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Abstract: The aim of the research was to study perceived stress, personality and decision making styles among Karnataka Police Officers. A number of 48 Non-Gazetted police officers from Karnataka were selected using purposive and convenient sampling method having work experience ranging minimum 3 years to maximum 16 years. Perceived Stress Scale by Sheldon Cohen (1983), IAS Rating Scale by Mathew (1995) and General Decision Making Styles Scale by Scott and Bruce (1995) were administered on the sample. Spearman’s Rank Correlation was used to obtain the results and it showed no significant correlation between the perceived stress, personality and decision making styles among Karnataka Police Officers and hence proved the three hypotheses, however one of the domain of decision making style that is avoidant decision making styles was positive significant correlation with perceived stress and the other domain of personality that is inertia, has a positive significant correlation with perceived stress. The same domain of personality that is inertia has a negative significant correlation with the rational decision making style. Therefore, it can be said that there is no significant correlation between perceived stress, personality and decision making styles among Karnataka Police Officers.

Keywords: perceived stress, IAS personality, decision making styles, non-gazetted police officers

1. Introduction

The role of police organizations has become both pivotal and multifaceted in complex society. As a result, police are presented with a multitude of challenges and demands in their day-to-day operations. In many communities, police officers and traffic police must act as first responders (e.g. in serious automobile accidents, terrorist events or natural catastrophes), social workers (e.g. child custody disputes or welfare of the elder) and peacekeepers by dealing with the most deviant members of society. Although all humans experience stress and stressors in their lives, their source, intensity, and duration vary depending on the social and personal circumstances of each individual (Selye, 1976). Due to the nature of their work, police officers are constantly subjected to stressful situations such as violence, loss of human life, natural disasters and/or social injustice (Gaines & Jermier, 1983; Harpold & Feemster, 2002). They are not only forced to deal with stressors faced by most members of society, but are also subjected to the strain of dealing with the stressors afforded by their profession.

2. Perceived Stress and Decision Making

Two types of stressors in have been identified in an abundance of literature: occupational and personal stressors (Anshel, 2000; Gershon, Lin & Li, 2002). Occupational stressors can be divided into critical incident stressors and general work stressors (Stevens, 2005). Examples of critical incidents are apprehending a murderer, riot control, high speed chases, and/or shooting incidents. Critical incident stressors expose officers to danger and therefore, personal vulnerability. Continued exposure to critical incidents is highly conducive to high stress and traumatic stress reactions among law enforcement officers (Paton, 2005). General work stressors are related to occupational and organizational variables such as shift work, management style, interpersonal relationships, work roles, and environmental conditions. It can affect the cognitive performance. The physical and psychological effects of police stress are both dreadful and troublesome. Law enforcement officers have a high incidence of coronary heart disease, diabetes, stomach issues, insomnia, back problems, eating disorders and high cholesterol (Neylan, Metzler, Best, Weiss, Fagan, Lieberman, et al., 2002; Ramey, 2003; Sparrow, Thomas & Weiss, 1983; Söreson, Smolander, Louhevaara, Korhonen & Oja, 2000). In addition, police officers suffer from high levels of cognitive deficiencies such anxiety, depression and aggression (Carlan & Nored, 2008; Gershon, et al., 2002). A wide range of stressful experiences can influence human decision making in complex ways beyond the simple predictions of a fight-or-flight model. Recent advances may provide insight into this complicated interaction, potentially in directions that could result in translational applications.

Early research suggests that stress exposure influences basic neural circuits involved in reward processing and learning, while also biasing decisions towards habit and modulating our propensity to engage in risk-taking. Stress may also damage the prefrontal cortex, a brain region involved in important cognitive abilities such as judgment and decision making. Notably, several of the brain regions vulnerable to increased levels of stress. So it has an effect on various decision making styles. The five dimensions of general decision making model are rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant, spontaneous. So it has been seen that avoidant style and, to some extent, the Dependent style were significantly associated with higher Perceived Stress. This study investigates the relationship between perceived stress, personality and decision making styles on police officers.

3. Decision Making

Decision is defined a moment in an ongoing process of evaluating alternatives related to a goal, at which the expectation of decision maker with regard to a particular course of action impels him to make a selection (Harrison, 1981).

Decision making is a process of making a choice from a number of alternatives to achieve a desired result (Eisenfuhr, 2011). This definition has three key elements.
First, decision-making involves making a choice from a number of options. Second, decision making is a process that involves more than simply a final choice from among alternatives. Finally, the “desired result” mentioned in the definition involves a purpose or target resulting from the mental activity that the decision maker engages in to reach a final decision.

4. Theories of Decision-Making

Decision Theories could be under certainty (each alternative lead to a goal or consequence), risk ‘each alternative has one or more consequence and the probability of each are known) and uncertainty (each alternative lead to one or more consequence with an unknown probability). There are different types of theory that have been implemented. These include:

Causal Decision Theory: This is an old theory that is still in use till date. This theory adopts the principle of rational choice which implies that the outcome of your choice is a consequence of your decision.

Evidential Decision Theory: Evidential Decision Theory in contrary to causal decision theory believes that the best option conditional on having chosen it is the one with the best outcome. This is believed to be an irrational thinking.

