Chapter 2: Police in India

The chapter presents an overview of the context of the study i.e. policing in India. The chapter traces the historical evolution of policing in India. It also takes a stock of present status of Indian police. The chapter ends with the identification of signs of stress among Indian police.

2.1 Indian Police: The Context

The term *police* has been derived from the latin word *politia* which means the condition of a *Polis* or *State*. According to Oxford dictionary, the term *police* means *a system of regulation for the preservation of order and enforcement of law; the internal government of State* (Kalia, 1995). The term broadly refers to purposeful maintenance of public order and protection of persons and property, from the hazards of public accidents and the commission of unlawful acts. It refers to civil functionaries charged with maintaining public order and safety and enforcing the law including the prevention and detection of crime (Ghosh & Rustamji, 1993).

India is multi-cultural, multi-ethnic and vast country. It is the second most populated country of the world. Maintaining law and order in world’s largest democratic country is an arduous task. The police personnel provide for the security of people and enforcement of laws of the country. It determines the manner in which democratic decisions are implemented in the country. In view of the growing violence, social conflicts and serious threats of terrorist activities, the role of police is becoming even more important. The assurance of equality and dignity to the weaker sections of the society is also dependent upon the performance of the police. Clearly, police has a crucial role in the existence and development of India (Verma, 2005).

2.2 Police: Historical Perspective

Modern Indian police system is a creation of British rule. But the origin of police can be traced to the earliest *vedic* period of the Indian history. *Rig Veda* and *Atharva Veda* mention certain kinds of crimes known to Vedic India. Evidence indicates existence of security forces in *Harappan* Civilisation as well. Let us take a stock of policing system in ancient, medieval and modern India.
2.2.1 Police: Ancient India

During Vedic period, exact references of criminal justice organization are not available (Verma, 2005). However, Mauryan period (C.324 BC-183BC) showed important features of criminal justice system. Arthasastra of Kautilya, written around 310 BC throws light on the state of the society and the administration, system of administrating justice and also the state of crime during that period. The Arthasastra is a treatise on the criminal justice system. It reads like a manual for the police in modern times. According to Arthasastra, the smallest administrative police unit was the village. The village councils were responsible to detect and prevent crime under the supervision of the headman (Nath, 1983). Danvarika, the warden of police, was responsible for keeping strict vigilance on the management of the royal palace. Antervansika, a lady officer, was responsible to maintain vigilance on the ladies of the royal household. There were three types of police officers, namely, Dandapala, Durgapala and Antpala. Atavikas were the police soldiers particularly for operation in the forest areas (Srivastava, 1999). Overall, the Mauryan system of criminal justice was rigorous and espionage based.

During Ashoka’s reign (304BC-232BC), the criminal justice system was tempered and moderated by the Buddhist philosophy, piety and non-violence. During his reign, Mahamatras were the highest executive officers in a province responsible for overall peace and order of the province. Pradesikas were under Mahamatras. They were responsible for collection of revenue and maintenance of peace, law and order and administration of justice. Rajjukas were under the Pradesikas. They were responsible for the welfare and happiness of the Janpad with absolute powers in matter of rewards and punishments. Ayuktas were responsible to Rajjukas and Pradesikas. They were responsible for the village. Prativedakas were the intelligence police. They were responsible for the intelligence regarding the affairs of the state and the police (Srivastava, 1999).

Megasthenes, the Greek ambassador and Fahien, the Chinese traveler wrote a detailed account of the administration during the Guptas Period. During Gupta period, Dandika were the highest ranked police officers. Chauro, Dhanmika and Dandaparika were other police officers under Dandikas. Nagar Shreshthi was
responsible for peace and security of the city. *Rabasika or Rahasaga* was incharge of the secret and confidential service (Srivastava, 1999).

The criminal justice system developed during this period continued for five to six hundred years with only one difference in Mauryan and Gupta period. The administration system during Mauryan system was centralized while it was more decentralized during the Gupta period. However, it may be noticed that basic structure of police was nearly the same. The village police, the city police and the palace police were the basic systems which was suitably developed or changed by various Kings (Srivastava, 1999).

### 2.2.2 Police: Medieval India

During the medieval period *Sultan* was the center of power and political activity. *Faujdar* was the head of criminal justice administration at the provincial level. As a chief executive, he was entrusted with the duty of ensuring peace and security to the whole province. *Kotwal* was the administrative owner of criminal justice system of the district. He was the magistrate, head of the police and Municipal office, rolled into one. At the village level, *Choukidar* was responsible for the prevention and detection of crimes (Srivastava, 1999).

