001 - 2,25,000	112	46.3	60	24.8	70	28.9	242	100.0
	2,25,001 - 3,00,000	52	27.5	56	29.6	81	42.9	189	100.0
	3,00,000 - 5,00,000	26	26.0	18	18.0	56	56.0	100	100.0
	above 5,00,000	14	41.2	10	29.4	10	29.4	34	100.0
Number of Family Members in Police Department	Nil	340	34.7	340	34.7	300	30.6	980	100.0
	One	85	44.3	55	28.6	52	27.1	192	100.0
	Two	21	28.8	31	42.5	21	28.8	73	100.0
	Three	7	23.3	12	40.0	11	36.7	30	100.0

	Four	4	40.0	2	20.0	4	40.0	10	100.0
	Five & above	1	16.7	5	83.3	0	.0	6	100.0
	Total	458	35.5	445	34.5	388	30.1	1291	100.0
Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire									

Out of the total respondents, a majority of the respondents have reported moderate to high rate of response for Sources of stress at work place in all categories of age. In the age group of 41-45 and 46-50, only 9 and 12 respondents have reported a low rate of response within the group of sources of stress at work place respectively.

In the category of gender, 819 male respondents reported moderate to high rate of response for sources of stress at work place whereas among the female, a majority of the respondents have reported low rate of response for sources of stress at work place. 171 respondents out of 339 having educational qualification up to HSC, have reported a moderate level of rate of response for sources of stress at work place followed by high rate of response (125 respondents). Among the graduate respondents, the response rate of the respondents are similarly divided in two levels i.e. low (353 respondents) and Moderate to high (369 respondents) as shown in Table - 6.19.

In the caste category i.e., General category; respondents' response rate is uniformly divided among three categories whereas in SEBC category 186 respondents out of 429 have reported moderate level of rate of response for the sources of stress at work place followed by a high level of rate of response. Among SC category a majority of the respondents have responded low rate of response while in ST category of the respondents more number of respondents reported moderate level of rate of response within the group of sources of stress at work place followed by low level in the rate of response by the respondents.

It was observed that majority of the respondents reported moderate to high rate of response in all the categories of marital status. A majority of the respondents, having no dependents on them have reported low level of rate of response for sources of

stress at work place whereas, more number of respondents have reported moderate to high rate of response in case of respondents having dependents on them.

With reference to the police station's location urban, town and village areas, majority of the respondents have reported moderate to high level of rate of response for sources of stress at work place whereas in outpost category majority of the respondents have reported low level of rate of response within the group.

Among the PI, 92 respondents reported moderate to high rate of response for sources of stress at work place where as in DSP/DCP category half of the respondents have reported moderate to high rate of response as shown in Table - 6.19. As experiences of the respondents increase the respondents rate of response for moderate to high also increases. It has been observed that more respondents having experience up to five years, have reported, within the group, moderate level of rate of response for sources of stress at work place followed by low level of rate of response. A large number of respondents having an income of Rs. 2.25-5.0 lakhs, have reported high level of rate of response for sources of stress at work place whereas more number of respondents having an income below Rs. 1 Lakh have reported moderate level of rate of response followed by low level in the rate of response within the group.

Table - 6.20: Cross Tabulation [Sources of Stress; Recreational Sphere Vs. Demographic Profile]

		Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress							
		LOW		MODERATE		HIGH		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age	Below 25	123	38.3	121	37.7	77	24.0	321	100.0
	25 -30	187	40.6	152	33.0	122	26.5	461	100.0
	31 -35	48	26.1	51	27.7	85	46.2	184	100.0
	36 - 40	15	13.2	46	40.4	53	46.5	114	100.0
	41 -45	11	15.7	13	18.6	46	65.7	70	100.0
	46 - 50	17	22.1	25	32.5	35	45.5	77	100.0
	51 -58	24	42.9	14	25.0	18	32.1	56	100.0
	58 & above Retd.	3	37.5	2	25.0	3	37.5	8	100.0
Gender	Male	408	32.5	413	32.9	433	34.5	1254	100.0

	Female	20	54.1	11	29.7	6	16.2	37	100.0
Qualification	Up to HSC	61	18.0	100	29.5	178	52.5	339	100.0
	Graduate	284	39.3	256	35.5	182	25.2	722	100.0
	Post graduate	80	36.5	64	29.2	75	34.2	219	100.0
	Others	3	27.3	4	36.4	4	36.4	11	100.0
Religion	Hindu	381	32.2	388	32.8	414	35.0	1183	100.0
	Muslim	38	42.7	32	36.0	19	21.3	89	100.0
	Sikh	6	85.7	0	.0	1	14.3	7	100.0
	Christian	3	25.0	4	33.3	5	41.7	12	100.0
Category	General	152	29.1	170	32.5	201	38.4	523	100.0
	SEBC	97	22.6	169	39.4	163	38.0	429	100.0
	SC	131	56.0	57	24.4	46	19.7	234	100.0
	ST	48	45.7	28	26.7	29	27.6	105	100.0
Place of Residence	Urban	290	37.9	258	33.7	217	28.4	765	100.0
	Town	69	28.4	93	38.3	81	33.3	243	100.0
	Rural-Village	69	24.4	73	25.8	141	49.8	283	100.0
Marital Status	Married	326	34.4	317	33.5	304	32.1	947	100.0
	Unmarried	98	33.9	84	29.1	107	37.0	289	100.0
	Divorced	4	10.0	11	27.5	25	62.5	40	100.0
	Others	0	.0	12	80.0	3	20.0	15	100.0
Number of Dependants	Nil	230	39.7	162	28.0	187	32.3	579	100.0
	One	57	25.3	67	29.8	101	44.9	225	100.0
	Two	67	31.2	81	37.7	67	31.2	215	100.0
	Three	41	30.4	49	36.3	45	33.3	135	100.0
	Four	21	21.0	47	47.0	32	32.0	100	100.0
	Five & above	12	32.4	18	48.6	7	18.9	37	100.0
Location of Police Station	Urban	328	38.2	277	32.2	254	29.6	859	100.0
	Town	60	27.3	83	37.7	77	35.0	220	100.0
	Village	27	15.3	42	23.7	108	61.0	177	100.0
	Out post	13	37.1	22	62.9	0	.0	35	100.0
Unit of Current Posting	Police Station	393	34.8	362	32.1	374	33.1	1129	100.0
	Police Chowky	35	21.6	62	38.3	65	40.1	162	100.0
Rank in the Police Force	DG, ADG, IG, SPL, IG, DIG	0	.0	1	33.3	2	66.7	3	100.0
	DSP/DCP, DYSP/ACP	32	45.1	30	42.3	9	12.7	71	100.0
	PI	20	15.9	62	49.2	44	34.9	126	100.0
	PSI, JAMADAR, HEAD CONSTABLE, CONSTABLE	376	34.5	331	30.3	384	35.2	1091	100.0
Experience	UP TO 5	231	36.0	222	34.6	188	29.3	641	100.0
	6 -10	118	32.8	98	27.2	144	40.0	360	100.0
	11 – 15	18	11.4	63	39.9	77	48.7	158	100.0
	16 – 20	25	39.7	16	25.4	22	34.9	63	100.0
	21 – 25	16	53.3	11	36.7	3	10.0	30	100.0
	26 -30	16	53.3	10	33.3	4	13.3	30	100.0
	Above 30	4	44.4	4	44.4	1	11.1	9	100.0

Income in Rupees	Below 1,00,000	240	33.1	244	33.6	242	33.3	726	100.0
	1,00,001 - 2,25,000	102	42.1	74	30.6	66	27.3	242	100.0
	2,25,001 - 3,00,000	44	23.3	65	34.4	80	42.3	189	100.0
	3,00,000 - 5,00,000	26	26.0	27	27.0	47	47.0	100	100.0
	Above 5,00,000	16	47.1	14	41.2	4	11.8	34	100.0
Number of Family Members in Police Department	Nil	334	34.1	282	28.8	364	37.1	980	100.0
	One	61	31.8	89	46.4	42	21.9	192	100.0
	Two	25	34.2	27	37.0	21	28.8	73	100.0
	Three	7	23.3	17	56.7	6	20.0	30	100.0
	Four	0	.0	6	60.0	4	40.0	10	100.0
	Five & above	1	16.7	3	50.0	2	33.3	6	100.0
	Total	428	33.2	424	32.8	439	34.0	1291	100.0
Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire									

Many respondents in the age categories below 25-30 and 51-58, have reported low level of rate of response for recreational sources of stress whereas a large number of respondents belonging to the age group 21-35, 36-40, 41-45 and 46-50 have reported high level of rate of response. In the male category, the highest number of respondents reported high level of rate of response for recreational source of stress followed by moderate level of rate of response within the group.

A majority of respondents having an educational qualification up to HSC, have reported high level of rate of response for recreational sources of stress whereas a large number of graduate respondents have reported low level of rate of response for recreational sources of stress followed by moderate level of rate of response.

A majority of the respondents belonging to general and SEBC category have reported moderate to high level of rate of response for recreational sources of stress whereas a majority of respondents belonging to SC and ST category, have reported low level of rate of response. In the unmarried and divorced categories respondents have reported a high level of rate of response for recreational sources of stress where as in the married category the response is uniformly distributed among all the three levels of rate of response. Majority of the respondents have reported moderate to high level of rate of response for recreational sources of stress irrespective of the number dependents on them.

Majority of the respondents posted in village police station have reported high level of rate of response for recreational sources of stress whereas no respondents have reported high level of rate of response amongst out post. In town police station, 83 respondents out of 220 have reported moderate level of rate of response for recreational sources of stress followed by high level of rate of response (77 respondents).

Among the top rank of the police force no respondents have reported low level of rate of response for recreational sources of stress whereas more numbers of respondents belonging to DSP/DCP have reported low level of rate of response as shown in Table - 6.20. In PI category 62 respondents out of 126, have reported moderate levels of rate response for recreational sources of stress followed by high level of rate of response. In PSI category more numbers of respondents have reported high level of rate of response for recreational sources of stress followed by low level of rate of response. A large number of respondents having an experience of 6-20 years have reported high level of rate of response for recreational sources of stress where as respondents belonging in the age group of 21 and above, majority of them have reported low level of rate of response.

The majority of the respondents reported moderate to high level of rate of response for recreational source of stress irrespective of the variation in income level of the respondents.

Table - 6.21: Cross Tabulation [Coping Strategies of Stress Vs. Demographic Profile]									
		Coping Strategies							
		LOW		MODERATE		HIGH		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age	Below 25	109	34.1	126	39.4	85	26.6	320	100.0
	25 -30	189	41.4	139	30.4	129	28.2	457	100.0
	31 -35	54	30.7	63	35.8	59	33.5	176	100.0
	36 - 40	20	24.4	26	31.7	36	43.9	82	100.0
	41 -45	11	30.6	6	16.7	19	52.8	36	100.0
	46 - 50	7	12.5	15	26.8	34	60.7	56	100.0
	51 -58	12	24.0	20	40.0	18	36.0	50	100.0
	58 & above Retd.	1	33.3	0	.0	2	66.7	3	100.0
Gender	Male	393	34.3	382	33.3	371	32.4	1146	100.0
	Female	10	29.4	13	38.2	11	32.4	34	100.0
Qualification	Up to HSC	28	8.7	121	37.7	172	53.6	321	100.0
	Graduate	294	45.0	219	33.5	141	21.6	654	100.0
	Post graduate	77	39.5	55	28.2	63	32.3	195	100.0
	Others	4	40.0	0	.0	6	60.0	10	100.0
Religion	Hindu	353	32.8	363	33.7	361	33.5	1077	100.0
	Muslim	39	45.9	28	32.9	18	21.2	85	100.0
	Sikh	6	85.7	0	.0	1	14.3	7	100.0
	Christian	5	45.5	4	36.4	2	18.2	11	100.0
Category	General	143	31.1	147	32.0	170	37.0	460	100.0
	SEBC	89	22.6	149	37.8	156	39.6	394	100.0
	SC	122	54.5	71	31.7	31	13.8	224	100.0
	ST	49	48.0	28	27.5	25	24.5	102	100.0
Place of Residence	Urban	247	33.4	255	34.5	238	32.2	740	100.0
	Town	88	38.3	77	33.5	65	28.3	230	100.0
	Rural-Village	68	32.4	63	30.0	79	37.6	210	100.0
Marital Status	Married	299	35.5	276	32.7	268	31.8	843	100.0
	Unmarried	97	33.7	103	35.8	88	30.6	288	100.0
	Divorced	5	13.2	14	36.8	19	50.0	38	100.0
	Others	2	18.2	2	18.2	7	63.6	11	100.0
Number of Dependants	Nil	221	38.5	176	30.7	177	30.8	574	100.0
	One	63	35.6	64	36.2	50	28.2	177	100.0
	Two	51	27.6	78	42.2	56	30.3	185	100.0
	Three	33	26.4	35	28.0	57	45.6	125	100.0
	Four	24	26.7	36	40.0	30	33.3	90	100.0
	Five & above	11	37.9	6	20.7	12	41.4	29	100.0
Location of Police Station	Urban	304	36.5	279	33.5	251	30.1	834	100.0
	Town	72	34.0	71	33.5	69	32.5	212	100.0
	Village	10	10.1	40	40.4	49	49.5	99	100.0
	Out post	17	48.6	5	14.3	13	37.1	35	100.0
Unit of Current Posting	Police Station	371	36.0	355	34.4	305	29.6	1031	100.0
	Police Chowky	32	21.5	40	26.8	77	51.7	149	100.0

Rank in the Police Force	DG, ADG, IG, SPL, IG, DIG	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	.0	3	100.0
	DSP/DCP, DYSP/ACP	27	40.9	28	42.4	11	16.7	66	100.0
	PI	45	37.2	42	34.7	34	28.1	121	100.0
	PSI, JAMADAR, HEAD CONSTABLE, CONSTABLE	330	33.3	323	32.6	337	34.0	990	100.0
Experience	UP TO 5	223	35.3	207	32.8	201	31.9	631	100.0
	6 -10	114	35.6	117	36.6	89	27.8	320	100.0
	11 - 15	36	28.3	39	30.7	52	40.9	127	100.0
	16 - 20	19	33.9	13	23.2	24	42.9	56	100.0
	21 - 25	5	23.8	6	28.6	10	47.6	21	100.0
	26 -30	5	20.8	13	54.2	6	25.0	24	100.0
	Above 30	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	1	100.0
Income in Rupees	Below 1,00,000	231	32.0	244	33.7	248	34.3	723	100.0
	1,00,001 - 2,25,000	85	39.9	67	31.5	61	28.6	213	100.0
	2,25,001 - 3,00,000	51	34.2	45	30.2	53	35.6	149	100.0
	3,00,000 - 5,00,000	21	33.9	25	40.3	16	25.8	62	100.0
	Above 5,00,000	15	45.5	14	42.4	4	12.1	33	100.0
Number of Family Members in Police Department	Nil	281	31.8	297	33.6	306	34.6	884	100.0
	One	78	42.9	64	35.2	40	22.0	182	100.0
	Two	25	35.2	21	29.6	25	35.2	71	100.0
	Three	16	55.2	9	31.0	4	13.8	29	100.0
	Four	3	33.3	2	22.2	4	44.4	9	100.0
	Five & above	0	.0	2	40.0	3	60.0	5	100.0
	Total	403	34.2	395	33.5	382	32.4	1180	100.0
Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire									

It has been observed that practices of coping strategies of stress are inversely related with the age of the respondents as reported in Table 6.21. Respondents response rate for the coping strategies of stress are uniformly distributed among three levels of the rate of response irrespective of gender.

