CHAPTER IV

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

- Selection of sample
- Research instruments
- Description of the instruments
- Psychometric properties
- Scoring
- The data processing and analysis
CHAPTER IV

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

A study on the "Role stress, Social Support and Life Satisfaction of Police women in Madras City" was undertaken to analyse the extent of role stress, level of social support and degree of life satisfaction among the police women. This study also aims at finding out the relationship between these three variables and to suggest measures for reducing stress, enlarging social support and improving life satisfaction.

SELECTION OF SAMPLE

Women police from all the police stations within Madras City who constituted the Universe of the study were taken as the sample of this study. As per the statistics provided by the office of the Director General of Police of Tamil Nadu, totally there were about 155 police women working at 13 police stations spread over Madras City. All the 13 police stations were visited by the investigator and the data were collected personally from the police women by means of pre-prepared questionnaires and an interview schedule.

RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

In the present study, a set of three questionnaires along with an interview schedule containing items on certain biographic details were administered to the sample. They are
a  Organisational Role Stress scale by Pareek (1982).
b  Social Support scale by Caplan et al., (1975).
c  Life Satisfaction scale by Thyagarajan (1981), and
d  Interview Schedule on biographic details

DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTRUMENTS

A. ORGANISATIONAL ROLE STRESS SCALE

The Organisational Role Stress scale was developed by Pareek (1983) from an earlier scale named 'Your Feelings about Your Role', Pareek (1980). The Organisational Role Stress scale is a multi-dimensional scale comprising the dimensions of

(a)  Self Role Distance (SRD)
(b)  Inter Role Distance (IRD)
(c)  Role Stagnation (RS)
(d)  Role Ambiguity (RA)
(e)  Role Overload (RO)
(f)  Role Isolation (RI)
(g)  Role Inadequacy (RIin)
(h)  Role Inadequacy (RI)

Later on Role Ambiguity was split so as to include Role Expectation Conflict (REC) also. Role Inadequacy was divided into Personal Inadequacy (PI) and Resource Inadequacy (RI) to make-in-all ten dimensions.
Psychometric Properties

The retest reliability co-efficients were found to be ranging between 37 to 73. Except Role Erosion (RE) \((r = 37)\) the tests were significant at 0.01 level and the former at 0.03 level. Validity through item analysis shows all but 3 correlations above 36. Most of the correlations were significant at 0.01 level. Of the rest, one was significant at 0.02 level and the rest at 0.08 level. Validity through factor analysis shows satisfactory values and high internal consistency (Sen, 1982).

Description of the Scale

The Organisational Role Stress scale has 50 items, 5 items on each dimension. The score of each item could vary between 0 and 4. Hence, each dimension can have a score range of 0 to 20 and the total score could be between 0 and 200.

The items were printed in reusable booklets and the answersheet was provided separately. Instructions were provided on the booklets. They read, "People have different feelings about their roles. Statements describing some such feelings are given below. Use the answersheet to write your responses. Read each statement and indicate in the space against the corresponding question number in the answersheet how often you have the feeling expressed in the statement in relation to your role in the organisation. Use the numbers given below to indicate your feelings." The instructions also state that no item should be left unanswered and if exact responses are not possible, the closest alternative was to be chosen.
Scoring

The response alternatives were in five levels. The following is the scoring pattern.

0  - never or rarely feel that way
1  - occasionally (a few times) feel this way
2  - sometimes feel this way
3  - frequently feel this way
4  - very frequently or always feel this way

Items belonging to a particular dimension were grouped in a row. The total score for each dimension could be marked alongside. The score for each dimension is the sum of the alternatives checked against the items belonging to that dimension. For example, the score for (IRD) dimension would be the sum of the numbers marked against items 1, 11, 21, 31 and 41. The total score would be the sum of the scores of all dimensions.

This scale was considered suitable for the present study because it measures, comprehensively a variety of role stress constructs. As the scale was constructed and validated in India, it is more amenable to research in India.

B. SOCIAL SUPPORT SCALE

The Social Support scale by Caplan et al., (1975) covers the extent to which people around an employee provide support to the employee by being good listeners or by being people he or she can rely on for providing help when needed.
Psychometric Properties

Cross sectional estimates of the reliability are 83, 73, and 81 respectively for support from 'supervisors', 'others at work' and 'spouse, friends and relatives', respectively. The inter-correlations among the items of the three scales range from 0.1 to 0.67 (Caplan et al., 1975).

The retest reliability of the three scales are found to be 0.95, 0.83 and 0.76 respectively for support from 'supervisors', from 'others at work' and from 'family and friends'. The total social support score which is the composite of the three scales, correlates significantly ($r = 0.40, P < 0.01$) with poor peer relation sub-scales of occupational stress index indicating the validity of the support measure (Joseph, 1986).