The government under the *Mughals* was autocratic and military in nature. It did not take responsibility or devote itself to manifold functions, as a modern government generally does (Srivastava, 1999). Justice and police were two weak points of the Mughal period (Mishra & Mohanty, 1992).

### 2.2.3 Police: Under East India Company

The law and order situation at the close of *Mughal* Empire was characterized by anarchy and confusion (Shah, 1993). The British came to India as traders in 1612. The leading organization was the *East India Company*. Initially, the British presence was *maritime and commercial in character* (Arnold, 1986). The company officials functioned with the cooperation of local rulers. By the early nineteenth century, *Mughal* Empire started disintegrating. The native rulers emerged at various nooks and corners of the country. Infighting among the native rulers and prevalence of greed & corruption among the ruling class and several other factors paved the way for conversion of the Company administration into a full-fledged colonial state.
Till the middle of nineteenth century, there was no satisfactory police system (Griffiths, 1971). This was because of Britishers inexperience and lack of knowledge about the country. Policing was not taken away from the zamindars till 1792. East India Company sent Cornwallis to India as Governor General. He abolished zamindari system of maintaining law and appointed thanedars who were now made responsible for the maintenance of law and order. He introduced a number of reform measures. However, his reforms displayed a lack of faith in the natives of the land and their institutions.

2.2.4 Police: Background to the Indian Police Act of 1861

After the annexation of Sind (presently in Pakistan) to the British Indian Empire in 1843, Sir Charles Napier was made responsible for the administration of this crime-ridden and difficult area. He realized that only under a recognized organization, the police could function properly and produce desired results. He reorganized the native police system on the basis of a colonial model of police, namely Royal Irish Constabulary. His system was based on two basic principles; first, the police must be completely separated from the military, and second, they must act as an independent body, assisting Collectors in discharging the responsibilities for law and order, but under their officers (Griffiths, 1971). Napier’s system provided Inspector General of Police who was responsible for the administration of the force throughout the territory. He was responsible for law and order for the entire territory (Bayley 1969). There were superintendents in each district. The system soon spread to other part of the country under the control of the East India Company. Napier regarded his force as military in form. The main principles of the model were not altered even by the Police Commission of 1860, which designed the present police force of India (Srivastava, 1999).

2.2.5 Indian Police Act of 1861

The events of 1857 necessitated an instrument to control the vast lands at an economical cost. After facing a real threat of losing power in 1857, the British rulers were determined to ensure complete suzerainty and suppression of all challenges to their power (Arnold, 1986). A Police Commission was appointed in august 1860 with the aim of making police an efficient instrument for the prevention and detection of crime. Nevertheless, an internal government memo to
the Police Commission did not mask the real objectives for the new police force. The commission was told to bear in mind that *functions of a police are either protective and repressive or detective* and that *the line which separates the protective and repressive functions of a civil force from functions purely military, may not always be very clear* (Imperial Gazetteer of India, Part IV, reprint 1909, p. 380).

The Indian police system, designed in 1860, was, therefore, sharply opposite to the British Bobby who is celebrated symbol of democratic policing throughout the world. The primary objectives were to meet the exigencies of trade and company profit. Accordingly, the emphasis was on order maintenance, on keeping the trade routes safe and ensuring that the exploitation of resources could continue unhindered. However, in addition to the objectives of controlling the vast lands and subjugating the people, there were imperialistic and racist considerations too for the British rulers (Verma, 2005). The design of the British police system was based on the structure developed by the Mughals in the seventeenth century. The new model incorporated many features of the Mughal system and officials such as *Daroga, Kotwal* and *Faujdar* found place in the reorganized British system (Woodruff, 1954).

The *Indian Police Act* (IPA) of 1861 imposed a uniform police system on the entire country. The Act established organized police forces the responsibility of the various provincial governments. Within the provinces the police was to be recruited, trained, disciplined and control by British officers. The Act established Indian police (IP), a superior police service. It was conceived to relieve the District Magistrate of his duties to keep check over the local police and make it more professional in nature. Thus, police force became organized, disciplined and well-supervised. The Act instituted a system of policing in India which is still in force. It may be noted that the Act brought uniformity in administration with the district police placed under the supervision and control of the District Magistrate (Srivastava, 1999).