In educational qualification of the respondents, except graduate respondents, a large number of respondents have reported high level of rate of response for practices of coping strategies of stress. In the caste category, many respondents belonging to the general and SEBC category have reported a high level of rate of response for practices of coping strategies of stress whereas more respondents belonging to SC and ST category reported low rate of response for practices of coping strategies of stress.

Majority of the respondents have been practicing coping strategies of stress with a moderate to high level of rate of response irrespective of the marital status of the respondents as shown in Table 6.21. The same trend has been observed in the respondents irrespective of the number of dependents on them.

Many respondents posted in urban and town police stations, have reported low level of rate of response for practicing coping strategies of stress whereas in village police station 49 respondents out of 99 respondents have reported high level of rate of response for practicing coping strategies of stress followed by moderate level of rate of response.

Among the respondents at top rank (ACP/Dy. SP and Above), a large numbers of respondents reported a moderate rate of response for practicing coping strategies of stress whereas PI and those below that rank have uniformly reported all three levels of rate of response.

It was observed that a large number of less experienced respondents, more number of respondents is rarely practice coping strategies of stress. The data reported in the table shows that there is a direct relationship between the number of years of experience and the level of the rate of response for practicing coping strategies of stress.

248 respondents out of 723 having a low level income i.e., below 1 Lakh, have reported a high level of rate of response for practicing coping strategies of stress followed by moderate level of rate of response by 244 respondents. While in income category of 1.0-2.25 lakh and 5 lakhs or above, many respondents have reported a low level of rate of response for practicing coping strategies of stress followed by moderate level of rate of response.

The study essentially focuses on those respondents who have reported moderate, high and a very high level of stress and survives in a stressful situation which leads to various problems in their personal and professional life. The response were collected on a 5-point Likert scale which best fits in qualitative ranking but difficult to quantify exactly and differentiate the degree of response to find out the level of stress. For that purpose, the original response (5-point Scale) of the respondents have been converted into three quantitative categories by assigning a Zero to very low and low, One to moderate and Two for high and very high degree of response and the summation of these scores is termed as Severity Index (SI) of the respondents response to stress.

Table – 6.22: Mean Comparison of Severity Index of Mental, Physical, Other Symptoms of Stress; Personal, Interpersonal, Work, Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; Coping Strategies with respect to Age Group

Age		SIMSS	SIPSS	SIOSS	SIPSSS	SIIPSSS	SIWSSS	SIRSSS	SICS
Below 25	Mean	5.6137	5.7321	.7227	3.3832	2.3645	5.2181	1.7539	6.0594
	N	321	321	321	321	321	321	321	320
	Std. Deviation	6.04155	6.19197	1.41898	3.77817	2.63650	5.32175	2.24969	4.35849
25 -30	Mean	5.6095	4.7657	.7310	3.7375	2.5488	6.5488	1.8568	5.7418
	N	461	461	461	461	461	461	461	457
	Std. Deviation	6.18514	6.01641	1.42390	3.88846	2.90732	6.10277	2.26819	4.63717
31 -35	Mean	8.6033	7.5978	.9185	5.0652	3.4946	7.4674	2.6087	6.7614
	N	184	184	184	184	184	184	184	176
	Std. Deviation	6.08503	6.25341	1.47433	3.46348	2.63851	5.10320	2.04836	4.83439
36 – 40	Mean	9.4561	7.9912	1.4737	4.9561	3.6140	9.2368	2.7544	7.4268
	N	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	82
	Std. Deviation	5.90056	5.90409	1.75091	3.26524	2.54346	5.53237	2.10167	4.99143
41 -45	Mean	12.1714	7.8143	2.3000	6.7000	4.5000	11.2000	3.4714	8.3611
	N	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	36
	Std. Deviation	5.62338	5.22617	1.98070	2.80450	2.55802	4.47084	2.32018	5.44139
46 – 50	Mean	12.0260	10.7922	1.2987	7.0260	5.0130	11.2078	3.0130	9.1071
	N	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	56
	Std. Deviation	5.44584	6.66755	1.60644	3.61639	2.86307	4.86756	2.44138	3.80755
51 -58	Mean	7.8750	5.9107	.5000	5.1786	2.9643	6.9821	2.0714	6.7800
	N	56	56	56	56	56	56	56	50
	Std. Deviation	6.31035	5.56704	1.23583	3.91318	3.15055	6.23332	2.49259	4.71338

The mean comparison of age group and the severity index of other symptoms of stress show that the mean are varied in the age category. The average severity index of other symptoms of stress is 0.93 out of 6 which indicate that 15.5% of the other symptoms of stress were observed in the sample of the study.

The respondents who belong to the age group of 36-40 to 46-50 have a higher mean than the sample mean with a maximum mean of 2.3 in age group of 41-45 and a minimum mean of 0.5 in age group of 51-58. Total 261 (20.2%) respondents have more than 15.5% (Average) of other symptoms of stress.

It was observed that out of the three identified symptoms of stress, the severities of mental symptoms of stress are high among the respondents, followed by physical symptoms of stress.

The high severity of mental symptoms of stress indicates that the police personnel fall short of the expectation and are not able to perform efficiently, because one of the major reasons could be the lack of concentration in their professional and personal life which leads to negative impact on their assigned task. This in turn may increase the level of physical symptoms of stress.

The mean comparison of age group and the severity index of personal sources of stress show that the mean are varied among the age category. The average severity index of personal sources of stress is 4.36 out of 14, which indicate that 31% of personal sources of stress were observed in the sample of the study. The respondents who belong to the age group of 31-35 to 51-58 have a higher mean than the sample mean with a maximum mean of 7.02 in age group of 46-50 and a minimum mean of 3.38 in age group of below 25. A total 501 (38.8%) respondents have more than 31% (Average) of mental symptoms of stress in which 77 respondents have more than 50% of personal sources of stress and belong to age group of 46-50.

58 & above (Retd.)	Mean	6.6250	5.3750	.7500	3.6250	3.3750	8.0000	1.8750	10.0000
	N	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	3
	Std. Deviation	6.36817	5.97465	1.03510	3.24863	2.97309	4.47214	1.72689	8.66025
Total	Mean	7.2200	6.2727	.9303	4.3648	3.0077	7.1441	2.1836	6.3915
	N	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1180
	Std. Deviation	6.43184	6.27447	1.54963	3.83428	2.86410	5.85213	2.29416	4.69467

SIMSS = Severity Index of Mental Symptoms of Stress; SIPSS = Severity Index of Physical Symptoms of Stress; SIOSS = Severity Index of Other Symptoms of Stress; SIPSSS = Severity Index of Personal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIIPSSS = Severity Index of Interpersonal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIWSSS = Severity Index of Work Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIRSSS = Severity Index of Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; SICS = Severity Index of Coping Strategies.

Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire

The mean comparison of age group and severity index of mental symptoms of stress shows that the mean are varied in the category of age. The average severity index of mental symptoms of stress is 7.22 out of 24 which indicates that 30% mental symptoms of stress were observed in the sample of the study. The respondents belong to the age group of 31-35 to 51-58 and have a higher mean than the sample mean with a maximum mean of 12.17 in the age group of 41-45 and a minimum mean of 5.609 in the age group of 25-30. A total of 501 (38.8%) respondents have more than 30% (Average) of mental symptoms of stress out of which 147 respondents reported more than 50% of mental symptoms of stress and belonged to the age group of 41-45 and 46-50.

The mean comparison of age group and the severity index of physical symptoms of stress show that the mean are varied in the age category. The average severity index of physical symptoms of stress is 6.27 out of 26, which indicate that 24% of physical symptoms of stress were observed among the sample of the study. The respondents belonging to the age group of 31-35 to 46-50 have a higher mean than the sample mean with a maximum mean of 10.79 in the age group of 46-50 and a minimum mean of 4.76 in age group of 25-30. A total 445 (34.5%) respondents have more than 24% (Average) of physical symptoms of stress.

The mean comparison of age group and the severity index of inter personal sources of stress show that the mean are varied among the age category. The average severity index of inter personal sources of stress is 3.01 out of 10 which indicates that 30% of inter personal sources of stress were observed in the sample of the study. The respondents belonging to the age group of 31-35 to 46-50 and 58 & above have a higher mean than the sample mean with a maximum mean of in age group of 46-50 and a minimum mean of 3.38 in age group of below 25. Total 453 (35.1%) respondents have more than 30% (Average) of inter personal symptoms of stress in which 77 respondents have more than 50% of personal sources of stress and belong to age group of 46-50.

The mean comparison of age group and the severity index of sources of stress at work place show that the mean are varied among the age category. The average severity index of sources of stress at work place is 7.14 out of 20 which indicates that 35.9% of sources of stress at work place were observed in the sample of the study. The respondents belong to the age group of 31-35 to 46-50 and 58 and above have a higher mean than the sample mean with a maximum mean of 11.21 in age group of 46-50 and a minimum mean of 5.21 in age group of below 25. A total of 453 (35.1%) respondents have more than 35.9% (Average) of sources of stress at work place in which 147 respondents reveal more than 50% of sources of stress are work place and belong to age group of 41-45 and 46-50.

The mean comparison of age group and the severity index of Recreational sources of stress show that the mean are varied among the age category. The average severity index of recreational sources of stress is 2.18 out of 08 which indicates that 27.3% of recreational sources of stress were observed among the sample of the study. The respondents belonging to the age group of 31-35 to 46-50 have a higher mean than the sample mean with a maximum mean of 3.47 in the age group of 41-45 and a minimum mean of 1.75 in the age group of below 25. A total 445 i.e., (34.5%) respondents have more than 27.3% (Average) of recreational sources of stress.

The data of the study indicates that one of the major sources of stress is work sphere, as the high Severity Index of Sources of stress were observed at work place followed by Personal and Inter personal sources of stress reported in Table 6.22. In general, it has been observed that the discomfort at work place is one of the main sources of personal and inter-personal source of stress and collectively it affects the behavior of individuals at work, and their personal and Inter personal activities. The data of the study confirms this finding.

The mean comparison of age group and the severity index of practicing coping strategies for stress show that the mean are varied among the age category. The average severity index of practicing coping strategies for stress is 6.39 out of 18 which indicates that 35.5% of practicing coping strategies for stress were observed in the sample of the study. The respondents belong to the age group of below 25 and 25-30 have a lower mean than the sample mean with a minimum mean of 5.74 in age group of 25-30. A total of 777 i.e., (65.9%) respondents have lower than 35.5% (Average) of practicing coping strategies for stress.

The study found that those respondents who belong to the middle and upper category of age are more sensible towards practicing coping strategies for stress than the younger respondents.

Table - 6.23: Mean Comparison of Severity Index of Mental, Physical, Other Symptoms of Stress; Personal, Interpersonal, Work, Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; Coping Strategies with respect to Gender

Gender		SIMSS	SIPSS	SIOSS	SIPSSS	SIIPSSS	SIWSSS	SIRSSS	SICS
Male	Mean	7.2648	6.2911	.9426	4.4019	3.0447	7.1914	2.2049	6.3709
	N	1254	1254	1254	1254	1254	1254	1254	1146
	Std. Deviation	6.47853	6.31917	1.55502	3.84905	2.88064	5.88897	2.30554	4.70356
Female	Mean	5.7027	5.6486	.5135	3.1081	1.7568	5.5405	1.4595	7.0882
	N	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	34
	Std. Deviation	4.37077	4.52288	1.30430	3.08026	1.86198	4.17396	1.74156	4.39261
Total	Mean	7.2200	6.2727	.9303	4.3648	3.0077	7.1441	2.1836	6.3915
	N	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1180
	Std. Deviation	6.43184	6.27447	1.54963	3.83428	2.86410	5.85213	2.29416	4.69467

SIMSS = Severity Index of Mental Symptoms of Stress; SIPSS = Severity Index of Physical Symptoms of Stress; SIOSS = Severity Index of Other Symptoms of Stress; SIPSSS = Severity Index of Personal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIIPSSS = Severity Index of Interpersonal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIWSSS = Severity Index of Work Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIRSSS = Severity Index of Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; SICS = Severity Index of Coping Strategies.

Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire

The Severity Index among gender is higher than the sample mean for male and lower in the female category in all the variables under study except practicing coping strategies for stress. The general perception of the society is that females are more conscious and sensible towards their mental and physical health which has been confirmed from the practice of coping strategies for stress in this study as shown in Table 6.23.

Table - 6.24: Mean Comparison of Severity Index of Mental, Physical, Other Symptoms of Stress; Personal, Interpersonal, Work, Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; Coping Strategies with respect to Qualification

Qualification		SIMSS	SIPSS	SIOSS	SIPSSS	SIIPSSS	SIWSSS	SIRSSS	SICS
up to HSC	Mean	11.2655	10.7581	1.2920	6.5959	4.4071	9.3864	3.1475	9.2523
	N	339	339	339	339	339	339	339	321
	Std. Deviation	5.26575	5.27699	1.70805	3.22143	2.60054	4.26919	2.23780	4.08448
Graduate	Mean	5.4030	4.4972	.6870	3.2119	2.3283	5.8241	1.7355	5.0581
	N	722	722	722	722	722	722	722	654
	Std. Deviation	6.05931	5.60272	1.34961	3.66158	2.70696	6.09753	2.22783	4.46559
Post graduate	Mean	6.7123	4.7580	1.1005	4.6119	2.9635	7.8311	2.1735	6.0103
	N	219	219	219	219	219	219	219	195
	Std. Deviation	6.36247	5.98246	1.68069	3.65358	2.93016	5.94036	2.14968	4.19498
Others	Mean	11.9091	14.7273	2.3636	6.3636	5.3636	11.0000	2.0909	9.2000
	N	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	10
	Std. Deviation	6.83307	7.44434	2.57964	4.20173	2.87307	5.38516	2.25630	5.90292
Total	Mean	7.2200	6.2727	.9303	4.3648	3.0077	7.1441	2.1836	6.3915
	N	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1180
	Std. Deviation	6.43184	6.27447	1.54963	3.83428	2.86410	5.85213	2.29416	4.69467

SIMSS = Severity Index of Mental Symptoms of Stress; SIPSS = Severity Index of Physical Symptoms of Stress; SIOSS = Severity Index of Other Symptoms of Stress; SIPSSS = Severity Index of Personal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIIPSSS = Severity Index of Interpersonal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIWSSS = Severity Index of Work Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIRSSS = Severity Index of Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; SICS = Severity Index of Coping Strategies.

Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire

The mean comparison of academic qualification and severity index of mental symptoms of stress shows that the mean are varied among the categories of educational qualification. The respondents with educational qualification up to HSC and Others have a severity index of mental symptoms of stress higher than the sample mean. A total 350 i.e., (27%) of the respondents have more than above average mental symptoms of stress. The same trend has been observed in the majority of the variables under study as shown in Table 6.24.

In physical symptoms of stress, Inter personal source of stress and source of stress at work place, respondents with educational qualification in the others category have more than 50% of severity of symptoms and sources of stress. Respondents in the

qualification category up to HSC and others are level-headed towards practicing coping strategies for stress, while graduates and post graduates are numbed towards practicing coping strategies for stress, in which graduates are more insensitive than post graduates in practicing coping strategies for stress.

Table - 6.25: Mean Comparison of Severity Index of Mental, Physical, Other Symptoms of Stress; Personal, Interpersonal, Work, Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; Coping Strategies with respect to Religion

Religion		SIMSS	SIPSS	SIOSS	SIPSSS	SIIPSSS	SIWSSS	SIRSSS	SICS
Hindu	Mean	7.3297	6.2502	.9780	4.3728	3.0304	7.2409	2.2401	6.5125
	N	1183	1183	1183	1183	1183	1183	1183	1077
	Std. Deviation	6.46096	6.26528	1.57750	3.82933	2.86954	5.85299	2.30350	4.71029
Muslim	Mean	5.6517	6.5955	.3371	4.1798	2.7753	5.9551	1.4494	4.9765
	N	89	89	89	89	89	89	89	85
	Std. Deviation	5.35151	5.90977	1.01067	3.73729	2.68731	5.44791	1.99437	4.27054
Sikh	Mean	2.4286	2.1429	.0000	2.8571	.4286	2.4286	.4286	3.5714
	N	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
	Std. Deviation	6.42540	4.81070	.00000	4.22013	1.13389	4.68534	1.13389	5.19157
Christian	Mean	10.8333	8.5000	1.1667	5.8333	4.0000	9.1667	3.0833	7.2727
	N	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	11
	Std. Deviation	8.00946	9.47245	1.52753	4.78318	3.59292	7.39574	2.64432	4.10100
Total	Mean	7.2200	6.2727	.9303	4.3648	3.0077	7.1441	2.1836	6.3915
	N	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1180
	Std. Deviation	6.43184	6.27447	1.54963	3.83428	2.86410	5.85213	2.29416	4.69467

SIMSS = Severity Index of Mental Symptoms of Stress; SIPSS = Severity Index of Physical Symptoms of Stress; SIOSS = Severity Index of Other Symptoms of Stress; SIPSSS = Severity Index of Personal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIIPSSS = Severity Index of Interpersonal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIWSSS = Severity Index of Work Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIRSSS = Severity Index of Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; SICS = Severity Index of Coping Strategies.

Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire

More than 90% of the respondents belonged to the Hindu religion; it was observed that the severity index is higher than the sample mean except physical symptoms of stress among variables under study. The number of respondents from other religion is very less but still the study has taken into consideration and found that the severity index for variables in the study among Christians is higher than the sample mean while the inverse trend has been found in Sikh religion. In Muslims except severity index of physical symptoms of stress all variables under study have a lower severity index value than the sample mean as shown in table 6.25.

Table - 6.26: Mean Comparison of Severity Index of Mental, Physical, Other Symptoms of Stress; Personal, Interpersonal, Work, Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; Coping Strategies with respect to Caste/Category

Category		SIMSS	SIPSS	SIOSS	SIPSSS	SIIPSSS	SIWSSS	SIRSSS	SICS
General	Mean	8.2199	7.1453	1.1663	5.0669	3.3442	7.7075	2.4302	6.8522
	N	523	523	523	523	523	523	523	460
	Std. Deviation	6.55681	6.35703	1.63448	4.00733	2.96404	6.00163	2.40617	4.91185
SEBC	Mean	7.7646	7.3357	.9977	4.9883	3.4802	8.5758	2.5105	7.2640
	N	429	429	429	429	429	429	429	394
	Std. Deviation	5.78332	6.05999	1.61838	3.46037	2.63827	5.33083	2.23565	4.48195
SC	Mean	3.6325	2.4744	.3632	1.8333	1.4957	3.3846	1.1068	4.1607
	N	234	234	234	234	234	234	234	224
	Std. Deviation	5.67594	4.70519	1.07672	2.83184	2.43587	4.97262	1.81355	3.97538
ST	Mean	8.0095	6.0476	.7429	3.9619	2.7714	6.8667	2.0190	5.8431
	N	105	105	105	105	105	105	105	102
	Std. Deviation	7.18906	6.61493	1.39386	3.98054	3.00403	5.45271	2.21438	4.39339
Total	Mean	7.2200	6.2727	.9303	4.3648	3.0077	7.1441	2.1836	6.3915
	N	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1180
	Std. Deviation	6.43184	6.27447	1.54963	3.83428	2.86410	5.85213	2.29416	4.69467

SIMSS = Severity Index of Mental Symptoms of Stress; SIPSS = Severity Index of Physical Symptoms of Stress; SIOSS = Severity Index of Other Symptoms of Stress; SIPSSS = Severity Index of Personal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIIPSSS = Severity Index of Interpersonal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIWSSS = Severity Index of Work Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIRSSS = Severity Index of Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; SICS = Severity Index of Coping Strategies.

Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire

The mean comparison of caste category and the severity index of all variables under study show that the mean are varied among all categories. Respondents belonging to the general and SEBC in caste category have higher mean value of severity index than the sample mean for all variables under study where as among SC respondents, the inverse trend was observed with exceptionally low mean value of severity index. While in the ST category the mean value of the severity index for all the variables were found lower than the sample mean except for severity index of mental symptoms of stress.

Respondents belonging to the SEBC category practiced coping strategies of stress more rigorously than the General category as shown in Table 6.26 whereas from among the SC and ST category, respondents belonging to ST category were responsible in practicing coping strategies of stress than the respondent belonging to the SC category.

Table - 6.27: Mean Comparison of Severity Index of Mental, Physical, Other Symptoms of Stress; Personal, Interpersonal, Work, Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; Coping Strategies with respect to Place of Residence

Place of Residence		SIMSS	SIPSS	SIOSS	SIPSSS	SIIPSSS	SIWSSS	SIRSSS	SICS
Urban	Mean	6.6876	6.3778	.8013	4.0941	2.7281	6.3477	1.8954	6.4149
	N	765	765	765	765	765	765	765	740
	Std. Deviation	6.52967	6.54083	1.48280	3.99103	2.87694	5.79758	2.22834	4.68719
Town	Mean	7.0041	7.0741	.8066	4.3539	3.2510	7.0494	2.1276	5.9261
	N	243	243	243	243	243	243	243	230
	Std. Deviation	5.71463	6.28085	1.46574	3.59727	2.92021	5.49959	2.11747	4.47396
Rural Village	Mean	8.8445	5.3004	1.3852	5.1060	3.5548	9.3781	3.0106	6.8190
	N	283	283	283	283	283	283	283	210
	Std. Deviation	6.49963	5.36652	1.70836	3.49915	2.68691	5.73670	2.42107	4.92874
Total	Mean	7.2200	6.2727	.9303	4.3648	3.0077	7.1441	2.1836	6.3915
	N	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1180
	Std. Deviation	6.43184	6.27447	1.54963	3.83428	2.86410	5.85213	2.29416	4.69467

SIMSS = Severity Index of Mental Symptoms of Stress; SIPSS = Severity Index of Physical Symptoms of Stress; SIOSS = Severity Index of Other Symptoms of Stress; SIPSSS = Severity Index of Personal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIIPSSS = Severity Index of Interpersonal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIWSSS = Severity Index of Work Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIRSSS = Severity Index of Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; SICS = Severity Index of Coping Strategies.

Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire

The general perception of the society towards urban area is that the standard of living and access to various amenities and technologies are high as compared to the town and village. The access amenities and technologies are considered as two edged sword which either cause the comfort or discomfort in the various sections of the society.

The study found that among the urban respondents, the severity index of all the variables are lower than the sample mean except the severity index of physical symptoms of stress and practicing of the coping strategies. When studying the town and village respondents, it was noticed that the respondents belonging to the village have a higher value of severity index than the respondents belonging to the town except severity index of physical symptoms of stress. The respondents living in rural areas (village) are more prone to practicing coping strategies than the respondents living in town (semi-urban areas).

Table - 6.28: Mean Comparison of Severity Index of Mental, Physical, Other Symptoms of Stress; Personal, Interpersonal, Work, Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; Coping Strategies with respect to Marital Status

Marital Status		SIMSS	SIPSS	SIOSS	SIPSSS	SIIPSSS	SIWSSS	SIRSSS	SICS
Married	Mean	7.0539	6.0169	.9176	4.2313	2.9166	7.0961	2.0697	6.3215
	N	947	947	947	947	947	947	947	843
	Std. Deviation	6.48239	6.22633	1.54550	3.85031	2.82776	5.99368	2.26318	4.74002
Unmarried	Mean	6.9100	6.3564	.8858	4.4671	2.9654	6.8824	2.3737	6.2292
	N	289	289	289	289	289	289	289	288
	Std. Deviation	6.17557	6.26063	1.57589	3.84416	2.93545	5.60444	2.40633	4.58177
Divorced	Mean	11.5750	10.6750	1.5000	6.3000	4.7500	8.7000	3.5500	9.0789
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	38
	Std. Deviation	5.74183	6.40267	1.60128	2.86625	2.75262	4.33944	1.93417	4.08942
Others	Mean	12.0667	9.0667	1.0667	5.6667	4.9333	11.0667	2.0667	6.7273
	N	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	11
	Std. Deviation	3.57505	4.38287	.79881	3.47782	1.98086	2.15362	1.53375	3.69028
Total	Mean	7.2200	6.2727	.9303	4.3648	3.0077	7.1441	2.1836	6.3915
	N	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1180
	Std. Deviation	6.43184	6.27447	1.54963	3.83428	2.86410	5.85213	2.29416	4.69467

SIMSS = Severity Index of Mental Symptoms of Stress; SIPSS = Severity Index of Physical Symptoms of Stress; SIOSS = Severity Index of Other Symptoms of Stress; SIPSSS = Severity Index of Personal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIIPSSS = Severity Index of Interpersonal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIWSSS = Severity Index of Work Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIRSSS = Severity Index of Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; SICS = Severity Index of Coping Strategies.

Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire

The mean comparison of marital status and the severity index of all variables under study show that the mean are varied among all the categories. In the married category, the respondent's value of the severity index of all variables under study are lower than the sample mean whereas the respondents who belong to the unmarried category, the value of the severity index of physical symptoms of stress, personal source of stress and recreational source of stress are higher than the sample mean. In the divorced and other category of marital status, the value of severity index of all the variables are higher than the sample mean of all the variables under study. While in the other category of marital status the value of severity index of mental symptoms of stress and sources of stress at work place are more than 50% of the total values of severity index in both the variables as shown in Table 6.28.

