METHOD

DESIGN

The objective of the present investigation was to determine the effect of Group (Awarded, Suspended, Average) and Rank (Junior, Senior) on police sub-culture; role stress; health complaints, experience and expression of anger; cognitive and emotional well-being; and coping strategies used by police functionaries. For this purpose a two-way factorial design incorporating three levels of Group performance i.e. Awarded, Suspended and Average and two levels of Rank Junior (Constable, Head Constable, Assistant Sub Inspector) and Senior (Sub Inspector, Inspector and Deputy Superintendent of Police), i.e., (3x2=6) with 28 police functionaries in each condition was employed. The total number of police functionaries were 168. They were all male non-IPS policemen belonging to the state of Haryana and Union Territory of Chandigarh.

These police functionaries were administered Police Sub-Culture Scale developed by Cochran and Bromley (2003). Role Stress Inventory developed by Ravikumar (1984) was used to measure role stressors in these police functionaries on eleven dimensions of role stress. The Adult Health Checklist devised by Forgays (1994) was used to measure health complaints. The State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory constructed by Spielberger (1988) was used to measure state anger, trait anger, anger-in, anger-out, anger control and anger expression. To measure the affective component of psychological well-being, the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule developed by Watson, Clark and Tellegen (1988) was used. To measure the cognitive component of psychological well-being, the Satisfaction With Life Scale devised by Diener et al. (1985) was used. To measure the strategies that police functionaries use to cope with stress, the Coping Strategies Inventory developed by Tobin et al. (1989) was employed.

SAMPLE

Three groups of police functionaries 56 Awarded, 56 Suspended and 56 Average comprised the sample of the present study. The total sample being 168. In each of these three groups, functionaries of two ranks: Junior Rank comprising of 28 functionaries and Senior Rank comprising of 28 functionaries were taken.
Awarded functionaries were those who had been given significant awards like medals and certificates and had never been placed under suspension in their entire police service.

Suspended functionaries were those who had been placed under suspension at least once for a period of one month or more, in their entire police service.

Average functionaries were those who had neither received significant awards nor had been placed under suspension in their entire police service.

The age of police functionaries ranged from 25 to 57 years, the mean age 43.35, SD 8.95. Only those police functionaries were included in the present study who had a minimum of at least three years of continuous service in the police organization. The average length of service ranged from 3 to 39 years and the mean length of service was 21.29, SD 9.91. The study was carried out on policemen belonging to the state of Haryana and Union Territory, Chandigarh. The police functionaries belonged to the middle socio-economic income group.

TESTS

The following standardized tests were used in the present investigation:

1. Police Sub-Culture Adherence Scale (Cochran & Bromley, 2003)
2. Role Stress Inventory (Ravikumar, 1984)
3. Adult Health Checklist (Forgays, 1994)
4. State Trait Anger Expression Inventory (Spielberger, 1988)
5. Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988)
6. Satisfaction With Life Scale (Diener et al., 1985)
7. Coping Strategies Inventory (Tobin et al., 1989)
BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF TESTS

1. POLICE SUB-CULTURE ADHERENCE SCALE (PSC).

(Cochran & Bromley, 2003).

Police Sub-Culture Adherence Scale has been developed by Cochran & Bromley (2003). In this scale, functionaries' degree of adherence to the sub-culture of policing is measured by five distinct work/role orientation scales: Crime control, service, cynicism, traditionalism, receptivity to change. The functionaries are required to indicate their responses to the items along a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'.

Based on a pilot study conducted on 50 respondents, in the present study four sub-scales were used to measure adherence to police sub-culture, namely crime control, service, cynicism and receptivity to change.

A brief description of the four sub scales is given below:

**Crime control orientation** refers to the importance police functionaries place on the law enforcement and crime control functions of their jobs.

Crime control is a twelve item additive scale. The range of scores is from 12 to 60. High values on this scale indicate a strong preference among respondents for the crime-fighting aspects of their roles as law enforcement officers. In the present study, Cronbach Alpha reliability was computed and found to be 0.67 for Crime control.