Description of the Scale

The social support scale includes three scales having four parallel items measuring social support from

a) Immediate supervisors
b) Others at work
c) Spouse, friends and relatives

The support measures are based on the theoretical and empirical research by Pinneau (1972), Taylor and Bowen (1972), Likert (1961) and Gore (1973). This is a good measure of the qualitative aspect of social support. The items of the scale have four response options ranging from (1) - not at all, to
(4) very much Each item has three parallel items and the response should be made for each of the three parallel items The instructions given are, "Please read each item carefully and give your choice by placing a tick mark in the appropriate place for each item Use the response categories given below

Scoring

The response options are as follows

0 - don't have any such person
1 - not at all
2 - a little
3 - some what
4 - very often

The subjects mark a tick against the number which is closest to the exact feeling The score of social support from each source will be the sum of the ratings of that sub-scale For example, the score of support from immediate supervisors is the sum of the ratings of items 1a, 2a, 3a and 4a The total social support scale is the sum of the scores of each of the dimensions The '0' referring to I don't have any such person' is given a missing data value while scoring

This scale was considered apt for the present study because it is related to support with respect to work situations It is generally usable for jobs of all types It is simple and easily comprehensible
C. LIFE SATISFACTION SCALE

The Life Satisfaction scale by Thyagarajan (1981) comprises of four areas, that is family leisure, life and overall job itself. This scale was framed based on the work of Kornhauser (1965). This scale was formed in order to find out whether an individual who is dissatisfied at work has any compensation of being satisfied with life and similarly to find out whether unhappiness at work leads one to being unhappy with life in general.

Psychometric Properties

The inter-correlations among the items of the four areas range from 15 to 62. The retest reliability of the four areas were found to be 0.90, 0.75, 0.85, and 0.88 respectively for family, leisure, life and job. The total life satisfaction score which is the composite of the four areas, correlates significantly ($r = 0.12, P<0.1$) with occupational stress index indicating the validity of the life satisfaction measure.

Description of the Scale

The Life Satisfaction scale includes four areas which consists of six items in each area measuring satisfaction. The score on each item could vary between 1 to 5. Hence, each area has a score range of 6 to 30, and the total, score which is the sum of scores on all the four areas, could range between 24 to 120.
The items are in the form of Likert type. The individual has to state how well he is satisfied in the four areas of life satisfaction scale. Each individual is asked to tick either completely satisfied, or well satisfied, or neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, or a little satisfied, or very dissatisfied, for each of the items in the four areas.

Scoring

The response alternatives were in five levels. The following is the scoring pattern:

1 - Very dissatisfied
2 - A little dissatisfied
3 - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
4 - Well satisfied
5 - Completely satisfied

Items belonging to a particular area were grouped together. The total score for each of the four areas were as follows with a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 30:

- Family: 6 to 30
- Leisure: 6 to 30
- Life: 6 to 30
- Job: 6 to 30
The total core would be the sum of the scores in all the four areas which could range from 24 to 120.

This scale was considered suitable for the present study because it measures, comprehensively, satisfaction in all the areas of life.

DATA COLLECTION

The locale of the study was Madras City, a major metropolitan city in India. As per the statistics provided by the office of the Director General of Police of Tamil Nadu, totally there were about 155 police women working at 13 police stations spread over the entire city. All the 155 police women who constituted the Universe formed the sample for the study. After the tools were finalised, every police woman was contacted personally in the police station and the questionnaires were administered after getting their cooperation and willingness to answer the questionnaires, and their responses were noted. The investigator had to make several visits to the police stations to achieve this purpose. The data thus collected was coded and subjected to suitable statistical analysis using the computer. The results obtained were used for the verification of the hypotheses.

THE DATA PROCESSING AND ANALYSIS

The data collected were processed using the statistical techniques such as frequency analysis, correlation, chi-square, and path-analysis.
The purpose of the frequency analysis is purely descriptive and provides information on the distribution of a simple variable. This method was employed to understand the extent of stress, level of social support and degree of life satisfaction.

Correlation or chi-square gives information as to whether two variables are related and how changes in one variable is related to another. The investigator has used Pearson's product moment correlation co-efficient (r) to study the relationship between variables, when both the variables are continuous, for example age and stress scores. When the variables were discrete, for example, type of family, chi-square analysis was undertaken to determine the degree of association between the variables.

However, in the case of some continuous variables such as extent of stress, normal distribution was assumed and hence the first 33 3 percent score were clubbed together as 'low' stress, the next 33 3 percent as 'medium' stress and the last 33 3 percent as 'high' stress. These three groups were later used for the chi-square analysis to find out their association with other discrete variables such as designation, department, etc.

Among the multivariate analysis, path analysis was developed by Sewall Wright (1934) as a method for studying the effects of direct and indirect variables taken as the cause of other variables. Hence to establish the relationship between the major independent variables and stress, path-analysis was used.