Table - 6.29: Mean Comparison of Severity Index of Mental, Physical, Other Symptoms of Stress; Personal, Interpersonal, Work, Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; Coping Strategies with respect to Number of Dependent

Number of Dependant		SIMSS	SIPSS	SIOSS	SIPSSS	SIIPSSS	SIWSSS	SIRSSS	SICS
Nil	Mean	6.3299	5.7962	.7150	3.9171	2.6960	5.7772	1.9672	5.9321
	N	579	579	579	579	579	579	579	574
	Std. Deviation	6.73317	6.52437	1.38077	4.06053	2.93367	5.67125	2.35969	4.79389
One	Mean	8.8222	6.5022	1.2044	4.8000	3.2489	8.0800	2.7511	6.4237
	N	225	225	225	225	225	225	225	177
	Std. Deviation	5.96077	5.81725	1.66180	3.35942	2.69429	5.84111	2.36423	4.78707
Two	Mean	7.3023	6.2558	.9302	4.2047	3.0140	8.1860	2.1395	6.4324
	N	215	215	215	215	215	215	215	185
	Std. Deviation	6.31544	6.04923	1.49759	3.69705	2.85389	5.99398	2.17227	4.36227
Three	Mean	7.7852	6.9556	.8741	5.3852	3.6074	9.0296	2.2593	8.0960
	N	135	135	135	135	135	135	135	125
	Std. Deviation	5.94425	5.95489	1.41648	3.53234	2.79951	5.56768	2.29198	4.25862
Four	Mean	7.5200	7.3600	1.5300	4.6600	3.0200	7.2800	2.1800	6.6889
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	90
	Std. Deviation	5.74453	6.62490	2.01236	3.76110	2.79603	5.27062	1.99180	4.25228
Five & above	Mean	8.0541	7.0000	1.2162	5.1351	4.1622	9.5405	2.1081	6.7586
	N	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	29
	Std. Deviation	6.56144	6.07819	2.00188	3.99418	2.61952	5.64503	1.76043	5.75484
Total	Mean	7.2200	6.2727	.9303	4.3648	3.0077	7.1441	2.1836	6.3915
	N	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1180
	Std. Deviation	6.43184	6.27447	1.54963	3.83428	2.86410	5.85213	2.29416	4.69467

SIMSS = Severity Index of Mental Symptoms of Stress; SIPSS = Severity Index of Physical Symptoms of Stress; SIOSS = Severity Index of Other Symptoms of Stress; SIPSSS = Severity Index of Personal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIIPSSS = Severity Index of Interpersonal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIWSSS = Severity Index of Work Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIRSSS = Severity Index of Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; SICS = Severity Index of Coping Strategies.

Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire

The mean comparison of the number of dependents and the severity index of all variables under study shows that the mean are varied in all the categories. In respondents having no dependents on them, the average value of the severity index off all the variables are lower than the sample mean. In, respondents having one dependent on them have a higher average value of severity index than the sample mean for all the variables except the severity index of recreational sources of stress. While in respondents having two dependents on them, the value of the severity index of mental symptoms of stress, inter personal sources of stress, source of stress at work place and practicing coping strategies of stress are higher than the sample mean.

Respondents having three dependents on them, the value of the severity index of all the variables under study are higher than the sample mean except the severity index of other symptoms of stress whereas in respondents having four dependents on them, the value of the severity index for all the variables are higher than the sample mean except severity index of recreational sources of stress and the same trend has been seen in the five and more number of dependent category.

Table - 6.30: Mean Comparison of Severity Index of Mental, Physical, Other Symptoms of Stress; Personal, Interpersonal, Work, Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; Coping Strategies with respect to Location of Police Station

Location of Police Station		SIMSS	SIPSS	SIOSS	SIPSSS	SIIPSSS	SIWSSS	SIRSSS	SICS
Urban	Mean	6.5728	6.1059	.8184	4.1048	2.7905	6.5821	1.9884	6.1439
	N	859	859	859	859	859	859	859	834
	Std. Deviation	6.46834	6.54920	1.49423	3.98490	2.89125	5.89288	2.25524	4.78552
Town	Mean	7.3182	6.8864	.7136	4.3773	3.3091	6.9045	2.1409	6.5472
	N	220	220	220	220	220	220	220	212
	Std. Deviation	5.89239	5.66821	1.32582	3.14467	2.70547	5.13605	2.13968	4.32918
Village	Mean	10.7345	7.0339	1.7966	5.8418	3.8870	10.7571	3.4520	8.3535
	N	177	177	177	177	177	177	177	99
	Std. Deviation	5.80190	5.58803	1.81327	3.54482	2.78973	5.17564	2.39536	4.10652
Out post	Mean	4.7143	2.6571	.6571	3.2000	2.0000	4.1714	.8286	5.8000
	N	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35
	Std. Deviation	5.86902	4.80773	1.34914	3.72432	2.44949	5.39327	.95442	5.00470
Total	Mean	7.2200	6.2727	.9303	4.3648	3.0077	7.1441	2.1836	6.3915
	N	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1180
	Std. Deviation	6.43184	6.27447	1.54963	3.83428	2.86410	5.85213	2.29416	4.69467

SIMSS = Severity Index of Mental Symptoms of Stress; SIPSS = Severity Index of Physical Symptoms of Stress; SIOSS = Severity Index of Other Symptoms of Stress; SIPSSS = Severity Index of Personal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIIPSSS = Severity Index of Interpersonal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIWSSS = Severity Index of Work Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIRSSS = Severity Index of Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; SICS = Severity Index of Coping Strategies.

Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire

The mean comparison of the location of police station and the severity index of all variables under study show that the mean are varied among all the categories. The average value of severity index of mental symptoms of stress is high in the village and town category of the location of police station than the sample mean and same trend has been observed in the severity index of physical symptoms of stress, personal and inter personal sources of stress and the practicing of coping strategies for stress. While in others symptoms of stress, the value of the severity index is

higher in the village category of location of police station than the sample mean and the same trend has been found in the sources of stress at work place and recreational sources of stress.

Table – 6.31: Mean Comparison of Severity Index of Mental, Physical, Other Symptoms of Stress; Personal, Interpersonal, Work, Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; Coping Strategies with respect to Rank in the Police Force

Rank in the Police Force		SIMSS	SIPSS	SIOSS	SIPSSS	SIIPSSS	SIWSSS	SIRSSS	SICS
DG, ADG, IG, SPL, IG, DIG	Mean	5.3333	10.3333	1.0000	4.3333	4.3333	9.3333	4.0000	7.0000
	N	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	Std. Deviation	6.65833	9.60902	1.73205	4.04145	3.51188	7.57188	1.00000	3.60555
DSP/DCP, DYSP/ACP	Mean	6.2394	7.4366	.6761	3.6197	2.9296	6.2535	1.1408	4.7727
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	66
	Std. Deviation	6.46411	7.89346	1.26236	3.70469	3.33520	6.28313	1.74271	3.89791
PI	Mean	7.6667	7.6111	.9365	5.0556	3.5635	7.9444	2.3730	5.9587
	N	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	121
	Std. Deviation	6.25204	5.75357	1.51127	3.67109	3.00798	5.78592	2.03070	4.73708
PSI, JAMADAR, HEAD CONSTABLE, CONSTABLE	Mean	7.2374	6.0312	.9459	4.3336	2.9450	7.1036	2.2246	6.5505
	N	1091	1091	1091	1091	1091	1091	1091	990
	Std. Deviation	6.45105	6.18276	1.57090	3.85358	2.80869	5.82334	2.33953	4.72253
Total	Mean	7.2200	6.2727	.9303	4.3648	3.0077	7.1441	2.1836	6.3915
	N	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1180
	Std. Deviation	6.43184	6.27447	1.54963	3.83428	2.86410	5.85213	2.29416	4.69467

SIMSS = Severity Index of Mental Symptoms of Stress; SIPSS = Severity Index of Physical Symptoms of Stress; SIOSS = Severity Index of Other Symptoms of Stress; SIPSSS = Severity Index of Personal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIIPSSS = Severity Index of Interpersonal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIWSSS = Severity Index of Work Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIRSSS = Severity Index of Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; SICS = Severity Index of Coping Strategies.

Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire

The mean comparison of rank in the police force and the severity index of all variables under study show that the mean are varied among all the categories. In the respondents belonging to the DG category, the value of the severity index is higher for all the variables except the severity index of mental symptoms of stress and personal sources of stress than the sample mean as shown in Table 6.31, where as in the DSP/DCP category, the average value of the severity index of all the variables is lower than the sample mean except the severity index of physical symptoms of stress.

In the respondents belonging to the PI category, the value of the severity index of all the variables is higher than the sample mean except the severity index for practicing coping strategies of stress. While among the PSI category, the value of the severity index of mental and other symptoms of stress, recreational sources of stress and practicing coping strategies of stress is higher than the sample mean.

Table - 6.32: Mean Comparison of Severity Index of Mental, Physical, Other Symptoms of Stress; Personal, Interpersonal, Work, Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; Coping Strategies with respect to Experience

Experience		SIMSS	SIPSS	SIOSS	SIPSSS	SIIPSSS	SIWSSS	SIRSSS	SICS
UP TO 5	Mean	6.0109	5.5179	.7691	3.9766	2.7005	6.6895	2.0343	6.2678
	N	641	641	641	641	641	641	641	631
	Std. Deviation	5.99413	6.12654	1.42622	3.67607	2.72617	5.62795	2.24417	4.52326
6 -10	Mean	7.6444	6.1000	1.1222	4.2028	3.0806	6.8111	2.2833	5.9688
	N	360	360	360	360	360	360	360	320
	Std. Deviation	6.82705	6.17624	1.67783	3.96720	2.99613	6.23923	2.43758	4.78100
11 - 15	Mean	10.1203	8.5127	1.4810	6.0759	4.2595	9.6392	2.9304	7.3780
	N	158	158	158	158	158	158	158	127
	Std. Deviation	6.15858	5.90664	1.83983	3.59679	2.64016	5.62096	2.17723	5.14693
16 - 20	Mean	9.0635	8.1111	.5238	5.0794	3.0000	7.2222	2.2540	7.0536
	N	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	56
	Std. Deviation	7.32180	7.42731	1.11958	4.09288	3.13667	5.90911	2.34155	5.02510
21 - 25	Mean	8.6667	9.2000	.8667	4.6667	2.4000	7.4667	1.2000	8.8571
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	21
	Std. Deviation	6.01340	6.60929	1.40770	4.76578	3.36923	5.03596	1.62735	4.45293
26 -30	Mean	7.4000	6.7667	.3000	4.2333	2.6667	6.5333	1.3000	6.6250
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	24
	Std. Deviation	3.63508	6.06677	.59596	3.01357	2.35377	4.44688	1.74494	3.58514
Above 30	Mean	7.1111	3.3333	.2222	2.8889	3.2222	9.4444	1.4444	.0000
	N	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	1
	Std. Deviation	6.31357	3.77492	.66667	2.52212	3.23179	5.91843	1.58990	.
Total	Mean	7.2200	6.2727	.9303	4.3648	3.0077	7.1441	2.1836	6.3915
	N	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1180
	Std. Deviation	6.43184	6.27447	1.54963	3.83428	2.86410	5.85213	2.29416	4.69467

SIMSS = Severity Index of Mental Symptoms of Stress; SIPSS = Severity Index of Physical Symptoms of Stress; SIOSS = Severity Index of Other Symptoms of Stress; SIPSSS = Severity Index of Personal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIIPSSS = Severity Index of Interpersonal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIWSSS = Severity Index of Work Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIRSSS = Severity Index of Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; SICS = Severity Index of Coping Strategies.

Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire

The mean comparison of Experience and severity index of all the variables under study show that the mean are varied among al the categories. Among respondents

having experience of up to five years, the average value of the severity index of all the variables is lower than the sample mean. While in respondents having an experience of 6-10 years, the average values of the severity index of all the variables is lower than the sample mean except severity index of mental & other symptoms of stress and inter personal & recreational sources of stress.

Among the respondents having 11-15 years of experience, the average value of the severity index of all the variables is higher than the sample mean where as in the respondents with 16-20 years of experience the average value of the severity index of all the variables is higher than the sample mean except other symptoms of stress and inter personal sources of stress. While in respondents with 21-25 years of experience, the average value of the severity index of all the variables is higher than the sample mean except other symptoms of stress, inter personal & recreational sources of stress.

Those respondents who belong fall in the category of 26-30 years of experience, the average value of the severity index of all the variables is lower than the sample mean except mental & physical symptoms of stress and practicing coping strategies for stress whereas in respondents belonging to the category of 30 years and above experience, the average value of the severity index of all the variables is lower than the sample mean except inter personal & work place sources of stress.

Table - 6.33: Mean Comparison of Severity Index of Mental, Physical, Other Symptoms of Stress; Personal, Interpersonal, Work, Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; Coping Strategies with respect to Income in Rupees

Income in Rupees		SIMSS	SIPSS	SIOSS	SIPSSS	SIIPSSS	SIWSSS	SIRSSS	SICS
below 1,00,000	Mean	6.7149	5.9421	.7796	4.1763	2.9311	6.6997	2.1708	6.6321
	N	726	726	726	726	726	726	726	723
	Std. Deviation	6.29482	6.31338	1.43970	3.73565	2.79521	5.48560	2.30466	4.60551
1,00,001 - 2,25,000	Mean	6.5207	5.9917	.9380	4.0537	2.6364	6.1694	1.7769	5.7324
	N	242	242	242	242	242	242	242	213
	Std. Deviation	6.55218	6.45507	1.64490	4.04759	2.71006	5.93955	2.11883	4.98571
2,25,001 - 3,00,000	Mean	8.8995	7.4497	1.1746	5.1746	3.4868	8.7566	2.6243	6.7450
	N	189	189	189	189	189	189	189	149
	Std. Deviation	6.06748	5.25356	1.56633	3.83103	3.05553	5.90834	2.28353	4.71793

3,00,000 - 5,00,000	Mean	9.6000	7.1500	1.7200	5.1000	3.7600	9.9000	2.7800	6.2097
	N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	62
	Std. Deviation	6.56898	6.40293	1.89673	3.57460	2.88892	6.50951	2.40614	4.65582
Above 5,00,000	Mean	6.6471	6.2059	.4118	3.9412	2.4118	6.5000	1.1471	4.1212
	N	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	33
	Std. Deviation	7.14305	8.09332	.89163	4.41033	3.55151	6.66174	2.16210	3.78944
Total	Mean	7.2200	6.2727	.9303	4.3648	3.0077	7.1441	2.1836	6.3915
	N	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1291	1180
	Std. Deviation	6.43184	6.27447	1.54963	3.83428	2.86410	5.85213	2.29416	4.69467

SIMSS = Severity Index of Mental Symptoms of Stress; SIPSS = Severity Index of Physical Symptoms of Stress; SIOSS = Severity Index of Other Symptoms of Stress; SIPSSS = Severity Index of Personal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIIPSSS = Severity Index of Interpersonal Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIWSSS = Severity Index of Work Sphere of Sources of Stress; SIRSSS = Severity Index of Recreational Sphere of Sources of Stress; SICS = Severity Index of Coping Strategies.

