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2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

2.1 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The ultimate success of any training programme is dependent upon a wise and dynamic recruitment policy. Training, to an extent, can make up for some deficiencies in the recruit, as one experienced officer has put it, but it cannot rectify the original error.

Training has an important role to play for police personnel in framing behavioural and attitudinal changes. The role of police is regularly undergoing change to keep consonance with the aspirations of the people. The training becomes essential not only for the police department but for the society as a whole.

Police training programs are a basic attribute of all police forces’ organizational approach, with training used not only to socialise new officers into the profession but as a strategy of modification in cases when a force is not up to the expected standard of professionalism (Mastrofski & Ritti, 1996).¹

A study carried out by the Director, National Police Academy, Sankar Sen showed that IPS trainees of a higher age group (at present the upper age limit is 28 instead of 24 in the past) find it tricky to cope with the stress and strain imposed by a rigorous
training programme. Some of them arrive with frozen attitudes and a negative approach emphasized during the training.²

Police Training often aims to affect attitudes as a way of affecting skills & behaviour. There is an assumption of a casual pathway, in which changing knowledge and attitudes are a step towards behaviour change (Mastrofski, Worden, & Snipes, 1995)³ or more generally in professionals’ behaviour change (Cabana et al., 1999).⁴

Herzog (2002) demonstrates that the deviant personality perspective is inappropriate when examining Israeli police violence, and that the phenomenon is best understood as group behaviour. Following this argument, Herzog suggests that the way to deal with these behaviours is through the development of preventive educational training programs for all police officers. This approach sees training as a possible site for organizational socialization towards democratic policing.⁵

Police behaviour, and more specifically police misconduct, is explained by three types of theories: sociological, psychological and organizational (Sklansky, 2008).⁶
2.1.2 Stress, Personality, Emotional Intelligence and Happiness

Police services have always been one of the most tough and stressful services in India and with changing times it is becoming even more so. The major brunt of this job is borne by constables as they are the foot-soldiers of police in India. They have to deal with angry mobs, counter-insurgency operations, traffic control, VIP security, political rallies, religious festival crowd control, and various other law and order duties without losing their composure and sensitivity. They have to face potentially hazardous situations that can result in physical or mental trauma or even death in the line of duty. Their work stress can be further aggravated because of their personality traits or wrong coping methods. A majority of Indian and international studies have found high stress levels in police, which is disturbing as psychiatric morbidity in police can have many direct and indirect negative consequences for society. Therefore, apart from physical fitness, they have to be mentally fit to do full justice to their duties.

John Van Maanen (1975) also stressed that the police personality is developed through the process of learning and doing police work.⁷ The characteristics usually associated with police personalities in present times are machismo, bravery, authoritarianism, cynicism and aggression. Additional characteristics have been associated with police personalities
as well: suspicious, solidaristic, conservative, alienated and thoroughly bigoted (Balch, 1977). Hanewicz (1978) begins his effort to describe police personality by first defining personality by using Thomas Gray’s (1975) concept of affinity: “…a tendency to adhere partially to a set of distinctive sentiments that can be expanded and reinforced by training and socialization.” Hanewicz identifies two major positions: 1. The police personality is something that police possess by virtue of their being police; or 2. The police personality is something that people have who become police.

According to the psychological paradigm, police officers share certain characteristics in advance that make them choose a career within law enforcement (Vastola, 1978). The researches done by Edward Thibault, Lawrence M. Lynch, and R. Bruce McBride found that in most studies the police working personality derives from the socialization process in the police academy, field training, and patrol experience (Thibault et al., 1985).

The statement “cops are born and not made” shows the psychological paradigm better (Bonifacio, 1991, p. 147).
Empirical evidence is pointing to the organizational framework as more relevant to explaining behaviour, as opposed to personality-oriented explanations (Skolnic & Fyfe, 1993).\(^{13}\)

As people possess certain stable personality characteristics that endure throughout life the personality characteristics that officers entail before they join the police, form the basis of the police personality. (Kappeler et al., 1994)\(^{14}\)

Gershon et al. (2002) reported that the most essential risk factor in a police officer's perceived work stress was maladaptive coping behavior and exposure to critical occurrences.\(^{15}\)

Collins et al. (2003) in a cross-sectional study on county police constables and sergeants in the United Kingdom found that the high-stress group composed 41% of the population and showed considerable alliance with having negative job perception.\(^{16}\)