**Service** measures the extent of orientation towards community oriented policing.

Functionaries' work orientation toward service-related activities is an indicator of disagreement with the police sub-culture. It is measured by a fourteen item additive scale. The range of scores is from 14 to 70. High values on this scale are indicative of a strong pro-service work orientation commensurate with the ideals of community-oriented policing and antagonistic to the police sub-culture. In the present study, Cronbach Alpha reliability was computed and found to be 0.83 for Service.
Cynicism refers to cynical perception of the public by the Police.

It is a six item additive scale. The range of scores is from 6 to 30. High values on this scale are indicative of a strong agreement with cynical attitudes of law enforcement officers. In the present study, Cronbach Alpha reliability was computed and found to be 0.64 for Cynicism.

Receptivity or openness to organizational change refers to openness towards modern organizational changes occurring within law enforcement.

It is an additive scale comprising four statements. The range of scores is from 4 to 20. High values on this scale indicate a high level of receptivity to modern organizational changes occurring within law enforcement which are antagonistic to the police sub-culture. In the present study, Cronbach Alpha reliability was computed and found to be 0.69 for Receptivity to organizational change.

2. ROLE STRESS INVENTORY (RSI).

(Ravikumar, 1984).

The Role Stress Inventory has been developed by Ravikumar (1984). This fifty five item inventory measures eleven dimensions. There are five items on each of the eleven dimensions. The respondents are required to indicate their responses to the items along a 5-point Likert format ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'.

A brief description of each of these dimensions follows:

Role Ambiguity-Feedback refers to the situation in which the functionary is in a perplexed state since he does not know whether his performance is to the satisfaction of his superior and in the expected direction.

Role Ambiguity-Task refers to the situation in which the functionary is not provided with adequate information about his nature of duties, organizational goals and policies, limits of authority and decision making.
**Personal Inadequacy** refers to the feeling in the functionary that he lacks in certain skills.

**Role Shrinkage** refers to feelings of diminished responsibility, reduction in the importance of one’s role.

**Role Stagnation** is the result of feelings of lack of opportunities for career development, advancement and growth.

**Inter-Role Conflict** refers to the situation in which the functionary is required to play many different roles which are viewed as incompatible.

**Role Overload** refers to the feeling of having too much of work to do in the time available.

**Role Isolation** refers to the situations in which the functionary does not get opportunity for interaction with other roles and develops feeling of being left alone.

**Role Conflict-Intersender** refers to those situations wherein the role pressures from one oppose role pressures from others.

**Role Conflict-Person** refers to those situations where there is incompatibility between the personal needs and values of the functionary and the needs and demands of his role.

**Resource Inadequacy** refers to the feeling that the functionary lacks certain skills or expertise to perform his role.

This inventory was based on the work of researchers like Beehr, Walsh & Taber (1976) and had been used on several samples by trainers and researchers in India. The inventory has been found to be reliable and valid with reliability and validity coefficients ranging from 0.79 to 0.89. The scale has factorial purity and independence as evidenced in the factor analysis on a few managerial samples. There are no negatively worded items in the scale and hence no reverse scoring. The range of scores is from 5 to 25 for each of the eleven dimensions.

In the present study, Cronbach Alpha reliability was computed for the eleven sub-scales of Role Stress. These were found to be 0.55 for role ambiguity-feedback, 0.79 for role ambiguity-task, 0.63 for personal inadequacy, 0.56 for role shrinkage,
0.69 for role stagnation, 0.83 for inter-role conflict, 0.68 for role over load, 0.64 for role isolation, 0.73 for role conflict-intersender, 0.61 for role conflict-person, 0.79 for resource inadequacy respectively.

The inventory has been used extensively by Ravikumar & Madhu (1983), Ravikumar (1984, 1985), Nagpal (1986), and Bhatia (1993). Specifically this inventory has been used by Bhandari & Khan (1987) and Khan & Bhandari (2006) to study role stress in Indian policemen.