The Police Act was implemented throughout the country. However, the general conditions of crime control remained unsatisfactory due to various reasons, prominent being the prevalence of the poverty and famines, adverse conditions
and shortage of force. The Government of India established the *Second All India Police Commission* in 1902. The Commission recommended major structural changes as appointment of new Dy. IG and Dy. SP posts, constitution of Railway Police Force, division of provinces into ranges, and constitution of armed force at district level. The recommendations were implemented but they were against Indianisation (Hooja, 1961). Despite the dissent of the Maharaja of Darbhanga, the only Indian member of the team, the Commission’s recommendations were accepted by the Government of India (Beghum, 1996). Other important developments during this period were setting up of *Islinton Commission* (1912) and *Lee Commission* (1924). The recommendations of these commissions led to substantial Indianisation of the senior rank of the Police Force. By Islinton Commission, the meritorious Indians were accommodated at the senior levels. Later in the year 1919, 33% of IPS quota was fixed for the Indians. With Lee Commission (in 1924), the quota was raised to 50% (Beghum, 1996). The development had also been shown in the subordinate level gradually. Thus, before Independence of the country, a system had been established which the posterity could improve upon (Raghavan, 1989).

### 2.3 Present Organizational Structure of Police

According to article 246 of the Indian Constitution and section 3 of the IPA, the police force is a state subject and not dealt with at central level. Each state government has the responsibility to draw guidelines, rules and regulations for its police force. These regulations are found in the state police manuals (Commonwealth Human Right Initiative Report, 2005). The organizational structure of police forces in India is fairly uniform in all the states throughout the country. The broad set up of police organization in a state is shown in the figure 2.1.

State police works under the overall control of State Government (CHRI, 2005). The head of the police force in a state is the *Director General of Police* (DGP). DGP is responsible to the state government for the administration of the police force in the state and for advising the government on police matters. The state is further divided into several zones, ranges and districts (Martensson, 2006). An officer of the rank of *Superintendent of Police* (SP) heads the district police force.
A group of districts form a range, which is looked after by an officer of the rank of Deputy Inspector General of Police (DIGP). DIGP guides, advises and assists the SP through regular visits and inspections. Some states have zones comprising two or more ranges. Zones are the areas which are under the charge of an officer of the rank of an Inspector General of Police (IGP) (CHRI, 2005).

The districts are again divided into sub-divisions, circles and police stations (Martensson, 2006). A sub-division is under the charge of an officer of the rank of Additional or Deputy Superintendent of police (ASP/ Dy. SP). Every sub-division is further divided into a number of police stations, depending on its area, population and prevalence of crime. The police station is headed by the station in charge of the rank of Inspector/Sub-Inspector. Each police station is further divided into a number of beats assigned for patrolling, surveillance and collection of intelligence. Police beats are under the charge of Sub Inspector. Head Constables and Constables form lower level of police hierarchy. Between the police station and the sub-division, there are police circles in some states. The head of the circle is an Inspector of Police (CHRI, 2005).

District police is divided into two major branches of police force i.e. the armed police and the civil police. The primary function of the civil force is to control crime, while the primary function of armed police is to deal with law and order situation. Armed police is the reserve police of the district. The force is kept reserved to meet any emergency situation (CHRI, 2005). Armed police and civil police supply material and officers to the other branches. Therefore, these two branches constitute the most visible part of the force (Shah, 1991). In addition to civil and armed forces there are departments like detective police, traffic police, revenue police, mounted police, fire police, and technical branches like prosecution branch, radio branch and intelligence police.
Figure: 2.1 Field establishment of Police
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Police and Public Order are state subjects, but this does not minimize the role of Central Government in Police administration. Constitution of India empowers the Central Government to intervene in some situations or perform special function in police matters. For example, Article 355 specifies that it is the duty of the Centre to protect the states against internal disturbances and to ensure that the governance of every state is carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution.

The constitution itself enumerates a long list of subjects like All India Services, arms, ammunition, passports etc. in the union list. As per List 1 of the 7th Schedule, the Parliament of India has exclusive powers to make laws with respect to the armed forces of the Union, the Central Bureau of Intelligence and Investigation, the Union agencies and institutions for training of police officers, promotion of special studies or research, scientific and technical assistance in the investigation or detection of crime, all India Services, extension of the powers and jurisdiction of members of one state police force to another with the consent of that state or to outside railway areas (CHRI, 2005). Thus, Central government under the supervision of Ministry of Home Affairs plays an important role in formulating the policies of the police administration.