An article on “Police Stress Research” prepared by a NIOSH working group, The Indian Police Journal (2004), discloses that according to the National Police Suicide Foundation, every 22 hours, a police officer in America takes his or her own life. This leads to the inevitable conclusion
that police officers are not able to cope adequately with job-related stress.¹⁷

**Hoque et al., 2004**, has been shown that there is a negative impact upon police officer engagement and job outcomes on their emotions. While much research has shown that the emotional intelligence of police officers has an impact upon their work outcomes.¹⁸

To do jobs effectively, entry level officers need organizational support which is best provided through proper training, resources, development, and leadership. Officers with high emotional intelligence (EI) will often be more successful; characteristics such as impulse control, stress tolerance, problem solving, and the ability to build and maintain interpersonal relationships have been found to be predictors of high job performance and leadership skills.

Since police work is known to be stressful, recent articles have questioned whether enough is being done for officers’ well-being as some are committing suicide and suffer from post traumatic stress. Psychologists believe that in comparison with other occupations, law enforcement is an emotionally and dangerous career. Policing is a form of emotional labour and the effort involved in protecting the community,
while behaving in a “client-focused” manner but restrained by fiscal constraints.

**Deb et al. (2008)**, in a study on traffic constables under Kolkata Police, disclosed that 79.4% of them were moderately or highly stressed. A study by **Rao et al. (2008)** on Central Industrial Security Force (CISF) personnel found 28.8% of them scoring positive for high stress on GHQ-30. The study also found higher psychiatric morbidity in the high-stress group.

**Lipp (2009)** found 43% of senior Brazilian police officers under significant stress. **Zukauskas et al. (2009)** identified in their study on police officers that consequences of stress included depression, alcoholism, physical illness, and suicide.

A study involving different ranks of police personnel by **Ranta (2009)** reported that enhancing the coping behaviour of subjects using Indian psychological techniques resulted in a significant reduction in job stress. A research on “Workplace stress – Factors that contribute to workplace stress”, by **Maria Parkinson (2010)**, says that the workplace stress is becoming a major problem in today’s society. A quarter of employees view their job as the major stress in their lives. Several factors contribute
to workplace stress like one factor is longer working hours. She also says that police officers reported more suicidal thoughts than the general population. Policing is an inherently psychologically stressful job where officers face danger, possible death, violence and very high demands.24

**Cabarkapa (2011),** in a study on military aviation crew, found neuroticism as a personality trait in correlation to job related stress and concluded that stress evaluation and certain personality characteristics examination can be used for the development of basic anti-stress programs and measures.25

### 2.2 OBJECTIVES

The main aim of the present research is to measure the efficacy of behavioural training module in police personnel. Major objectives are following:

1. To determine whether there is any significant difference in Stress level after training programmes in Rajasthan police.
2. To determine whether there is any significant difference in Happiness level after training programmes in Rajasthan police.
3. To determine whether there is any significant difference in Personality Factors after training programmes in Rajasthan police.
4. To determine whether there is any significant difference in Emotional Intelligence level after training programmes in Rajasthan police.

5. To study the difference of Stress level between male and female trainee constables.

6. To study the difference of Happiness level between male and female trainee constables.

7. To study the difference of Personality traits between male and female trainee constables.

8. To study the difference of Emotional Intelligence level between male and female trainee constables.

2.3 HYPOTHESIS

Major Hypotheses of the present study are as follow:

1. Training Programmes of Trainee Constables in Rajasthan are not effective.

2. There is a significant difference in Stress level between male and female trainee constables.

3. There is a significant difference in Happiness level between male and female trainee constables.
4. There is a significant difference in Personality traits between male and female trainee constables.

5. There is a significant difference in Emotional Intelligence level between male and female trainee constables.

2.4 VARIABLES

Major variables were selected for the present study is as follows-

1. Stress Level before and after Training Programmes

2. Happiness Level before and after Training Programmes

3. Personality Factors before and after Training Programmes
   I. Warmth
   II. Reasoning
   III. Emotional Stability
   IV. Dominance
   V. Liveliness
   VI. Rule Consciousness
   VII. Social Boldness
   VIII. Sensitivity
   IX. Vigilance
   X. Abstractness
XI. Privateness

XII. Apprehensiveness

XIII. Openness to Change

XIV. Self Reliance

XV. Perfectionism

XVI. Tension

4. Emotional Intelligence Level before and after Training Programmes

I. Self Awareness

II. Empathy

III. Self Motivation

IV. Emotional Stability

Managing Relationships

V. Integrity

VI. Self Development

VII. Value Orientation

VIII. Commitment

IX. Altruist Behaviour

4. Demographic Variables

I. Name

II. Age
III. Sex

IV. Marital Status

V. Qualification

2.5 RESEARCH DESIGN

Research design is the most crucial aspect in the smooth and successful conduction of any research work. It serves as a blueprint. The implicit purpose of all research designs is to improve controlled restriction on observation of natural phenomena. It has been found that the chances of arriving at accurate and valid conclusions are better with sound research design.