Sources: SPSS (Version 20) Output of Primary Data Based on Questionnaire

The mean comparison of income and the severity index of all variables under study show that the mean are varied among the all categories. The average value of the severity index of mental symptoms of stress is higher among the middle income group than the sample mean as shown in Table 6.33 and the same trend has been observed in the severity index of physical symptoms of stress, personal, inter personal work place and recreational sources of stress. While in other symptoms of stress the average of the severity index of others symptoms of stress is high among the income group of 1-2.5 lakhs to 3-5 lakhs than the sample mean. The respondents in the below one lakh and 2.25-3 lakhs income category are sensible in practicing coping strategies of stress.

REGRESSION ANALYSIS:

The study has considered Others symptoms of stress as Dependent variables and two independent variables were used to check the influence of independent variables on dependent variable mental symptoms of stress and physical symptoms of stress. To establish the relationship between dependent and independent variables, the study applied the OLS regression model to determine the significance of the level of the independent variables for the various symptoms of stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat. .

The basic model is as follows:

Other symptoms of stress (OSS) = f [Mental symptoms of stress (MSS) and Physical symptoms of stress (PSS)]. Statistically Regression equation can be written as:

$$[OSS = \alpha + ß_1x_1 + ß_2x_2 + e]$$

Where,

OSS = Others symptoms of stress

X_1 = Mental symptoms of stress (MSS)

X_2 = Physical symptoms of stress (PSS)

The α is constant while $ß_s$ are coefficients of estimates and e is the error term.

Table 6.34 a: [Descriptive Statistics of Various Symptoms of Stress

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Other Symptoms of Stress	1.7281	.93133	1291
Mental Symptoms of Stress	2.2772	.94226	1291
Physical Symptoms of Stress	2.0565	.87167	1291

[Source: SPSS regression results of the primary data]

Table (6.34 a) shows the mean value depicting all the variables of stress for selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat. As far as the descriptive statistics of all the variables is concerned, the other symptoms of stress have a mean value of 1.7281 on a 5 point Likert scale, while the mental and physical symptoms of stress have a mean

value of 2.2772 and 2.0565 respectively. The respondents have shown very low level of other symptoms of stress while the level of mental symptoms of stress is very high among the three variables. The study tried to find out the impact of mental symptoms of stress and physical symptoms of stress on other symptoms of stress. A regression analysis was applied for the same to identify and explain the independent variables and its effect on dependent variables. The overall regression models and its ANOVA are summarized in the following table.

Table 6.34 b: Model Summary of Symptoms of Stress

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.556[a]	.309	.308	.77471

a. Predictors: (Constant), PSS, MSS

Table 6.34 c: ANOVAb : Symptoms of Stress

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	345.869	2	172.935	288.137	.000[a]
	Residual	773.034	1288	.600		
	Total	1118.903	1290			

a. Predictors: (Constant), PSS, MSS

b. Dependent Variable: OSS

It is clear from the ANOVA test (Table 6.34 c) shown in the table that the significance value 0.05 is greater than the calculated significance value 0.000. It reflects the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance. It means that there was a significant correlation between Dependent and Independent variables. Therefore the other symptoms of stress among selected police personnel in Gujarat depends on the mental symptoms of stress and physical symptoms of stress. But it does not mean that both the identified independent variables have a significant correlation with other symptoms of stress among selected police personnel in Gujarat.

The overall predictability of the model is shown in Table 6.34 b. The adjusted R^2 value of .308 indicates that the model explains 30.8% of independent variables as

responsible for others symptoms of stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat. The ANOVA table shows the significant F values which implies that the model and data are appropriate to explain the other symptoms of stress. Based on the data found in Table 6.34 d, it can be interpreted that the independent variable i.e., mental symptoms of stress have a strong impact on the other symptoms of stress than the Physical symptoms of stress. Both the variables have almost equal and significant contribution towards other symptoms of stress. Hence no variable has been dropped from the final analysis.

Table 6.34 d: Coefficients[a] Symptoms of Stress

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.419	.059	-	7.148	.000
	MSS	.315	.037	.319	8.489	.000
	PSS	.288	.040	.269	7.179	.000
a. Dependent Variable: OSS						

On the basis of above data and its finding, the following regression model has been developed:

$$[OSS = 0.419 + .315X_1 + .288X_2]$$

Where,

OSS = Other Symptoms of Stress

X_1 = Mental Symptoms of Stress

X_2 = Physical Symptoms of Stress

Coefficient analysis shows the relationship between Dependent variable and each Independent variable. According to the significance value, Mental Symptoms of Stress and Physical Symptoms of Stress have Positive significant correlation with the Other Symptoms of Stress. But the table significance value is 0.05 which is greater than the calculated significance value 0.000.

In regression coefficient analysis (Table 6.34 d) Beta value of X_1 (Mental Symptoms of Stress) is .319 which indicates that 100% variation in Mental symptoms of stress leads to 31.9% change in the Other symptoms of Stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

Beta value of X_2 (Physical Symptoms of Stress) is .269 which indicates that 100% variation in Physical Symptoms of Stress leads to 26.9% change in the Other symptoms of Stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

An attempt has been made to improve the goodness of fit of the model by inter changing the variables. In this modified regression analysis, dependent variable has been considered as Mental Symptoms of stress and independent variables are Physical symptoms of stress and Other Symptoms of stress. The descriptive statistics of the modified model is the same as above.

Table 6.35 a: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.800[a]	.639	.639	.56637

a. Predictors: (Constant), OSS, PSS

Table 6.35 b: ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	732.170	2	366.085	1141.234	.000[a]
	Residual	413.164	1288	.321		
	Total	1145.334	1290			

a. Predictors: (Constant), OSS, PSS

b. Dependent Variable: MSS

A comparison has been made between the original model of adjusted R square and modified model of adjusted R square. A drastic improvement has been noticed between the two adjusted R square. The earlier model's adjusted R square was .308 while the current modified model's adjusted R square is .639.

Table 6.35 c: Coefficients[a]						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.430	.042		10.218	.000
	PSS	.757	.021	.700	35.742	.000
	OSS	.168	.020	.166	8.489	.000
a. Dependent Variable: MSS						

On the basis of the above data and its finding, the following modified regression model has been developed:

$$[MSS = .430 + .757X_1 + .168X_2]$$

Where,

MSS = Mental Symptoms of Stress

X_1 = Physical Symptoms of Stress

X_2 = Other Symptoms of Stress

In the model, a major improvement has been noticed in all aspects. The first improvement is in the constant (Alpha) value. The modified constant value increased slightly to .430 from the original constant value .419. The second improvement is in the contribution of physical symptoms of stress towards dependent variable. In the previous model the parameter of physical symptoms of stress was .066 only, whereas in the modified model the significant improvement has been noticed in the value (0.757). This explains that 100% variation in Physical symptoms of stress leads to 75.7% change in mental symptoms of stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat. In other symptoms of stress, the standard Beta value explains that 100% variation in other symptoms of stress leads to 16.8% change in the mental symptoms of stress which explains that other symptoms of stress have a say of 16.8% in the mental symptoms of stress. Finally, the improved regression analysis model has been taken into consideration for the study and the analysis has been made on that basis.

Regression Analysis: Personal Source vs. Symptoms of Stress:

The study has considered Personal Sources of Stress as a Dependent variable and three independent variables are used to check the influence of independent variables on the dependent variable mental symptoms of stress, physical symptoms of stress and others symptoms of stress. To establish the relationship between dependent and independent variables, the study has applied the OLS regression model to determine the significance level of the independent variables for the Personal Sources of Stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

The basic model is as follows:

Personal Sources of Stress (PSS) = f [Mental symptoms of stress (MSS), Physical symptoms of stress (PSS) and Others Symptoms of Stress (OSS)]. Statistically the Regression equation can be written as:

$$[PSS = \alpha + ß_1x_1 + ß_2x_2 + ß_3x_3 + e]$$

Where,

PSS = Personal Sources of Stress

X_1 = Mental symptoms of stress (MSS)

X_2 = Physical symptoms of stress (PSS)

X_3 = Other symptoms of Stress (OSS)

The α is constant while $ß_s$ are coefficients of estimates and e is the error term.

Table (6.36 a) shows the mean value depicting all variables of symptoms of stress for selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat. As far as the descriptive statistics of all variables is concerned, the other symptoms of stress have a mean value of 1.7281 on a 5 point Likert scale while the mental and physical symptoms of stress have a mean value of 2.2772 and 2.0565 respectively. The mean value of personal symptoms of stress is 2.3851, the highest among all four variables in the study. The respondents have shown very less level of other symptoms of stress while the level

of mental symptoms of stress is very high among the three variables. The study tries to find out the impact of various symptoms of stress on personal sources of stress. A regression analysis was applied for the same to identify and explain the independent variables and its effect on dependent variables. The overall regression models and its ANOVA are summarized in the following tables.

Table 6.36 a: Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Personal sources of stress	2.3851	.86529	1291
Mental symptoms of stress	2.2772	.94226	1291
Physical symptoms of stress	2.0565	.87167	1291
Other symptoms of stress	1.7281	.93133	1291

[Source: SPSS regression results of the primary data]

Table 6.36 b: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.767[a]	.588	.587	.55596

a. Predictors: (Constant), OSS, PSS, MSS

It is clear from the ANOVA test (Table 6.36 c) that the table significance value 0.05 is greater than the calculated significance value 0.000. It reflects the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance. It means that there was a significant correlation between Dependent and Independent variables. Therefore the personal sources of stress among selected police personnel in Gujarat depends on the mental symptoms of stress, physical symptoms of stress and other symptoms of stress. But it does not mean that all the three identified independent variables have a significant correlation with personal sources of stress.

The overall predictability of the model is shown in Table 6.36 b. The adjusted R^2 value of .587 indicates that the model explains 58.7% of independent variables are responsible for personal sources of stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat. The ANOVA table shows the significant F values which implies that

the model and data are useful in explaining the personal sources of stress. Based on the data found in the Table 6.36 d, it can be interpreted that the independent variables Mental symptoms of stress, physical symptoms of stress and others symptoms of stress have a strong impact on the personal sources of stress. The entire three variables have significant contribution towards personal sources of stress. Hence no any variable have been dropped from the final analysis.

Table 6.36 c: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	568.060	3	189.353	612.606	.000[a]
	Residual	397.805	1287	.309		
	Total	965.865	1290			

a. Predictors: (Constant), OSS, PSS, MSS

b. Dependent Variable: PSSS

Table 6.36 d Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.691	.043		16.094	.000
	MSS	.416	.027	.453	15.203	.000
	PSS	.324	.029	.326	11.031	.000
	OSS	.047	.020	.051	2.371	.018

a. Dependent Variable: PSSS

On the basis of above data and its finding, the following regression model has been developed:

$$[PSS = 0.691 + .416X_1 + .324X_2 + .047X_3]$$

Where,

PSS = Personal Sources of Stress

X_1 = Mental Symptoms of Stress

X_2 = Physical Symptoms of Stress

X_3 = Other Symptoms of Stress

Coefficient analysis shows the relationship between Dependent variable and each Independent variable. According to significance value Mental Symptoms of Stress, Physical Symptoms of Stress and other symptoms of stress have Positive significant correlation with the personal sources of stress. But the table significance value is 0.05 which is greater than the calculated significance value 0.000.

In regression coefficient analysis (Table 6.36 d) Beta value of X_1 (Mental Symptoms of Stress) is .453 which indicates that 100% variation in Mental symptoms of stress leads to 45.3% change in the personal sources of stress among selected police personnel in the state of Gujarat.

Beta value of X_2 (Physical Symptoms of Stress) is .326 which indicates that 100% variation in Physical symptoms of stress leads to 32.6% change in the personal sources of stress.

Beta value of X_3 (Other symptoms of stress) is .051 which indicates that 100% variation in others symptoms of stress leads to 5.1% change in the personal sources of stress.

The study has considered inter personal sources of stress as dependent variable and three independent variables used to check the influence of independent variables on dependent variable mental symptoms of stress, physical symptoms of stress and other symptoms of stress. To establish the relationship between dependent and independent variables, the study applied the OLS regression model to determine the significance level of the independent variables for the inter personal sources of stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat. The basic model is as follows:

Inter Personal Sources of Stress (IPSS) = f [Mental symptoms of stress (MSS), Physical symptoms of stress (PSS) and Other symptoms of stress (OSS)]. Statistically Regression equation can be written as:

$$[IPSS = \alpha + ß_1x_1 + ß_2x_2 + ß_3x_3 + e]$$

Where,

IPSS = Inter Personal Sources of Stress

X_1 = Mental symptoms of stress (MSS)

X_2 = Physical symptoms of stress (PSS)

X_3 = Other symptoms of stress (OSS)

The α is constant while $ß_s$ are coefficients of estimates and e is the error term.