The Central Government has established a number of police organizations known as Central Police Organizations (CPOs). The CPOs can be broadly divided into two groups, namely armed police organizations or Central Para-Military Forces (CPMFs) and other central government organizations. CPMFs include Assam Rifles, Border Security Force (BSF), Central Industrial Security Force (CISF), Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF), Indo-Tibetan Border Police (ITBP) and National Security Guards (NSG). Second group of central Police Organizations include Bureau of Police Research and Development (BPR&D), Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI), Directorate of Coordination of Police Wireless (DCPW), Intelligence Bureau (IB), National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB), National Institute of Criminology and Forensic Science (NICFS), and the National Police Academy (NPA).
An important power with Central Government is the appointment of IPS (Indian Police Services) officers. Section 3 of the All India Services Act, 1951 empowers the central government, after consultation with the state governments, to make rules for the regulation of recruitment and the conditions of service of persons appointed to an all India service including IPS. The senior duty posts are called cadres and generally the cadre posts are filled with IPS officers. The central government periodically reexamines the strength and compositions of each cadre in consultation with state government and makes such alteration therein as it deems fit.

2.4 Duties and Responsibilities of Police

Section 57 and 58 of the Model Police Act, 2006 describes the roles, functions and responsibilities of Indian police personnel. The police is expected to be the most accessible, interactive and dynamic organization of any society. Its roles, functions and duties in the society are natural to be varied, such as multifarious on the one hand; and complicated, knotty and complex on the other. In a broad way, police is expected to play two roles in the society i.e. maintenance of law and maintenance of order. However, the ramifications of these two duties are numerous. In fact, there is something a good patrolman puts into his work that is not found in the books of rules nor taught by police instructors (Vollmer, 1933).

The functions of police encompass preservation of law and order, to safeguard people’s life & property. The society expects the cop to play the varied roles with equal élan. He is helper, savior, friend and referee. On the other hand, as a law enforcer he arrests, encounters or uses force to enforce the rule of law. This rollercoaster ride is difficult to understand functionally and emotionally (Bratz, 1979). Policing makes huge demands on the mental, emotional and physical capabilities of the personnel. These demands are too often so stressful that they begin to destroy the individual (Depue, 1979).

2.5 Police Strength

In India, police is classified as civil police and armed police. Against a sanctioned strength of 21.24 lakh of total police force (both civil and armed), 25.42 percent deficiency (vacancy) remained in the actual force which comprised of 15.85 lakh police personnel (Bureau of Police Research & Development, 2012). During 2012
at all India level, the density of police personnel per unit area (100 sq. kms) was 50.06 and the number of police personnel per unit population (per lakh) were 131.45 (BPR&D, 2012, Figure 2.2).

**Figure 2.2: Police-population- ratio per lakh of population and per 100 sq. kms. Area**

Crime statistics of 2011 reveal that a total number of 4,881 police personnel (comprising 3,822 natural deaths, 867 deaths on duty and 192 suicidal deaths) died as compared to 3,988 deaths in the year 2009 showing an increase of 8.17% over the previous year (NCRB, 2012). But casualties while on duty (867) decreased during 2011 by 1% as compared to previous year (872). On the other hand, police casualties due to suicide are increasing steadily over the years. In 2008, 139 police personnel committed suicide, 162 in 2009, 189 in 2010 while 192 suicidal deaths were reported in 2011 (NCRB, 2012). This is showing an increase in stress level of police personnel. It was reported that highest number of casualties in Punjab (110) followed by casualties in Uttar Pradesh (105). Crime statistics further reveals that a total of 3,299 police personnel of various ranks sustained injuries while performing their duties in the year 2011. The trend analysis shows that there is a continuous increase in death and injuries of police personnel over the years. Figure 2.3 and 2.4 depicts the trend of deaths/injuries and suicides respectively.
2.6 Stress among Indian Police Personnel