Research design is the plan, structure and strategy of investigation conceived. So as to obtain answers to research questions and to control variance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre Test</th>
<th>Training Module</th>
<th>Post Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1, T2, T3, T4 to be administered before Training Program</td>
<td>1) Human Personalities: Types of Personalities, Importance of Personalities in Police personnel, Steps to improve Personality</td>
<td>T1, T2, T3, T4 to be administered after 9 months Training Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Stress Management:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors causing stress in Police working, Its impact on Personality and its management, Relaxing measures from stress, Controlling anger and aggression at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T1: Stress Level

T2: Happiness Level

T3: Personality Factors

T4: Emotional Intelligence Level

### 2.6 SAMPLING

The “Sample” is taking any portion of a population or universe, so that each member of the population or universe has an equal chance of being selected to make it representative of that population.
In the present research Purposive sampling technique was used. The study was conducted on 500 Constable Trainees from Rajasthan Police Academy, Jaipur.

2.7 INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION CRITERIA

2.7.1 Inclusion Criteria

i. Age range between 18-25 years.

ii. Only Trainee Constables were included.

iii. Minimum Educational Status senior secondary.

iv. The sample was drawn from Rajasthan police Academy, Jaipur.

v. The area of research was Rajasthan Police Academy, Jaipur.

2.7.2 Exclusion Criteria

i. R.P.S. and S.I. Trainees were not included.

ii. The area of research was not out of the Rajasthan Police Academy, Jaipur.

2.8 DATA COLLECTION

The Primary data was collected through administering the questionnaires.
The secondary data was collected from departmental reports, publications and websites. The secondary data was also collected from various newspapers and publications related to the topic of the study.

2.9 TOOLS

2.9.1 Perceived Stress Scale (PSS)

The perceived stress scale is the most widely used psychological instrument for measuring perception of stress (Cohen, 1983). It is a measure of the degree to which situations in one’s life are appraised as stressful. Items are designed to tap how unpredictable, uncontrollable, and overloaded people find their lives. The scale also includes a number of direct queries about current levels of experienced stress. The PSS is designed for use in community samples with at least a junior high school education. The items are easy to understand and the response alternatives are simple to grasp. Moreover, the questions are of general nature and hence are relatively free of content specific to any subpopulation group. Questions in PSS ask about feelings and thoughts during last month. In each case, respondents are asked how often they felt a certain way.
2.9.2 Oxford Happiness Questionnaire (OHQ)

To measure happiness Oxford Happiness Questionnaire (OHQ) developed by Hills and Argyle (2002) is used. The Oxford Happiness Questionnaire has been derived from the Oxford Happiness Inventory (OHI). A more instrument, Oxford Happiness Questionnaire includes 29 items, each presented as a single statement, which can be endorsed on a uniform sex-point Likert Scale. The responses to the items are scored on a 6-point scale: (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Moderately Agree, (3) Slightly Agree, (4) Slightly Disagree, (5) Moderately Disagree, (6) Strongly Disagree.

The scale possesses a high scale alpha reliability of 0.91. The inter-item correlations for the OHQ ranged from -0.04 to 0.65. The personality variables correlate very strongly with OHQ (Argyle and Hills, 2002). In terms of construct validity, OHQ appears to be the preferred measure in terms of its construct validity (Argyle and Hills, 2002).

2.9.3 PF (Hindi Version)

The 16 personality factor questionnaire (16PF) is an objectively scorable test devised by basic research in psychology to give the most complete coverage of personality possible in brief time. The test was designed for use with individuals age sixteen and above. These sixteen dimensions or
scales are essentially independent. Any item of the test contributes to the score on one and only one factor so the no dependencies were introduced at the level of scale construction. The personality of the trainee constables was measured through standard questionnaire 16 PF Personality inventory of Dr. S.D. Kapoor Hindi version was utilized in the collection of data. This inventory was very lengthy in itself. They had to fill a separate answer sheet after reading the questions from the questionnaire. After duration of an hour, the question booklets and answer sheets were collected. Researcher used utensil provided with the test for scoring the stens score of all 16 factors separately. The capsule descriptions of the sixteen factors are as follows.