Table 6.37 a: Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Inter Personal Sources of Stress	2.3682	.88842	1291
Mental symptoms of stress	2.2772	.94226	1291
Physical symptoms of stress	2.0565	.87167	1291
Other symptoms of stress	1.7281	.93133	1291

[Source: SPSS regression results of the primary data]

Table (6.37 a) shows the mean value depicting all the variables of stress for selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat. As far as the descriptive statistics of all variables is concerned, the other symptoms of stress have a lowest mean value of

1.7281 on a 5 point Likert scale, while the mental and physical symptoms of stress have a mean value of 2.2772 and 2.0565 respectively. The respondents have shown very low level of other symptoms of stress while the level of mental symptoms of stress is very high among the three variables. The study tries to find out the impact of mental symptoms of stress, physical symptoms of stress and other symptoms of stress on inter personal sources of stress. A regression analysis has been applied for the same to identify and explain the independent variables and its effect on dependent variables. The overall regression models and its ANOVA are summarized in the following table:

Table 6.37 b: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.755[a]	.570	.569	.58312

a. Predictors: (Constant), OSS, PSS, MSS

Table 6.37 c: ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	580.556	3	193.519	569.119	.000[a]
	Residual	437.621	1287	.340		
	Total	1018.178	1290			

a. Predictors: (Constant), OSS, PSS, MSS

b. Dependent Variable: IPSSS

It is clear from the ANOVA test (Table 6.37 c) which shows that the table significance value 0.05 is greater than the calculated significance value 0.000. It reflects the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance. It means that there was a significant correlation between Dependent and Independent variables. Therefore, inter personal sources of stress among selected police personnel in Gujarat depends on the mental symptoms of stress, physical symptoms of stress and other symptoms of stress. But it does not mean that all three identified independent variables have a significant correlation with inter personal sources of stress among selected police personnel in Gujarat.

The overall predictability of the model is shown in Table 6.37 b. The adjusted R^2 value of .569 indicates that the model explains 56.9% of independent variables as responsible for inter personal sources of stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat. The ANOVA table shows the significant F value which implies that the model and data fit well to explain inter personal sources of stress.

Based on the data found in the Table 6.37 d, it can be interpreted that the independent variables Mental symptoms of stress have a strong impact on the inter personal sources of stress than the Physical and other symptoms of stress. All the three variables have significant positive contribution towards inter personal sources of stress. Hence not a single variable has been dropped from the final analysis.

Table 6.37 d: Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.637	.045		14.159	.000
	MSS	.385	.029	.408	13.424	.000
	PSS	.306	.031	.300	9.944	.000
	OSS	.130	.021	.136	6.200	.000

a. Dependent Variable: IPSSS

On the basis of above data and its finding, the following regression model has been developed:

$$[IPSS = 0.637 + .385X_1 + .306X_2 + .130X_3]$$

Where,

IPSS = Inter Personal Sources of Stress

X_1 = Mental symptoms of stress (MSS)

X_2 = Physical symptoms of stress (PSS)

X_3 = Other symptoms of stress (OSS)

Coefficient analysis shows the relationship between Dependent variable and each Independent variable. According to significance value Mental Symptoms of Stress, Physical Symptoms of Stress and others symptoms of stress have Positive significant correlation with inter personal sources of stress. The table significance value is 0.05 which is greater than the calculated significance value 0.000.

In regression coefficient analysis (Table 6.37 d) Beta value of X_1 (Mental Symptoms of Stress) is .408 which indicates that 100% variation in Mental symptoms of stress leads to 40.8% change in inter personal sources of Stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

Beta value of X_2 (Physical Symptoms of Stress) is .300 which indicates that 100% variation in Physical Symptoms of Stress leads to 30% change in inter personal sources of Stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

Beta value of X_3 (Other Symptoms of Stress) is .136 which indicates that 100% variation in Physical Symptoms of Stress leads to 13.6% change in inter personal sources of Stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

The study has considered sources of stress at work place as Dependent variable and three independent variables were used to check the influence of independent variables on dependent variable mental symptoms of stress, physical symptoms of stress and other symptoms of stress. To establish the relationship between dependent and independent variables, the study has applied the OLS regression model to determine the significance level of the independent variables for sources of stress at work place among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

The basic model is as follows:

Sources of Stress at Work Place (SSWP) = f [Mental symptoms of stress (MSS), Physical symptoms of stress (PSS) and Other symptoms of stress (OSS)]. Statistically Regression equation can be written as:

$$[SSWP = \alpha + ß_1x_1 + ß_2x_2 + ß_3x_3 + e]$$

Where,

SSWP = Sources of Stress at Work Place

X_1 = Mental symptoms of stress (MSS)

X_2 = Physical symptoms of stress (PSS)

X_3 = Other symptoms of stress (OSS)

The α is constant while $ß_s$ are coefficients of estimates and e is the error term.

Table 6.38 a: Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Work sphere sources of stress	2.5466	.91643	1291
Mental symptoms of stress	2.2772	.94226	1291
Physical symptoms of stress	2.0565	.87167	1291
Others symptoms of stress	1.7281	.93133	1291

[Source: SPSS regression results of the primary data]

Table (6.38 a) shows the mean value depicting all the variables of stress for selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat. As far as the descriptive statistics of all

variables is concerned, the other symptoms of stress have the lowest mean value of 1.7281 on a 5 point Likert scale, while the mental and physical symptoms of stress have a mean value of 2.2772 and 2.0565 respectively. The respondents have shown very low level of other symptoms of stress while the level of mental symptoms of stress is very high among the three variables. The study tries to find out the impact of mental symptoms of stress, physical symptoms of stress and other symptoms of stress on sources of stress at work place. A regression analysis has been applied for the same to identify and explain the independent variables and its effect on dependent variables. The overall regression models and its ANOVA are summarized in the following table:

Table 6.38 b: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.724[a]	.524	.523	.63273

a. Predictors: (Constant), OSS, PSS, MSS

Table 6.38 c: ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	568.140	3	189.380	473.034	.000[a]
	Residual	515.252	1287	.400		
	Total	1083.392	1290			

a. Predictors: (Constant), OSS, PSS, MSS

b. Dependent Variable: WSSS

It is clear from the ANOVA test (Table 6.38 c) that the table significance value 0.05 is greater than the calculated significance value 0.000. It reflects the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance. It means that there was a significant correlation between Dependent and Independent variables. Therefore, sources of stress at work place among selected police personnel in Gujarat depends on the mental symptoms of stress, physical symptoms of stress and other symptoms of stress. But it does not mean that all three identified independent variables have a significant correlation with sources of stress at work place among selected police personnel in Gujarat.

The overall predictability of the model is shown in Table 6.38 b. The adjusted R^2 value of .523 indicates that model explains 52.3% of independent variables are responsible for sources of stress at work place among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat. The ANOVA table shows the moderate F value, which implies that the model and data are appropriate in explaining sources of stress at work place. Based on the data found in Table 6.38 d, it can be interpreted that the independent variables Mental symptoms of stress have a strong impact on sources of stress at work place than the Physical and others symptoms of stress. All the three variables have significant positive contribution towards sources of stress of stress. Hence no variable has been dropped from the final analysis.

6.38 d: Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.852	.049		17.455	.000
	MSS	.517	.031	.532	16.608	.000
	PSS	.140	.033	.133	4.189	.000
	OSS	.133	.023	.135	5.829	.000

a. Dependent Variable: WSSS

On the basis of the above data and its finding, the following regression model has been developed:

$$[SSWP = 0.852 + .517X_1 + .140X_2 + .133X_3]$$

Where,

SSWP = Sources of Stress at Work Place

X_1 = Mental symptoms of stress (MSS)

X_2 = Physical symptoms of stress (PSS)

X_3 = Other symptoms of stress (OSS)

Coefficient analysis shows the relationship between Dependent variable and each Independent variable. According to significance value of Mental Symptoms of Stress, Physical Symptoms of Stress and other symptoms of stress have Positive significant correlation with sources of stress at work place. The table significance value is 0.05 which is greater than the calculated significance value 0.000.

In the regression coefficient analysis (table 6.38 d) Beta value of X_1 (Mental Symptoms of Stress) is .532 which indicates that 100% variation in Mental symptoms of stress leads to 53.2% change in sources of stress at work place among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

Beta value of X_2 (Physical Symptoms of Stress) is .133 which indicates that 100% variation in Physical Symptoms of Stress leads to 13.3% change in sources of stress at work place among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

Beta value of X_3 (Other Symptoms of Stress) is .135 which indicates that 100% variation in Physical Symptoms of Stress leads to 13.5% change in the sources of stress at work place among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

The study has considered recreational sources of stress as Dependent variable and three independent variables were used to check the influence of Independent variables on Dependent variable Mental symptoms of stress, Physical symptoms of stress and other symptoms of stress. To establish the relationship between dependent and independent variables, the study applied the OLS regression model to determine the significance level of the independent variables for recreational sources of stress among selected police personnel in the state of Gujarat.

The basic model is as follows:

Recreational Sources of Stress (RSS) = f [Mental symptoms of stress (MSS), Physical symptoms of stress (PSS) and Other symptoms of stress (OSS)]. Statistically Regression equation can be written as:

$$[RSS = \alpha + ß_1x_1 + ß_2x_2 + ß_3x_3 + e]$$

Where,

RSS = Recreational Sources of Stress

X_1 = Mental symptoms of stress (MSS)

X_2 = Physical symptoms of stress (PSS)

X_3 = Other symptoms of stress (OSS)

The α is constant while $ß_s$ are coefficients of estimates and e is the error term.

Table 6.39 a: Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Recreational Sources of Stress	2.2318	.94968	1291
Mental Symptoms of Stress	2.2772	.94226	1291
Physical Symptoms of Stress	2.0565	.87167	1291
Other Symptoms of Stress	1.7281	.93133	1291

[Source: SPSS regression results of the primary data]

Table (6.39 a) shows the mean value depicting all the variables of stress for selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat. As far as the descriptive statistics of all the variables is concerned, the other symptoms of stress have the lowest mean value of

1.7281 on a 5 point Likert scale, while the mental and physical symptoms of stress have a mean value of 2.2772 and 2.0565 respectively. The respondents have shown a very low level of other symptoms of stress while the level of mental symptoms of stress is very high among the three variables. The study tried to find out the impact of mental symptoms of stress, physical symptoms of stress and other symptoms of stress on recreational sources of stress. A regression analysis has been applied for the same to identify and explain the independent variables and its effect on dependent variables. The overall regression models and its ANOVA are summarized in the following table:

Table 6.39 b: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.687[a]	.472	.470	.69120

a. Predictors: (Constant), OSS, PSS, MSS

Table 6.39 c: ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	548.581	3	182.860	382.753	.000[a]
	Residual	614.866	1287	.478		
	Total	1163.447	1290			

a. Predictors: (Constant), OSS, PSS, MSS

b. Dependent Variable: RSSS

It is clear from the ANOVA test (Table 6.39 c) that the table significance value 0.05 is greater than the calculated significance value 0.000. It reflects the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance. It means that there was a significant correlation between Dependent and Independent variables. Therefore, recreational sources of stress among selected police personnel in Gujarat depends on the mental symptoms of stress, physical symptoms of stress and other symptoms of stress. But it does not mean that all three identified independent variables have a significant correlation with recreational sources of stress among selected police personnel in Gujarat.

The overall predictability of the model is shown in Table 6.39 b. The adjusted R^2 value of .470 indicates that model explains that 47% of independent variables are responsible for sources of recreational stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat. The ANOVA table shows the F value which implies that the model and data are useful in explaining sources of stress at work place. Based on the data found in the Table 6.39 d, it can be interpreted that the independent variables mental symptoms of stress have a strong impact on recreational sources of stress than the other and physical symptoms of stress respectively. All the three variables have significant positive contribution towards recreational sources of stress. Hence no variable has been dropped from the final analysis.

Table 6.39 d: Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.600	.053		11.242	.000
	MSS	.378	.034	.376	11.130	.000
	PSS	.079	.036	.073	2.165	.031
	OSS	.352	.025	.345	14.148	.000

a. Dependent Variable: RSSS

On the basis of above data and its finding, the following regression model has been developed:

$$[RSS = 0.600 + .378X_1 + .079X_2 + .352X_3]$$

Where,

RSS = Recreational Sources of Stress

X_1 = Mental symptoms of stress (MSS)

X_2 = Physical symptoms of stress (PSS)

X_3 = Other symptoms of stress (OSS)

Coefficient analysis shows the relationship between Dependent variable and each Independent variable. According to significance value Mental Symptoms of Stress, Physical Symptoms of Stress and other symptoms of stress have a significant Positive correlation with recreational sources of stress. The table significance value is 0.05 which is greater than the calculated significance value 0.000 except in Physical Symptoms of stress.

In regression coefficient analysis (table 6.39 d) Beta value of X_1 (Mental Symptoms of Stress) is .378 which indicates that 100% variation in the Mental symptoms of stress leads to 37.8% change in recreational sources of Stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

Beta value of X_2 (Physical Symptoms of Stress) is .079 which indicates that 100% variation in Physical Symptoms of Stress leads to 7.9% change in recreational sources of stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

Beta value of X_3 (Other Symptoms of Stress) is .352 which indicates that 100% variation in Physical Symptoms of Stress leads to 35.2% change in recreational sources of stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

The study has considered Mental Symptoms of stress as dependent variable and four independent variables used to check the influence of independent variables on dependent variable personal sources of stress, interpersonal sources of stress, sources of stress at work place and recreational sources of stress. To establish the relationship between dependent and independent variables, the study has applied the OLS regression model to determine the significance level of the independent variables for mental symptoms of stress among selected police personnel in the state of Gujarat. The basic model is as follows:

Mental Symptoms of Stress (MSS) = f [Personal Sources of Stress (PSS), Inter Personal Sources of Stress (IPSS), Sources of Stress at Work Place (SSWP) and Recreational Sources of Stress (RSS)].

Statistically Regression equation can be written as:

$$[MSS = \alpha + ß_1x_1 + ß_2x_2 + ß_3x_3 + ß_4x_4 + e]$$

Where,

MSS = Mental Symptoms of Stress

X_1 = Personal Sources of Stress (PSS)

X_2 = Inter Personal Sources of Stress (IPSS)

X_3 = Sources of Stress at Work Place (SSWP)

X_4 = Recreational Sources of Stress (RSS)

The α is constant while $ß_s$ are coefficients of estimates and e is the error term.