Numerous researches on policing have been undertaken in the United States and other developed countries like Britain, Sweden, South Africa, Norway and Canada. In contrast, the body of police research in India is meager. Mostly it is in form of reports of the National Police Commissions of 1904 and 1978 (GOI 1979-83), some reports by state police commissions, symposium proceedings (Seminar 1977), memoirs by serving or retired police officers (e.g., Lobo 1992; Shah 1992; Singh 1996) and a few journalistic accounts. Overall, the literature on Indian police, especially the critical evaluation of the role is meager. The government publishes annual report, namely- Crime in India that provides official data on the regional distribution of crime and police resources. On the other hand, the media, especially newspapers and magazines provide journalistic accounts of police related subjects. This forms the body of knowledge for the police in India, which obviously is very limited (Verma, 2005).
Ghosh (1981) noted that Indians are all familiar with the *paan* chewing, discourteous, rude, aggressive and bully figure in *Khakhi*. But, similarly Indians are unaware about the fact that police in India is largely underpaid, understaffed, overworked, demoralized, inadequately trained and equipped and subject to political interference, feared as a persecutor rather than respected as a protector, often callous and corrupt. *The policeman is denounced by the public, criticized by the preacher, ridiculed by the movies, berated by the newspapers, and unsupported by the prosecuting officers and judges. He is shunned by the respectable. Condemned while he enforces the law and dismissed when he does not. He is supposed to possess qualifications of a soldier, doctor, lawyer, diplomat and educator with remuneration less than that of a daily laborer.* (Vollmer, 1933)

Police personnel face variety of stressors or job pressures due to their role. The job pressure for police officer include the responsibility of protecting the public, constant exposure to other people’s problems, emotional distancing from others, the inactivity/crisis see-saw, maintenance of macho defenses, bipolar thinking, negative public image of police, a web of personal puzzles and ceaseless on the job catastrophes (Mathur, 1994). Crime statistics reveal that number of suicides among police personnel is increasing steadily over the years. These suicides identify that police personnel of India are experiencing high level of stress. These stressors can become a growing and progressive disease which may undermine the efficiency and potential of the police force. Timely intervention can prevent much of the damage due to stress. It is said that to recognize the problem is itself a major step is handling it effectively. Thus, the present study makes an attempt to investigate the nature of stress experienced by the police personnel. The next chapter presents a review of literature on research theme.
Chapter 3: Literature Review

This chapter reviews the literature related to the theme of this research. With studies on various aspects of the theme pouring in at an incessant pace, the literature has grown manifold. This chapter presents a comprehensive review of the literature especially on role stress, personality traits and police. The review covers both conceptual and empirical contributions to the subject of study. Literature has been reviewed under different sub-sections.

3.1 Studies on Stress

Every human being encounters various kinds of challenges in his or her life. Different ages have different kinds of stress. In the prehistoric age, the nature was the main source of almost all stresses. Man was stressed due to factors like threat of wild animals, natural disasters; such as earthquake, flood, excessive rain, drought, famine, epidemics, and climate dangers; such as thunder and storm, inter group conflicts for searching food and living resources. The present day, world has witnessed substantial progress in science and technology. Now, man can manage the nature with greater confidence. However, other stressors have substituted natural stressors. Wars and conflicts for power have become a potent source of stress. Again, with the emergence of industrial society, new forms of stressors have replaced the earlier ones. These stressors may be political & economical uncertainty, regionalism, communalism, terrorism, urbanization, threat of war, nuclear threat, unemployment, poverty and job insecurity.

Over the past six decades, the stress had been the source of immense interest (Doublet, 2000). But it is an old concept. The term had evolved over several hundred years. Its discovery in the twentieth century was more of a rediscovery (Cassidy, 1999). It had been used in medicine for centuries (Hinkle, 1977). Robert Burton (1624) wrote about the sources of disease and melancholy (depression). He mentioned social stress as a key malady (cited in Hobfoll, 2004). In Indian context also, stress found a mention in the vedic literature, whereas it appeared as Dukha (Grief) and Dushchinta (anxiety). Walter Cannon was credited for originating research on the body’s response to stressors. Cannon (1914) first published his investigations on the adrenal medulla, in which he asserted that emotional stimuli were capable of releasing a substance which would prepare the animal for flight or
for defense. In fact, Cannon was also the first person to use the term stress to refer the physiological reactions caused by the perception of aversive or threatening situations (Bryce, 2001). Aziz (2004) noted that the phenomenon was old and inevitable which pervaded the human life right from the birth till death.

The present work environment has witnessed changes due to technological advances, organizational restructuring and various redesign options (Perrewe et al., 2000). These changes are potent enough to elevate levels of work stress (Conner & Douglas, 2005). This increased stress has led to a rise in the number of employees who have considered leaving their jobs. In order to provide stress management interventions, it is important to assess the stress in various contexts. Some of the studies are mentioned below. For ease of comparing the results between India and abroad, the review is categorized in two parts i.e. International studies on stress and Indian studies on stress.