**Factor A (Warmth)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserved, detached, critical, Cool</th>
<th>Outgoing, Warmhearted, Easy going, participating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The person who scores low on factor ‘A’tends to be stiff, cool skeptical, and aloof. He likes things rather than people, working alone, and avoiding compromises of view points. He is likely to be precise and ‘rigid’ in this way of doing things and in personal standards, and in many occupations these are desirable traits. He may tend at times to be critical, obstructive or hard.</td>
<td>The person who scores high on factor ‘A’ tend to be good natured and easy going, emotionally expressive, ready to cooperate, attentive to people, soft hearted, kindly adaptable. He likes occupations dealing with people and socially impressive situations. He ready forms active groups. He is generous in personal relations, less afraid of criticism, better able to remember names of people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Factor B (Reasoning)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less intelligent, concrete thinking</th>
<th>More intelligent, abstract thinking, Bright</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The person scoring low in factor B tends to be slow to learn and grasp dull, given to concrete and literal interpretation. His dullness may be simply a reflection of low intelligence, or it may represent poor functioning due to psychopathology.</td>
<td>The person who scores high on Factor B tends to grasp ideas, a fast learner, intelligent. There is some correlation of culture, and some with alertness. High scores contra indicate deterioration of mental functions in pathological conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Factor C (Emotional Stability)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected by feelings, emotionally less stable, easily upset</th>
<th>Emotionally stable, Faces reality, clam Mature.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The person who score low in factor C tends to be low in frustration, tolerance for unsatisfactory conditions, changeable and plastic, evading necessary reality demands, neurotically fatigued, fretful, easily emotional and annoyed, active in dissatisfaction, having neurotic symptoms (phobias, sleep, disturbances, psychosomatic complaints etc.) Low factor C is common in almost in all forms of neurotic and some psychotic disorders</td>
<td>The person who scores high on Factor C tends to be emotionally mature, stable, realistic about life, unruffled, possessing, ego strength, better able to maintain solid group morale. Some times he may be a person making a resigned adjustment to unsolved emotional problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Factor E (Dominance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humble, mild, accommodating, conforming</th>
<th>Assertive, Independent, aggressive competitive Stubborn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The person who scores low in Factor E tends to give a way to others, to be docile, and to conform. He is often dependent, anxious for obsession correctness. This passivity is part of many neurotic syndromes.</td>
<td>The person who scores high in Factor E is assertive, self assured and independent minded. He tends to be austere, a law to himself, hostile or extra punitive, authoritarian, and disregards authority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Factor F (Liveliness)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sober, prudent, abstract, serious, and Taciturn</th>
<th>Happy-go-lucky, Impulsive lively, Enthusiastic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The person who scores low in factor F tends to be restrained, reticent, and introspective. He is sometimes dour, pessimistic, unduly deliberate &amp; considered smug and primly correct by observers. He tends to be a sober, dependable.</td>
<td>The person who scores high in Factor tends to be cheerful active, talkative, frank, expressive, effervescent, and carefree. He is frequently chosen as an elected leader. He may be impulsive and mercurial.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor G (Rule Consciousness)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expedient, Ecades rules, Feels Few Obligations</th>
<th>Conscientious, Persevering, staid, rule bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The person who scores low on factor G tends to be unsteady in purpose. He is often casual lacking in comfort for group undertaking and cultural demands. His freedom from group influence many lead to anti social acts, but at times makes him more effective, while his refusal to be bound by rules causes him to have less somatic upset from stress.</td>
<td>The person who scores high in factor G tends to be exacting in character, dominated by sense of duty, preserving, responsible, painful, “fills fills the unforgiving minute”. He is usual conscientious and moralistic and he prefers hard working people to witty companions. The inner “categorical imperative” of this essential superego (in the psychoanalytical sense) should be distinguished from the superficially similar “social ideal self” of Q+.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor H (social Boldness)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shy, Restrained, diffident, Timid</th>
<th>Venturesome, socially-bold, Uninhibited, spontaneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The person who scores low in this trait tends to be shy, withdrawing, cautious, retiring, a ‘Wallflower’. He usually has inferiority feeling. He tends to be slow and impeded in speech and in expressing himself, dislikes occupations with</td>
<td>The person who scores high on factor H is sociable, bold, ready to try new things, spontaneous and abundant in emotional response. His thick skinned ness enables him to face wear and tear in dealing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
personal contacts, prefer one or two close friends to large groups, and is not given to keeping in contact with all that is on around them.

with people and grueling emotional situations, without fatigue. However he can be careless of detail ignore danger signals, and consume much time talking. He tends to be pushy and actively interested in the opposite sex.