3. ADULT HEALTH CHECKLIST (AHC).

(Forgays, 1994).

Adult Health Checklist refers to a self-report device comprising 26 health complaints/illness that happen at least once in a while to many individuals. The respondents are required to indicate the frequency and intensity of each illness in the past six months.

The Adult Health Checklist has been developed by Forgays (1994). Frequency of each illness is rated along a 6-point Likert response scale, ranging from 'does not happen, not a problem, to happens daily'. For indicating the intensity, respondents rate each illness along a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from 'does not bother me, not a problem, to bothers me a lot when it happens'. Further, the respondents are also required to specify whether they undertook medical care, that is, whether they visited a doctor for the illness. Frequency scores range from 0 to 130 with higher scores indicating greater frequency of occurrence of health complaints. Intensity scores range from 0 to 78 with higher scores indicating a greater degree of intensity of health complaints. Possible range of total scores is 0 to 390 with higher total scores indicating an overall higher incidence of health complaints.

Duggal (2004) reported the test retest reliability of the Adult Health Checklist to be 0.76 when the retesting was done after two weeks. In the present study, the test retest reliability has been found to be 0.70 when the retest was done after two weeks.

The scale has been used in India by Rajput (2001) on lawyers, Duggal (2004) on young adults and Singha (2006) on patients with epilepsy and it has been found to be reliable and valid.
4. STATE TRAIT ANGER EXPRESSION INVENTORY (STAXI).

(Spielberger, 1988).

The State Trait Anger Expression Inventory (STAXI) was developed by Spielberger (1988). It is a self-report device that measures the experience, expression and control of anger (Kassinove et al., 1997). Anger is a frequently experienced negative emotion that is most often associated with disruptive intrapersonal and interpersonal consequences (Ellis, 1977).

The 44-item STAXI comprises six subscales viz. state anger, trait anger, anger-in, anger-out, anger control and anger expression. The scale is an important advancement in anger assessment. It separates anger from related constructs such as hostility and aggression; and separates the felt experiences from the modes of expression of anger (Kassinove et al., 1997).

State Anger refers to an emotional state marked by subjective feelings that vary in intensity from mild annoyance or irritation to intense fury and rage. Individuals with high scores experience relatively intense angry feelings at the time the test is administered, the range of scores being 10 to 40 with higher scores indicating higher state-anger.

Trait Anger refers to the tendency to experience states of anger more frequently in response to various provocations, to perceive a wider range of situations as frustrating or annoying. High trait anger individuals frequently experience angry feelings, especially when they feel they are treated unfairly by others. The range of scores is from 10 to 40 with higher scores indicating higher trait-anger.

Anger-In refers to the frequency with which angry feelings are held up or suppressed. Persons with high anger-in scores frequently experience intense angry feelings, but tend to suppress these feelings rather than to express them either physically or in verbal behaviour. The range of scores is from 8 to 32 with higher scores indicating higher anger-in.

Anger-Out refers to the extent to which an individual expresses anger toward other people or objects in the environment. Persons with high anger-out scores frequently experience anger, which they express in aggressive behaviour. Anger-out
may be expressed in physical acts such as assaulting other persons or slamming doors, or verbally in the form of criticism, sarcasm, insults, threats and the extreme use of profanity. The range of scores is from 8 to 32 with higher scores indicating greater outward expression of anger.

**Anger Control** refers to the effective control or reduction of anger. Persons with high scores on the anger-control scale tend to invest a great deal of energy in monitoring and preventing the expression of anger. The range of scores is from 8 to 32 with higher scores indicating greater control of anger.

**Anger Expression** is a general index of the frequency of anger expression, regardless of direction, and comprises the anger-in and anger-out subscales while adjusting for anger control.

Respondents are required to describe themselves in response to “how they feel right now”, for the state anger; “how they generally feel”, for the trait anger; and “how they react when angry or furious”, for the anger-in, anger-out, and anger-control subscales respectively. The response format is a 4-point Likert scale ranging from ‘not at all, somewhat, moderately to very much so’ for Part-1; and from ‘almost never, sometimes, often to almost always’, for Part-2 and Part-3 respectively.