Table 6.40 a: Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Mental Symptoms of Stress	2.2772	.94226	1291
Personal Sources of Stress	2.3851	.86529	1291
Inter Personal Sources of Stress	2.3682	.88842	1291
Sources of Stress at Work Place	2.5466	.91643	1291
Recreational Sources of Stress	2.2318	.94968	1291

[Source: SPSS regression results of the primary data]

Table (6.40 a) shows the mean value depicting all the variables of stress for selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat. As far as the descriptive statistics of all variables is concerned, the Recreational Sources of Stress have a lowest mean value of 2.2318 on a 5 point Likert scale while the Sources of Stress at Work Place, Personal Sources of Stress and Inter Personal Sources of Stress have a mean value of 2.5466, 2.3851 and 2.3682 respectively. The study tries to find out the impact of Sources of Stress on mental symptoms of stress. A regression analysis has been applied for the same to identify and explain the independent variables and its effect on dependent variables. The overall regression models and its ANOVA are summarized in the following table.

Table 6.40 b: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.793[a]	.629	.628	.57507

a. Predictors: (Constant), RSSS,PSSS,WSSS,IPSSS

Table 6.40 c: ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	720.049	4	180.012	544.331	.000[a]
	Residual	425.285	1286	.331		
	Total	1145.334	1290			

a. Predictors: (Constant), RSSS,PSSS,WSSS,IPSSS

b. Dependent Variable: MSS

It is clear from the ANOVA test (Table 6.40 c) shows the table significance value 0.05 is greater than the calculated significance value 0.000. It reflects the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance. It means that there was a significant correlation between Dependent and Independent variables. Therefore Mental Symptoms of Stress among selected police personnel in Gujarat depends on the various Sources of Stress. But it does not mean that all four identified independent variables have a significant correlation with mental symptoms of stress among selected police personnel in Gujarat.

The overall predictability of the model is shown in Table 6.40 b. The adjusted R^2 value of .628 indicates that the model explains 62.8% of independent variables are responsible for various sources of stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat. The ANOVA table shows the F value which implies that the model and data fit well to explain the Mental Symptoms of Stress. Based on the data found in Table 6.40 d, it can be interpreted that the independent variables Personal Sources of Stress have a strong impact on Mental Symptoms of Stress followed by Inter Personal Sources of Stress, Sources of Stress at Work Place and Recreational Sources of Stress respectively. All the four variables have significant positive contribution towards Mental Symptoms of Stress. Hence no variable has been dropped from the final analysis.

Table 6.40 d: Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.034	.051		.670	.503
	PSSS	.366	.032	.336	11.461	.000
	IPSSS	.249	.032	.235	7.867	.000
	WSSS	.213	.031	.207	6.943	.000
	RSSS	.107	.025	.108	4.277	.000

a. Dependent Variable: MSS

On the basis of above data and its finding, the following regression model has been developed:

$$[MSS = 0.034 + .336X_1 + .235X_2 + .207X_3 + .108X_4]$$

Where,

MSS = Mental Symptoms of Stress

X_1 = Personal Sources of Stress (PSS)

X_2 = Inter Personal Sources of Stress (IPSS)

X_3 = Sources of Stress at Work Place (SSWP)

X_4 = Recreational Sources of Stress (RSS)

Coefficient analysis shows the relationship between Dependent variable and each Independent variable. According to significance value, personal sources of stress, interpersonal sources of stress, sources of stress at work place and recreational sources of stress have a positive significant correlation with mental symptoms of stress. The table significance value is 0.05 is greater than the calculated significance value 0.000.

In regression coefficient analysis (table 6.40 d) Beta value of X_1 (Personal Sources of Stress) is .336 which indicates that 100% variation in Personal Sources of stress leads to 33.6% change in mental symptoms of Stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

Beta value of X_2 (Inter Personal Sources of Stress) is .235 which indicates that 100% variation in Inter Personal Sources of stress leads to 23.5% change in mental symptoms of Stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

Beta value of X_3 (Sources of Stress at Work Place) is .207 which indicates that 100% variation in Sources of Stress at Work Place leads to 20.7% change in mental symptoms of Stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

Beta value of X_4 (Recreational Sources of Stress) is .108 which indicates that 100% variation in Recreational Sources of Stress leads to 10.8% change in mental symptoms of Stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

The study has considered Physical Symptoms of stress as Dependent variable and four independent variables were used to check the influence of independent variables on dependent variable: personal sources of stress, interpersonal sources of stress, sources of stress at work place and recreational sources of stress. To establish the relationship between dependent and independent variables, the study has applied the OLS regression model to determine the significance level of the independent variables for Physical symptoms of stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat. The basic model is as follows:

Physical Symptoms of Stress (PSS) = f [Personal Sources of Stress (PSS), Inter Personal Sources of Stress (IPSS), Sources of Stress at Work Place (SSWP) and Recreational Sources of Stress (RSS)].

Statistically Regression equation can be written as:

$$[PSS = \alpha + ß_1x_1 + ß_2x_2 + ß_3x_3 + ß_4x_4 + e]$$

Where,

PSS = Physical Symptoms of Stress

X_1 = Personal Sources of Stress (PSS)

X_2 = Inter Personal Sources of Stress (IPSS)

X_3 = Sources of Stress at Work Place (SSWP)

X_4 = Recreational Sources of Stress (RSS)

The α is constant while $ß_s$ are coefficients of estimates and e is the error term.

Table 6.41 a: Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Physical Symptoms of Stress	2.0565	.87167	1291
Personal Sources of Stress	2.3851	.86529	1291
Inter Personal Sources of Stress	2.3682	.88842	1291
Sources of Stress at Work Place	2.5466	.91643	1291
Recreational Sources of Stress	2.2318	.94968	1291

[Source: SPSS regression results of the primary data]

Table (6.41 a) shows the mean value depicting all the variables of stress for selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat. As far as the descriptive statistics of all variables is concerned, the Recreational Sources of Stress have a lowest mean value of 2.2318 on a 5 point Likert scale while the Sources of Stress at Work Place, Personal Sources of Stress and Inter Personal Sources of Stress have a mean value of 2.5466, 2.3851 and 2.3682 respectively. The study tries to find out the impact of Sources of Stress on physical symptoms of stress. A regression analysis has been applied for the same to identify and explain the independent variables and its effect on dependent variables. The overall regression models and its ANOVA are summarized in the following table:

Table 6.41 b: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.749[a]	.561	.560	.57823

a. Predictors: (Constant), RSSS,PSSS,WSSS,IPSSS

Table 6.41 c: ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	550.182	4	137.545	411.387	.000[a]
	Residual	429.968	1286	.334		
	Total	980.150	1290			

a. Predictors: (Constant), RSSS,PSSS,WSSS,IPSSS

b. Dependent Variable: PSS

It is clear from the ANOVA test (Table 43 c) that the table significance value 0.05 is greater than the calculated significance value 0.000. It reflects the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance. It means that there was a significant correlation between Dependent and Independent variables. Therefore Physical Symptoms of Stress among selected police personnel in Gujarat depends on the various Sources of Stress. But it does not mean that all the four identified independent variables have a significant correlation with physical symptoms of stress among selected police personnel in Gujarat.

The overall predictability of the model is shown in Table 6.41 b. The adjusted R^2 value of .560 indicates that the model explains 56% of independent variables as responsible for various sources of stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat. The ANOVA table shows the F value which implies that the model and data are appropriate to explain the Physical Symptoms of Stress. Based on the data found in Table 6.41 d, it can be interpreted that the independent variables Personal Sources of Stress have a strong impact on Physical Symptoms of Stress followed by Inter Personal Sources of Stress, Sources of Stress at Work Place and Recreational Sources of Stress respectively. All the four variables have significant positive contribution towards Mental Symptoms of Stress. Hence no variable has been dropped from the final analysis.

Table 6.41 d: Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.133	.051		2.608	.009
	PSSS	.398	.032	.395	12.419	.000
	IPSSS	.306	.032	.312	9.610	.000
	WSSS	.052	.031	.054	1.682	.093
	RSSS	.052	.025	.057	2.066	.039

a. Dependent Variable: PSS

On the basis of above data and its finding, the following regression model has been developed:

$$[PSS = 0.133 + .398X_1 + .306X_2 + .052X_3 + .052X_4]$$

Where,

PSS = Physical Symptoms of Stress

X_1 = Personal Sources of Stress (PSS)

X_2 = Inter Personal Sources of Stress (IPSS)

X_3 = Sources of Stress at Work Place (SSWP)

X_4 = Recreational Sources of Stress (RSS)

Coefficient analysis shows the relationship between Dependent variable and each Independent variable. According to significance value, personal sources of stress, interpersonal sources of stress, sources of stress at work place and recreational sources of stress have positive significant correlation with mental symptoms of stress. The table significance value is 0.05 which is greater than the calculated significance value 0.000 in Personal and Inter Personal Sources of Stress.

In regression coefficient analysis (Table 6.41 d) Beta value of X_1 (Personal Sources of Stress) is .395 which indicates that 100% variation in Personal Sources of stress leads to 39.5% change in physical symptoms of Stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

Beta value of X_2 (Inter Personal Sources of Stress) is .312 which indicates that 100% variation in Inter Personal Sources of stress leads to 31.2% change in physical symptoms of Stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

Beta value of X_3 (Sources of Stress at Work Place) is .054 which indicates that 100% variation in Sources of Stress at Work Place leads to 5.4% change in physical symptoms of Stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

Beta value of X_4 (Recreational Sources of Stress) is .057 which indicates that 100% variation in Recreational Sources of Stress leads to 5.7% change in physical symptoms of Stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

The study has considered Practicing of Coping Strategies of stress as a Dependent variable and four independent variables were used to check the influence of independent variables on dependent variable: personal sources of stress, interpersonal sources of stress, sources of stress at work place and recreational sources of stress. To establish the relationship between dependent and independent variables the study applied the OLS regression model to determine the significance level of the independent variables for Physical symptoms of stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat. The basic model is as follows:

Practicing of Coping Strategies of Stress (PCSS) = f [Personal Sources of Stress (PSS), Inter Personal Sources of Stress (IPSS), Sources of Stress at Work Place (SSWP) and Recreational Sources of Stress (RSS)].

Statistically Regression equation can be written as:

$$[PCSS = \alpha + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \beta_3 x_3 + \beta_4 x_4 + e]$$

Where,

PCSS = Practicing Coping Strategies of Stress

X_1 = Personal Sources of Stress (PSS)

X_2 = Inter Personal Sources of Stress (IPSS)

X_3 = Sources of Stress at Work Place (SSWP)

X_4 = Recreational Sources of Stress (RSS)

The α is constant while β_s are coefficients of estimates and e is the error term.

Table 6.42 a: Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Coping Strategies of Stress	2.5535	.79722	1180
Personal Sources of Stress	2.3600	.88014	1180
Inter Personal Sources of Stress	2.3427	.89354	1180
Sources of Stress at Work Place	2.4838	.90345	1180
Recreational Sources of Stress	2.1858	.93170	1180

[Source: SPSS regression results of the primary data]

Table (6.42 a) shows the mean value depicting all the variables of stress for selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat. As far as the descriptive statistics of all variables is concerned, the Recreational Sources of Stress have the lowest mean value of 2.1858 on a 5 point Likert scale while the Sources of Stress at Work Place, Personal Sources of Stress and Inter Personal Sources of Stress have a mean value of 2.4838, 2.3600 and 2.3427 respectively. The study tries to find out the impact of Sources of Stress on practicing coping strategies of stress. A regression analysis has been applied for the same to identify and explain the independent variables and its effect on dependent variables. The overall regression models and its ANOVA are summarized in the following table:

Table 6.42 b: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.578[a]	.334	.332	.65173

a. Predictors: (Constant), RSSS,PSSS,WSSS,IPSSS

Table 6.42 c: ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	250.250	4	62.562	147.293	.000[a]
	Residual	499.078	1175	.425		
	Total	749.328	1179			

a. Predictors: (Constant), RSSS,PSSS,WSSS,IPSSS

b. Dependent Variable: CS

It is clear from the ANOVA test (Table 6.42 c) that the table significance value 0.05 is greater than the calculated significance value 0.000. It reflects the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance. It means that there was a significant correlation between dependent and Independent variables. Therefore practicing coping strategies of Stress among selected police personnel in Gujarat depends on various Sources of Stress. But it does not mean that all the four identified independent variables have a significant correlation with practicing coping strategies of Stress among selected police personnel in Gujarat.

The overall predictability of the model is shown in Table 6.42 b. The adjusted R^2 value of .332 indicates that the model explains 33.2% of independent variables as responsible for various sources of stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat. The ANOVA table shows the F value which implies that the model and data are appropriate in explaining practicing coping strategies of Stress. Based on the data found in Table 6.42 d, it can be interpreted that the independent variables Sources of Stress at work place has a strong impact on practicing coping strategies of Stress followed by personal sources of stress, inter personal sources of stress and Recreational Sources of Stress respectively. All the four variables have significant positive contribution towards practicing coping strategies of Stress. Hence no variable has been dropped from the final analysis.

Table 6.42 d: Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.199	.059		20.268	.000
	PSSS	.217	.038	.239	5.654	.000
	IPSSS	.068	.038	.076	1.775	.076
	WSSS	.244	.037	.276	6.595	.000
	RSSS	.036	.030	.042	1.183	.237

a. Dependent Variable: CS

On the basis of above data and its finding, the following regression model has been developed:

$$[PCSS = 1.199 + .239X_1 + .076X_2 + .276X_3 + .042X_4]$$

Where,

PCSS = Practicing Coping Strategies of Stress

X_1 = Personal Sources of Stress (PSS)

X_2 = Inter Personal Sources of Stress (IPSS)

X_3 = Sources of Stress at Work Place (SSWP)

X_4 = Recreational Sources of Stress (RSS)

Coefficient analysis shows the relationship between Dependent variable and each Independent variable. According to significance value, personal sources of stress, interpersonal sources of stress, sources of stress at work place and recreational sources of stress have positive significant correlation with practicing coping strategies of stress. The table significance value is 0.05 which is greater than the calculated significance value 0.000 in Personal and Sources of Stress at work place.