### Factor I (Sensitivity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tough minded, self-reliant, realistic, no nonsense</th>
<th>Tender minded, dependent overprotected, sensitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The person who scores low on factor I tends to be practical, realistic, masculine, independent, responsible, but skeptical of subjective cultural elaborations. He is sometimes unmoved, hard, cynical, and smug. He tends to keep a group operating on a practical and realistic no-nonsense basis.</td>
<td>The person who scores high in factor G tends to be tender minded, daydreaming, artistic, fastidious, and feminine. He is sometimes demanding of attentions and help, impatient, dependent, impractical. He dislikes crude people and rough occupations. He tends to slow up grow performance and to upset group morale by unrealistic fussiness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Factor L (Vigilance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trusting, adaptable, Free of jealously, easy to get on with</th>
<th>Suspicious, self opinionated, hard to fool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The person who scores low on factor L tends to free of jealous tendencies, adaptable, cheerful, un-competitive, concerned about other people, a good team worker.</td>
<td>The person who scores high on factor L tends to be mistrusting and doubt full. He is often involved in his own ego, is self opinionated, and interested in internal mental life. He is usually deliberate in his actions, unconcerned about other people, a poor team member.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Factor M (Abstractness)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practical, careful, conventional, regulated by external realities, Proper</th>
<th>Imaginative, Wrapped up in Inner urgencies, careless of practical matters, absent minded.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The person who scores low on factor M tends to be anxious to do the right things, attentive to practical matters, and subject to the dictation of what is obviously possible. He is concerned over detail, able to keep his head in emergencies, but sometimes unimaginative.</td>
<td>The person who scores high on factor M tends to be unconventional over every day matters, Bohemian, self motivated, imaginatively creative, concerned with ‘essentials’ and oblivious of particular people and physical realities. His inner directed interests sometimes lead to unrealistic situations accompanied by expressive overbrust. His individuality tends to cause to be rejected in group activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Factor N (Privateness)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forthright, Natural, Artless, Sentimental</th>
<th>Shrewd, Calculating, Worldly, Penetrating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The person who scores low on factor N tends to be unsophisticated, sentimental and simple. He is sometimes crude and awkward, but easily pleased and content with what comes, and is natural and spontaneous.</td>
<td>The person who scores high in factor N tends to be polished, experienced, worldly, and shrewd. He is often hardhead and analytical. He has an intellectual, unsentimental approach to situations, an approach akin to cynicism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Factor O (Apprehensiveness)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placid, Self assured, Confident, Serene</th>
<th>Apprehensive, Worrying, Depressive, Troubled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The person who scores low on factor Q1 tends to be confident in what he has been taught to believe, and accepts the “tried and true” despite inconsistencies, when something else might better. He is cautious and compromising in regard to new ideas. Thus, he tends to oppose and postpone change, is inclined to go along with tradition, is more conservative in religion and politics, tends not to be interested in analytical “intellectual” thought.</td>
<td>The person who scores high in factor Q1 tends to be interested in intellectual matters and has doubt on fundamental issues. He is skeptical and inquiring regarding ideas, either old or new. He tends to be more well informed, less inclined to moralize, more inclined to experiment in life generally, and more tolerant of inconvenience and change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Factor Q2 (Self Reliance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group dependent, A ‘Joiner’ and sound Follower</th>
<th>Self sufficient, prefer own decisions, resourceful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The person who scores low on factor Q2 tends to be preferred to work and make decisions with other people, like and depends on social approval and admiration. He tends to go along with the group and may be lacking in individual resolution. He is not necessarily gregarious by choice; rather he needs group support.</td>
<td>The person who scores high in factor Q2 temperamentally independent, accustomed to going in his own way, making decisions and taking actions in his own. He discounts public opinion, but is not necessarily dominant in his relation with others. He does not dislike people but simply does not need their agreement or support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor $Q_3$ (Perfectionism)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indiscipline self-conflict, careless of protocol, follows own urges</th>
<th>Controlled, Socially precise, Following, Self image.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The person who scores low on factor $Q_3$ will not be bothered with will control and regard for social demands. He is not overly considerate careful, or pain-taking. He may feel maladjusted, and may maladjustment (especially the effective but not the paranoid) show $Q_3$.</td>
<td>The person who scores high in factor $Q_3$ tends to have strong control on his emotions and general behaviour, is inclined to be socially aware and careful, and evidence what is commonly termed as “self respect” and regard for social reputation. He sometimes tends, however, to be obstinate. Effective leaders and come paranoids, are high on $Q_3$.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor $Q_4$ (Tension)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relaxed, Tranquil, Torpid, Unfrustrated</th>
<th>Tense, Frustrated, Driven, overwrought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The person who scores low on factor $Q_4$ tends to be sedate, relaxed, composed, and satisfied. In some situations, his over satisfaction can lead to laziness and low performance, in the sense that low motivation produces little trail and error. Conversely, high tension level may disrupt school and work performance.</td>
<td>The person who scores high in factor $Q_4$ tends to be tense, excitable, restless, fretful, and impatient. He is often fatigued, but unable to remain inactive. In groups he takes a poor view of the degree of unity, orderliness, and leadership. His frustration represents an excess of stimulated, but undercharged, drive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.9.4 Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS)