The factor structure of the STAXI has received strong empirical support in a number of studies (Spielberger, Reheisser, & Sydeman, 1995; Fuqua et al., 1991; Spielberger, 1988). Internal consistency coefficients for the subscales range from 0.62 to 0.91 indicating strong relationships among the scales’ items (Cornell, Peterson, & Richards, 1999). The anger experience and expression scales have good test retest reliability, internal consistency, content, concurrent and discriminant validity and have a factor structure which is relatively uniform across criterion groups (Deffenbacher, 1992; Fuqua et al., 1991; Spielberger, 1988; Crane, 1981).

The STAXI has proved useful for assessing the experience, expression and control of anger in normal and abnormal individuals (Deffenbacher, 1992; Moses, 1992) and for evaluating the role of these components in a variety of disorders including alcoholism, hypertension, coronary heart disease and cancer (Spielberger, 1988). The scale has also been used to examine relations between hardiness, well-being and coping with stress (Schlosser & Sheeley, 1985a; 1985b) and to investigate
the role of anger in Type A behaviour (Croyle et al., 1988; Spielberger et al., 1988; Booth-Kewley & Friedman, 1987; Goffaux et al., 1987). The STAXI scales have also been used in research on the effects of situational factors on the experience and expression of anger (Buck, 1987; Pape, 1986). Significant correlations have been reported between the STAXI scales and physical and verbal aggression.

In the present study, Cronbach Alpha reliability was also computed and found to be 0.88 for state anger, 0.86 for trait anger, 0.65 for anger-in, 0.55 for anger-out, 0.83 for anger control.

The scale has been used by Cackowski & Nasar (2003) on architecture students. It has been extensively used in India by Sharma, Ghosh, & Spielberger (1995), Sharma, Krishna, & Spielberger (1996) and Duggal (2004).

5. POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE AFFECT SCHEDULE (PANAS).

(Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988).

PANAS is a self-report measure designed for assessing the structure of affect. It is based on the two-factor model of Watson & Tellegen (1985). The scale measures the two dominant and relatively independent dimensions of affect that is positive affect and negative affect.

PANAS is a 20-item scale, consisting of two 10-item mood scales—PANAS positive affect scale and PANAS negative affect scale.

Positive Affect reflects the extent to which a person feels enthusiastic, active and alert.

Negative Affect is a general dimension of subjective distress and unpleasurable engagement that subsumes a variety of aversive mood states, including anger, contempt, disgust, guilt, fear and nervousness, with low negative affect being a state of calmness and serenity.

The PANAS positive affect and negative affect items are randomly distributed throughout the questionnaire. The subjects are asked to indicate the extent to which they have experienced each mood state during the past few weeks. Respondents rate
each of the mood descriptors along a 5-point response format ranging from ‘very slightly or not at all, a little, moderately, quite a bit, to extremely’.

The PANAS scales are highly internally consistent, largely uncorrelated and stable at appropriate levels over a two-month time period (Watson et al., 1988). The Alpha reliabilities of the PANAS range from 0.86 to 0.90 for positive affect and from 0.84 to 0.87 for negative affect. The correlation between the PANAS positive affect scale and the PANAS negative affect scale is reported to be low, ranging from -0.12 to -0.23. The eight-week test retest reliability has been reported to range from 0.47 to 0.68 for positive affect; and from 0.39 to 0.71 for negative affect.