3.1.1 International Studies

The phenomenon of stress in the organizational context was initially explored by Kahn & his colleagues (1964). In the early 1960s, Kahn et al. developed a research programme and succeeded in finding a number of stress-inducing factors within organizations and how they are connected with unfavorable mental and physical consequences (French & Caplan, 1972).

Picking up the thread, Rizzo et al. (1970) examined the relationship of Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity with anxiety, influence in organization and propensity to leave the organization. The study indicated that role conflict and role ambiguity both tended to correlate weakly but positively with anxiety and propensity to leave the organization. On the other hand, Role Conflict & Role Ambiguity both negatively correlated with influence in the organization. The study indicated stronger negative relationship between role ambiguity and job satisfaction.

Johnson (1979) investigated the relationship between situational and individual variables with role stress, psychosomatic symptoms and job satisfaction in entry level police and safety officers. The study reported that high role stress was significantly correlated with low group cohesiveness, high need for independence,
low need for achievement, high dogmatism, less distortion in responding, external locus of control and more psychosomatic symptoms.

Oliver’s (1980) study on 208 employees in two Canadian retail organization reported that functional interdependence failed to moderate the relationships among social task characteristics, role conflict and outcomes such as job satisfaction, tension, tendency to leave the organization, satisfaction with contextual factors (peers, supervisors, pay and job security) and growth satisfaction. The moderating effects of Role Conflict on the task characteristics were found to be highly significant.

Abdel-Halim’s (1982) study focused on 89 middle-lower managerial personnel in a manufacturing firm. Instruments included the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory and items from the Job Diagnostic Survey and Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. The results indicated that social support variables from the work group and from the supervisor moderated the relationship of Role Conflict with job satisfaction and job involvement but not with job anxiety.

Osipow et al. (1985) noted that older respondents generally report more overload and responsibility, boundary role, and physical environmental stress than their younger counterparts. Older subjects also displayed a trend towards decreasing vocational, psychological, physical and interpersonal strain than younger ones, and greater recreational self care and rational cognitive resources than younger subjects. The study pointed out towards the possibility of age moderating the stress-strain relationship.

Steffy & Laker (1991) noted that role stressors, perceived employment insecurity, and recent stressful life events led to greater alcohol intake and a propensity to use alcohol to relax and cope with work and personal tensions. Excessive workload contributed to use of alcohol as a coping mechanism among subjects.

Akinnusi (1993) assessed how level of education was associated with stress among managers. Positive correlation was reported between education and psychological stress. Highly qualified managers were also subject to more organizational stressors but suffer less job stress, probably because they occupy positions of authority and their jobs were more intrinsically satisfying than their less qualified counterparts.
Terry et al. (1993) investigated the effects of work stress on psychological well-being and job satisfaction among 153 employees of a large public sector organization. Role ambiguity and role conflict emerged as significant predictors of both psychological well-being and job satisfaction. There was also some support for the proposed role of under-utilization of skills. However, quantitative work overload did not have a significant effect on either psychological well-being or job satisfaction. It was also reported that irrespective of the level of stress, supervisor support had main effects on employee’s well-being.

Vander & de Heus (1993) examined the difference between male and female Dutch managers in respect of work stress, social support and strains. They reported that although both work and life support were negatively correlated with work stress, only weak support was strongly correlated to each measure of strain.

Eriksen (1994) reviewed the literature to assess the role of social support in the pathogenesis of coronary heart disease. It was reported that social support was capable of moderating potentially harmful negative emotions and the potentially harmful cardiovascular response to psychological challenge. However, a lack of control with personality factors in most of the studies made this conclusion uncertain.

Spielberger & Reheiser (1994) measured perceived psychological severity and anxiety of 30 job stressor events, using men and women as subjects working in the university and corporate settings. The study revealed that overall stress level was similar for men and women. However, significant differences were reported in perceived severity and frequency of occurrence of individual stressor events as per gender.

Williams et al. (1997) reported that high job demands and low decision latitude were positively correlated with negative emotions (for instance; anxiety, anger and depression), reduce level of social support and negative feelings in dealing with coworkers and supervisors.

Sparks & Cooper (1999) opined that in order to get the better understanding of the relationships, the stress model should be more specific to the sample. They emphasized the need to develop occupation-specific stress questionnaire to pinpoint the particular stressors in an occupational group.