Emotional Intelligence Scale is developed by Hyde, Pethe and Dhar (2002). This scale has 34 statements in total and for each
statement there are five alternatives given. It consists of ten dimensions of emotional intelligence which are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Awareness (V14)</td>
<td>2, 8, 14, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy (V15)</td>
<td>6, 12, 18, 24, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Motivation (V16)</td>
<td>1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability (V17)</td>
<td>3, 9, 15, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Relationships (V18)</td>
<td>4, 10, 16, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity (V19)</td>
<td>5, 11, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self development (V20)</td>
<td>26, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Orientation (V21)</td>
<td>27, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (V22)</td>
<td>28, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic Behaviour (V23)</td>
<td>23, 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questionnaire is a five-point scale, (Strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree and strongly disagree). This scale is available in two languages English as well as Hindi.

The reliability of the scale was determined by calculating reliability coefficient on a sample of 200 subjects. The split half reliability coefficient was found to be 0.88. The scale has high content validity which is 0.93.

2.10 PROCEDURE

The present research is to study the differences of Stress level, Emotional Intelligence, Personality and Happiness level of trainee constables before and after their training at Rajasthan Police Academy, Jaipur. Purposive random sampling technique was used.
Questionnaires were employed simultaneously to measure the differences of Stress level, Emotional Intelligence, Personality and Happiness level of trainee constables before and after their training. A good rapport was established. The respondents were requested to first fill the questionnaire related to demographic variables. Although all the tests are self-administering, instructions were read and explained aloud and made clear. All the doubts regarding the tests were cleared beforehand.

2.11 SCORING

2.11.1 Stress (Perceived Stress Scale) PSS

This test consists of 10 statements. Each item had five response alternatives.

0 = never
1 = almost never
2 = sometimes
3 = fairly often
4 = very often
All the items were scored this way except for four positively stated items (item number 4,5,7 and 8), which were scored in a reverse order \((4,3,2,1,0)\) means 0 equivalent to 4, 1 equivalent to 3, 2 equivalent 2 and 4 equivalent to 0.

Interpretation of Scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 and above</td>
<td>High level of stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>Moderate level of stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>Low level of stress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.11.2 Oxford Happiness Questionnaire

The scale used is a uniform six-point Likert Scale, the responses to the items are scored on a 6-point scale: (1) strongly agree, (2) moderately agree, (3) slightly agree, (4) slightly disagree, (5) moderately disagree, (6) strongly disagree. Higher scores indicate a broad measure of happiness. There is reserve scoring for the * (starred) items. The responses given by each trainee constable was added up to yield a total score and then divided by 29.
Interpretation of Scores: Range of Scores 1-6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3 and above</td>
<td>High level of happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Moderate level of happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Low level of happiness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.11.3 Sixteen PF

Each answer scores 0, 1 or 2 points, except the Factor N (intelligence) answers which score 0 (incorrect) or 1 (correct). The score of each item contribute to only one factor total. Tests can be either hand scored, with a stencil key, or machine scored.

2.11.4 Emotional Intelligence Scale

The scale consists ten dimensions of emotional intelligence as well as overall emotional intelligence. There are five possible responses, Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Uncertain (3), Disagree (2) and Strongly Disagree (1). The responses given by each trainee constable was added up. Finally for each dimension and overall score of emotional intelligence were calculated.
2.12 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

All the responses were scored on the basis of scoring procedure as given in the manual of these tests. Statistical tools like t-test analysis of differences between means of different subscales was undertaken to derive results for measuring Stress, Happiness, Personality and Emotional Intelligence of trainee constables.
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