The external validity of the PANAS has been established by correlating PANAS scales with measures of related constructs. The PANAS was correlated with Hopkins Symptoms Checklist (HSCL: Derogatis et al., 1974) and it was found that PANAS negative affect scores correlated positively ($r = 0.74$) and positive affect scores correlated negatively ($r = -0.19$) with the scores on HSCL. The PANAS scales were correlated with Beck Depression Inventory (BDI: Beck et al., 1961). It was found that PANAS negative affect scale correlated substantially ($r = 0.58$) and PANAS positive affect scale correlated negatively ($r = -0.36$) with scores on BDI. State Trait Anxiety Inventory-State Anxiety Scale (A-State: Spielberger et al., 1970) exhibited strong correlations ($r = 0.51$) with PANAS negative affect scales and negative ($r = -0.35$) correlations with PANAS positive affect scales (Watson et al., 1988). In the present study, Cronbach Alpha reliability was also computed and found to be 0.77 for positive affect and 0.82 for negative affect.

The PANAS scales have been used by McCullough et al. (2004), Tugade & Fredrickson (2004). In India, it has been used by Bhandari & Goyal (2004), Duggal (2004), Bhandari (2006) and Singha (2006).

6. SATISFACTION WITH LIFE SCALE (SWLS).

(Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985).

The Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS) has been developed by Diener et al. (1985). SWLS is a self-report measure designed to assess a person’s global judgement of life satisfaction which is theoretically predicted to depend on a comparison of life circumstances to one’s standards.
Life Satisfaction is a conscious cognitive judgement of one’s life in which the criteria for judgement are up to the person (Pavot & Diener, 1993).

The SWLS is a 5-item scale, assessing satisfaction with the respondent’s life as a whole. The items of the scale are global rather than specific in nature, allowing respondents to weigh domains of their lives in terms of their own values, in arriving at a global judgement of life satisfaction.

Respondents are required to rate their responses along a 7-point scale, ranging from ‘strongly disagree, disagree, slightly disagree, neither agree, nor disagree, slightly agree, agree to strongly agree’. The range of scores is from 5 to 35, with higher scores indicating a greater degree of satisfaction with life.

The test has highly favourable psychometric properties (Pavot & Diener, 1993; Diener et al., 1985). Alpha coefficient of the test has been reported to be 0.81 across 40 nations (Suh et al., 1998). The test retest reliability of the scale was found to be 0.83 (two weeks; Alfonso & Allison, 1995); 0.84 (one month; Pavot et al., 1991); 0.82 (two months; Diener et al., 1985) and 0.54 (four years; Magnus et al., 1992).

The validity of SWLS has been established on the basis of a relationship between SWLS and measures of subjective well-being. Blais et al. (1989) reported a strong negative correlation ($r = -0.72$) between the SWLS and the Beck Depression Inventory (Beck et al., 1961). Larsen et al. (1985) found a correlation of -0.31 between the SWLS and measures of negative affect. Smead (1991) correlated the scores on SWLS with PANAS scales (Watson et al., 1988). It has been found that SWLS correlated positively ($r = 0.44$) with PANAS positive affect scales and negatively ($r = -0.48$) with PANAS negative affect scales. In the present study, Cronbach Alpha reliability was also computed and found to be 0.71 for Satisfaction With Life Scale.

In India, it has been extensively used by Bhandari & Goyal (2004), Bhandari, Upmanyu & Rattan (2004), Bhandari (2006), Bhandari & Duggal (2006) and Singha (2006) on students, adults and retired professionals.
7. COPING STRATEGIES INVENTORY (CSI).

(Tobin, Holroyd, Reynolds & Wigal, 1989).

It is a self report measure designed to assess the strategies that an individual uses to cope with specific life stressors (Carey et al., 1993).

The CSI has been developed by Tobin et al., (1989). The format of the CSI is borrowed from the Ways of Coping Checklist (Folkman & Lazarus, 1980).

The inventory consists of 72 items. The factor structure of the CSI supports a hierarchical relationship between the subscales. Using Wherry’s hierarchical factor analysis program (1984) eight primary factors, four secondary factors and two tertiary factors were obtained.

At the primary level, the factor structure includes eight coping strategies which have been measured in the present study.

**Problem Solving** It refers to both behavioural and cognitive strategies to eliminate the source of stress by changing a stressful situation.