In regression coefficient analysis (table 6.42 d) Beta value of X_1 (Personal Sources of Stress) is .239 which indicates that 100% variation in Personal Sources of stress leads to 23.9% change in practicing coping strategies of Stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

Beta value of X_2 (Inter Personal Sources of Stress) is .076 which indicates that 100% variation in Inter Personal Sources of stress leads to 7.6% change in practicing coping strategies of Stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

Beta value of X_3 (Sources of Stress at Work Place) is .276 which indicates that 100% variation in Sources of Stress at Work Place leads to 27.6% change in practicing coping strategies of Stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

Beta value of X_4 (Recreational Sources of Stress) is .042 which indicates that 100% variation in Recreational Sources of Stress leads to 4.2% change in practicing coping strategies of Stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

The study has considered Practicing Coping Strategies of Stress as Dependent variable and three independent variables were used to check the influence of independent variables on dependent variable mental symptoms of stress, physical symptoms of stress and others symptoms of stress. To establish the relationship between dependent and independent variables, the study applied the OLS regression model to determine the significance level of the independent variables for the Practicing Coping Strategies of Stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat. The basic model is as follows:

Practicing Coping Strategies of Stress (PCSS) = f [Mental symptoms of stress (MSS), Physical symptoms of stress (PSS) and Others symptoms of stress (OSS)]. Statistically Regression equation can be written as:

$$[PCSS = \alpha + ß_1x_1 + ß_2x_2 + ß_3x_3 + e]$$

Where,

PCSS = Practicing Coping Strategies of Stress

X_1 = Mental symptoms of stress (MSS)

X_2 = Physical symptoms of stress (PSS)

X_3 = Other symptoms of stress (OSS)

The α is constant while $ß_s$ are coefficients of estimates and e is the error term.

Table 6.43 a: Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Coping Strategies of Stress	2.5535	.79722	1180
Mental Symptoms of Stress	2.2186	.94356	1180
Physical Symptoms of Stress	2.0573	.89600	1180
Other Symptoms of Stress	1.6582	.89582	1180

[Source: SPSS regression results of the primary data]

Table (6.43 a) shows the mean value depicting all the variables of stress for selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat. As far as the descriptive statistics of all variables is concerned, the other symptoms of stress have a lowest mean value of

1.6582 on a 5 point Likert scale, while the mental and physical symptoms of stress have a mean value of 2.2186 and 2.0573 respectively. The respondents have shown very low level of other symptoms of stress while the level of mental symptoms of stress is very high among the three variables. The study tries to find out the impact of mental symptoms of stress, physical symptoms of stress and other symptoms of stress on practicing coping strategies of stress. A regression analysis was applied for the same to identify and explain the independent variables and its effect on dependent variables. The overall regression models and its ANOVA are summarized in the following table:

Table 6.43 b: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.580[a]	.336	.334	.65047

a. Predictors: (Constant), OSS,MSS,PSS

Table 6.43 c: ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	251.748	3	83.916	198.330	.000[a]
	Residual	497.580	1176	.423		
	Total	749.328	1179			

a. Predictors: (Constant), OSS,MSS,PSS

b. Dependent Variable: CS

It is clear from the ANOVA test (Table 6.43 c) that the table significance value 0.05 is greater than the calculated significance value 0.000. It reflects the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance. It means that there was a significant correlation between Dependent and Independent variables. Therefore, practicing coping strategies of stress among selected police personnel in Gujarat depends on the mental symptoms of stress, physical symptoms of stress and others symptoms of stress. But it does not mean that all the three identified independent variables have a significant correlation with practicing coping strategies of stress among selected police personnel in Gujarat.

Coefficient analysis shows the relationship between Dependent variable and each Independent variable. According to the significance value Mental Symptoms of Stress and Physical Symptoms of Stress have Positive significant correlation with practicing coping strategies of stress. The table significance value is 0.05 which is greater than the calculated significance value 0.000.

In regression coefficient analysis (table 6.43 d) Beta value of X_1 (Mental Symptoms of Stress) is .412 which indicates that 100% variation in Mental symptoms of stress leads to 41.2% change in practicing coping strategies of stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

Beta value of X_2 (Physical Symptoms of Stress) is .200 which indicates that 100% variation in Physical Symptoms of Stress leads to 20% change in practicing coping strategies of stress among selected police personnel in the State of Gujarat.

Table - 6.44: Pearson Chi-Square Tests

		MSS	PSS	OSS	PSSS	IPSSS	WSSS	RSSS	CS	Post-retirement departmental issues	Do you know about Coping Strategy	Do you think this has helped you to reduce stress
Age	Chi-square	183.212	158.734	136.238	127.963	111.048	103.704	103.122	58.600	76.767	328.727	41.975
	Df	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	7	7	7
	Sig.	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*,a	.000*,a	.000*,a	.000*,a
Gender	Chi-square	10.564	8.736	14.343	6.348	9.205	12.952	8.677	.467	.221	.012	1.350
	Df	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1
	Sig.	.005*	.013*	.001*	.042*	.010*	.002*	.013*	.792	.638,a	.914b	.245
Qualification	Chi-square	176.951	281.223	46.948	181.246	126.331	147.609	86.843	162.107	24.924	6.839	10.957
	Df	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	3	3
	Sig.	.000*,a	.000*,a	.000*	.000*,a	.000*,a	.000*,a	.000*,a	.000*,b	.000*,a	.077,a	.012*
Religion	Chi-square	30.424	11.432	31.426	15.691	10.316	18.862	16.944	17.397	2.447	2.764	1.444
	Df	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	3	3
	Sig.	.000*,a	.076,a	.000*,a	.016*,a	.112,a	.004*,a	.009*,a	.008*,b	.485,a	.429,ab	.695b
Category	Chi-square	147.371	173.168	72.675	167.541	78.485	169.968	91.224	88.412	28.801	17.989	12.834
	Df	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	3	3
	Sig.	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*,a	.000*	.005*
Place of Residence	Chi-square	52.271	18.730	74.974	39.017	10.613	62.935	48.097	5.428	64.672	137.415	4.415
	Df	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	2	2
	Sig.	.000*	.001*	.000*	.000*	.031*	.000*	.000*	.246	.000*,a	.000*	,.110
Marital Status	Chi-square	40.487	28.799	49.780	20.508	23.500	23.252	36.027	15.006	12.733	38.781	12.968
	Df	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	3	3
	Sig.	.000*	.000*	.000*	.002*	.001*	.001*	.000*	.020*,b	.005*,a	.000*b	.005*

Number of Dependants	Chi-square	108.318	91.757	42.746	71.592	45.029	64.452	43.930	28.131	46.926	106.836	9.139
	Df	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	5	5	5
	Sig.	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.002*	.000*,a	.000*	.104
Location of Police Station	Chi-square	74.196	78.761	93.382	41.855	38.497	120.231	96.808	36.011	74.176	328.903	5.536
	Df	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	3	3
	Sig.	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*,a	.000*	.137
Unit of Current Posting	Chi-square	19.369	34.707	.703	7.629	12.028	11.126	11.153	29.894	.504	.077	14.413
	Df	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1
	Sig.	.000*	.000*	.704	.022*	.002*	.004*	.004*	.000*	.478,a	.781	.000*
Rank in the Police Force	Chi-square	6.563	17.817	37.453	13.684	17.295	7.849	41.147	11.772	3.279	4.541	3.291
	Df	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	3	3
	Sig.	.363,a,b	.007*,a,b	.000*,a,b	.033*,a,b	.008*,a,b	.249,a,b	.000*,a,b	.067,a,b	.351,a,b	.209,ab	.349,ab
Experience	Chi-square	108.949	98.309	62.565	85.629	82.742	56.037	69.016	20.622	24.913	164.503	18.303
	Df	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	6	6	6
	Sig.	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.056,a	.000*,a	.000*,ab	.006*,ab
Income in Rupees	Chi-square	58.715	75.358	57.756	43.446	35.462	83.527	34.480	13.963	31.254	214.778	10.005
	Df	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	4	4	4
	Sig.	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.083	.000*,a	.000*	.040*
Number of Family Members In Police Department	Chi-square	34.750	34.886	14.390	21.410	31.399	18.746	42.601	24.208	6.809	9.365	8.516
	Df	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	5	5	5
	Sig.	.000*,a	.000*,a	.156,a	.018*,a	.001*,a	.044*,a	.000*,a	.007*,b	.235,a,b	.095,ab	.130,b

Results are based on nonempty rows and columns in each innermost subtable.

*. The Chi-square statistic is significant at the 0.05 level.

a. More than 20% of cells in this sub table have expected cell counts less than 5. Chi-square results may be invalid.

b. The minimum expected cell count in this sub table is less than one. Chi-square results may be invalid.

Table 6.45: Testing of Hypothesis & Results							
Sr. No.	HYPOTHESIS	VARIABLES		Beta Value	T Value	P Value	Decision
		Independent	Dependent				
$H0_1$	Mental Symptoms of Stress are independent of Physical Symptoms of Stress	Mental Symptoms of Stress	Physical Symptoms of Stress	.787	45.770	.000	Reject
$H0_{1a}$	There is no significant relationship between age and Physical symptoms of stress.	Physical Symptoms of Stress	Age	.198	7.262	.000	Reject
$H0_{1b}$	There is no significant relationship between Smoking / Tobacco and level of stress.	Smoking / Tobacco	Level of Stress	-.098	-3.516	.000	Reject
$H0_{1c}$	There is no strong association between consumption of drug, alcohol and level of stress.	Consumption of drug & Alcohol	Level of Stress	.727	38.008	.000	Reject
$H0_2$	There is no significant relation between personal sphere and symptoms of stress.	Symptoms of Stress	Personal Sources of Stress	.737	39.129	.000	Reject
$H0_{2a}$	Practising Coping Strategies are independent of Rank in the Police Force	Practising Coping strategies	Rank in Police Force	.079	2.720	.000	Reject
$H0_{2b}$	Unresolved issues do not strengthen the level of stress among police personnel.	Unresolved Issues	Level of Stress among police personnel	.460	18.615	.000	Reject
$H0_{2c}$	There is no relationship between Depression and Stress.	Depression	Stress	.729	38.187	.000	Reject

$H0_3$	There is no significant relationship between Interpersonal sphere and Symptoms of Stress.	Symptoms of Stress	Interpersonal Sources of Stress	.742	39.748	.000	Reject
$H0_{3a}$	There is no correlation between level of stress and level of anger (short temper).	Level of Anger (Short Temper)	Level of Stress	.586	25.945	.000	Reject
$H0_{3b}$	Difficulties in communication are independent of the level of stress.	Difficulty in Communication	Level of Stress	.521	21.907	.000	Reject
$H0_4$	There is no significant relationship between Work sphere and symptoms of Stress.	Symptoms of Stress	Sources of Stress at Work Place	.703	35.494	.000	Reject
$H0_{4a}$	There is no association between overloaded with work and the level of stress.	Overloaded with Work	Level of Stress	.530	22.442	.000	Reject
$H0_{4b}$	Overloaded with work and working long hours are independent of each other.	Overloaded with Work	Working Long Hours	.576	25.302	.000	Reject
$H0_{4c}$	There is no association between boring or/and less challenging work and the level of stress.	Boring or/and Less Challenging Work	Level of Stress	.576	25.279	.000	Reject
$H0_{4d}$	Cordial relationship among superiors, subordinates and peers is independent of the level of stress.	Cordial Relationship among Superiors, Subordinates and Peers	Level of Stress	.544	23.295	.000	Reject

$H0_5$	There is no significant relationship between Recreational sphere and Stress among police personnel in Gujarat.	Recreational Sources of Stress	Level of Stress	.977	33.000	.000	Reject
$H0_6$	There is no significant relationship between gender and Stress among police personnel in Gujarat.	Gender	Level of Stress	-.054	1.960	.050	Accept
$H0_7$	Factors determining stress level of respondents are independent of their age.	Age	Level of Stress	0.253	9.375	.000	Reject
$H0_8$	Factors determining stress level of respondents are independent of their Education.	Educational Qualification	Level of Stress	-.224	-8.240	.000	Reject
$H0_9$	Factors determining stress level of respondents are independent of their rank/position.	Rank/Position in Police Force	Level of Stress	-.062	-2.227	.026	Reject
$H0_{10}$	There are no evidences that the number of dependents is positively correlated with the level of stress.	Number of Dependent	Level of Stress	.126	4.570	.000	Reject
$H0_{11}$	There is no association between personal sources of Stress and Sources of Stress at Work Place	Personal Sources of Stress	Sources of Stress at work Place	.754	41.243	.000	Reject
$H0_{12}$	Sources of Stress at Work Place are independent of	Dissatisfied with Salary	Sources of Stress Work Place	.680	33.339	.000	Reject

	Dissatisfaction with Salary						
$H0_{13}$	Level of Stress is Independent of Number of Cigarette Smoked	Number of Cigarette Smoke	Level of Stress	-0.096	-1.352	.178	Accept
$H0_{14}$	Level of Stress is independent regular of exercise	Exercise Regularly	Level of Stress	.262	9.326	.000	Reject
$H0_{15}$	There is no association between Level of Stress and Getting a Massage	Getting a Massage	Level of Stress	.325	11.778	.000	Reject
$H0_{16}$	Loss of Interest in Others is Independent of the Level of Stress	Lost Interest in Others	Level of Stress	.591	26.282	.000	Reject
$H0_{17}$	Post Retirement Departmental Issues are Independent of Level of Stress	Post Retirement Departmental Issues	Level of Stress	.620	16.458	.000	Reject
$H0_{18}$	Level of Stress is Independent of Marital Status of Respondents	Marital Status of Respondents	Level of Stress	.110	3.988	.000	Reject