**Cognitive Restructuring** includes strategies that alter the meaning of the stressful transaction to that it is less threatening, is examined for its positive aspects, is viewed from a new perspective, etc.

**Express Emotion** refers to releasing and expressing emotions.

**Social Contact** refers to seeking social support from people, one’s family and one’s friends.

**Problem Avoidance** refers to denial of problems and avoidance of thoughts and actions about the stressful events.

**Wishful Thinking** refers to cognitive strategies that reflect an inability or reluctance to reframe or symbolically alter the situation. The items involve hoping and wishing that things could be better.

**Self Criticism** reflects blaming oneself for the situation and criticizing oneself.
Social Withdrawal refers to withdrawing from one’s family and friends especially with respect to one’s emotional reaction to the stressor.

Respondents are required to indicate their responses on a five point Likert format ranging from “Not at all, a little, somewhat, much to very much”.

The CSI has a good internal reliability and good test-retest reliability (Carey et al., 1993). Alpha reliability coefficients for the scale range from 0.72 to 0.94 for the primary subscales, 0.81 to 0.92 for the secondary subscales and 0.89 to 0.90 for the tertiary subscales (Tobin et al. 1989). The two week test-retest reliability coefficients were reported to range from 0.67 to 0.81 for the primary subscales; 0.69 to 0.81 for the secondary subscales and 0.78 to 0.79 for the tertiary subscales. Ridder (1997) in a review of coping assessment measures has found that the CSI is a reliable measure of assessing coping responses in specific situations.

The validity for the scale has been assessed by studying the relationship of the CSI with instruments measuring other important constructs in stress and coping literature. It is particularly predictive of depressive symptoms for individual who are under high level of stress (Tobin et al., 1983). The criterion validity of the CSI has been established by discriminating symptomatic and normal samples in several different populations. The CSI has differentiated neurotic from normal samples (Tobin et al., 1982), headache from non-headache sufferers (Holroyd et al., 1983) and depressed from non-depressed samples (Tobin et al., 1985).

In the present study, Cronbach Alpha reliability was computed on the sample for the primary sub-scales of Coping Strategy Inventory. These were found to be 0.77 for problem solving, 0.72 for cognitive restructuring, 0.60 for express emotion, 0.76 for social contact, 0.53 for problem avoidance, 0.68 for wishful thinking, 0.80 for self criticism, 0.57 for social withdrawal.

The CSI has been used by Maini (2001), Thapar (2002) and Singha (2006).

**PROCEDURE**

A careful survey was carried out to identify police functionaries falling in the Awarded, Suspended and Average Groups. The functionaries were male, non-IPS police officers in the age range of 25 to 57 years working in the state of Haryana and
Union Territory, Chandigarh. Only those functionaries were taken who had already completed 3 years of service in the police organization. Respondents in the Suspended Group were police functionaries who were under suspension at the time their data was taken. Further, keeping in view the design of the study, functionaries of the Ranks ranging from Constable to Deputy Superintendent of Police were taken. They were contacted and were requested to volunteer for the study. Rapport was established with each functionary and they were assured that the results and any information that they would give would be kept strictly confidential. They were requested to cooperate and respond to the questions truthfully.

Since Police Sub-culture scale by Cochran and Bromley (2003) was a new scale used in the present study, a pilot study was conducted to find the applicability of the scale on these Indian functionaries. Based on the results of this pilot study the scale was modified and only four subscales namely crime control, service, cynicism and receptivity to change were used to measure Police Sub-culture adherence.

In the first session, the functionaries were administered a brief questionnaire to obtain demographic information regarding age, rank, length of service, number and types of awards and period of suspension. They were also administered Police Sub-culture scale, Role Stress Inventory, Positive and Negative Affect Schedule.

In the second session, the Adult Health Checklist, State Trait Anger Expression Inventory, Satisfaction with Life Scale and Coping Strategies Inventory were administered.

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE SUBJECTS

1. Instructions for Police Sub-Culture Adherence Scale

The instructions for Police Sub-Culture Scale were as follows:

“Given below are 36 statements regarding the police organization. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that choice which best describes your thinking. Choose from the following alternatives:

Strongly agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree and Strongly disagree.

Please be honest in your responses and do not spend too much time on any one statement.
2. **Instructions for Role Stress Inventory**

The instructions for Role Stress Inventory were as follows:

“Given below are certain aspects of managerial jobs. Please read each statement carefully and circle the appropriate letter(s) given after each statement. Your response should reflect from perception of certain aspects of your present job”.

Choose from the following alternatives:

Strongly Agree = SA, Agree = A, Neither Agree nor Disagree = ?, Disagree = D, Strongly Disagree = SD

3. **Instructions for Adult Health Checklist**

The instructions for Adult Health Checklist were as follows: “This scale lists health complaints that happen once in a while to many individuals. For each illness please indicate the frequency and intensity of each illness by using the scales below:

Frequency Score: Happens Daily = 5, Happens several times a week = 4, Happens about once a week = 3, Happens about once a month = 2, Happens, but less than once a month = 1, and doesn’t happen, not a problem = 0.

Intensity Score: Bothers me a lot when it happens = 3, Bothers me a fair amount when it happens = 2, Bothers me only a little when it happens = 1, and Doesn’t bother me, not a problem = 0.

Under the heading medical care, circle ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ to indicate whether you went to the doctor for this illness.”

4. **Instructions for State Trait Anger Expression Inventory**

The State Trait Anger Expression Inventory consists of three parts. The instructions for ‘Part-1’ were as follows: “A number of statements that people use to describe themselves are given below. Read each statement and then indicate how you feel right now. Remember that there are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any one statement, but give the answer that seems to best describe your present feelings. Choose from the following alternatives:

Not at all = 1, Somewhat = 2, Moderately so =3, and Very much so = 4.”
The instructions for ‘Part-2’ were as follows: “A number of statements that people use to describe themselves are given below. Read each statement and then indicate how you generally feel. Remember that there are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any one statement, but give the answer that seems to best describe how you generally feel. Choose from the following alternatives:

Almost Never = 1, Sometimes = 2, Often =3, and Almost Always = 4”.

The instructions for ‘Part-3’ were as follows: “Everyone feels angry or furious from time to time, but people differ in the ways they react when they are angry. A number of statements are lists below which people use to describe their reactions when they feel angry or furious. Read each statement and then fill the blank with the number, which indicates how often you generally react or behave in the manner described when you are feeling angry or furious. Remember that there are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any one statement. Choose from the following alternatives:

Almost Never = 1, Sometimes = 2, Often =3, and Almost Always = 4”.

5. Instructions for Positive and Negative Affect Schedule

The instructions for Positive and Negative Affect Schedule were as follows: “This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent you have felt this way during the past weeks. Use the following scale to record your answers:

Very slightly or not at all = 1, A little = 2, Moderately = 3, Quite a bit = 4, and Extremely = 5”.

6. Instructions for Satisfaction with Life Scale

The instructions for Satisfaction with Life scale were as follows: “Below are five statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using the 1-7 scale below, indicate your agreement with each item by placing the appropriate number on the line preceding that item. Please be open and honest in your responding. The 7-item scale is as follows:
Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Slightly Disagree = 3, Neither agree nor disagree = 4, Slightly Agree = 5, Agree = 6, and Strongly Agree = 7”.

7. **Instructions for Coping Strategies Inventory:**

   The instructions for Coping Strategies Inventory were as follows:

   “Take a few minutes to think about your chosen stressful event in police work. As you read the following items, please answer them based on how you handled the stressful event. Please read each item and determine the extent to which you used it in handling your chosen stressful event according to the scale as follows:

   Not at all = 1, A little = 2, Some what = 3, Much = 4, and Very Much = 5.”

**SCORING**

Scoring for all the tests was done as per the instructions provided in the scoring manuals of the tests. These raw scores were then subjected to various statistical treatments and analyses.