Game Theory: It is a mathematical study of strategic decision-making. It is considered to be an interactive decision theory as it takes into consideration the conflict and cooperation between intelligent rational decision-making.

Bayesian Theory: It is a probability theory used in decision-making. Bayesian is regarded to be an extension of logic that enables reasoning with prepositions with either a true or false state. The above theories can all be regarded as mathematical theories of decision-making. Decision –Making theories can be viewed by analyzing the approach and procedure in making a decision.

5. Personality and Decision Making Styles

Personality traits have strong impact on decision making styles. The aim of this study is to check this relationship between personality traits and decision making styles among police officers and traffic polices that how personality affect decision making styles. Personality could be defined as the set of psychological traits and mechanisms within the individuals that are organized and relatively enduring and that influence his or her interactions with, and adaptations to, the intra-psychic, physical, and social environments. (Larsen, 2012). These characteristics in turn affect the thought pattern, feelings, and actions of an individual thus differentiating him from any other individual. The origin of the word “personality” is root in Latin term “persona”, interpreted as mask. By definition decision making is the procedure of selecting a legitimate decision amongst the accessible alternatives (Uzonwanne, 2015). At the point when attempting to settle on a decent choice, an individual must weigh the positives and negatives of every alternative, and consider all the choices. For viable choice making, the person must have the capacity to predict the result of every alternative, and in light of all these things, figure out which choice is the best for that specific circumstance (Reason, 1990).

Triguna Theory of Personality

Triguna theory is another composite framework of tri-dimensional personality to aid the understanding of the mental make up of the person, which came from Bhagadideota; The term “guna” refers to the inherent energy or tendency with which “prakriti” is created and with which human mind functions. The individual is the vital collection of powerful energies which drives people to work. The dynamism of “prakriti” is due to the continuous flux of three qualities-Satva (balanced), Rajas (passionate), Tamas (dull). Guna indicates the attitude with which human mind functions; Three Gunas in different proportions influence the mental intellectual caliber of every individual (Khanna et.al.2013).

Satvic Guna is the spiritual quality which indicates steady, calm-mind. Non-violent has desire to be good and caring, capable of vast knowing and deep understanding, work done as a duty without expecting for fruits, free from attachment to objects, not affected by success or failure, non-egoistic, firm, enthusiastic, they give respect to old people, pay homage to divine and spiritual values, help the people who need help. Rajasic Guna is the active quality. It has the characteristics like greed, restlessness, binds person to bodily activities and selfish interest, filled with joy in success and sorrow in failures, has the thirst for more and more; help others for self-gain, goal-oriented, distorted picture of right and wrong, bold and authoritative. Tamasic Guna has material quality. The other characteristics are arises from hope and illusions, revengeful, win by demolishing others, actions are directed for their own welfare; no consistency of purpose, brilliance of thought, tenderness of emotions, has narrow and limited vision, has no self control, stubborn and arrogant and creates disputes and quarrels.

Human performance with regard to decisions is subjected to active research from several perspectives i.e. psychological, cognitive and normative (Global business, 2011). Psychological view evaluates individual decisions with reference to the set of requirements, preferences and principles the individual seeks. According to Cognitive view the decision-making procedure is regarded as a consistent process integrated in the interaction with the environment. Normative perspective is by the analysis of individual decisions concerned with the logic of decision-making and rationality and the invariant choice it leads to (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979). Rational decision making is mind-directed, dynamic regulation that is deliberate and intentional. It has a single purpose and is directed by one’s voluntary intentions (Iram- Nejad and Gregg, 2001). Intuitional decision making is brain-directed, dynamic regulation, which deals with daily activities (Epstein, 1990; Iran-Nejad and Gregg, 2001). In case of any problem, this mode is the first to respond (Bowden and Jung-Beeman, 2003; Epstein, 1990). It is associated with acting something that has previously been performed.
(Dominowski and Dallob, 1995). Reproduced behavior, stereotypical responses, habits, and adapting known solution routines to a current situation fall into this category of decision making styles. Keeping in view the existing literature this study was designed. The main objective of the study was to explore personality traits and decision making style among traffic police and police officers.

Need for the Study:

- Police Department faces immense pressure and stress, because of the regular public interface and dispute resolution which is an integral part of their job. Thus, putting police officers under constant pressure to perform in the face of adverse conditions like political pressure, public pressure and performance oriented manage systems. The support can come by providing them better working conditions as well as giving work related autonomy, so that the officers can perform at their best and take decisions when required. Decision making within police work is a global concern. This research attempts to contribute to the literature regarding how police officers make decisions;
- The review is replete with studies indicating the stress experienced and its effect on the cognitive capacities of the officers. Thus, this study is trying to understand the integral role of this variable in decision making of officers, along with highlighting the role of personality. This study attempts to understand this relationship as police department forms a vital component of redresser and judiciary system in the Nation.
- Thus, the findings of the study can be beneficial for a number of government organizations, National Police Service Commission to develop strategies and policies that would assist them manage the stress and improve their decision making styles.
- The findings may assist heads of the police divisions put in place mechanisms that would improve the work performance of officers under their command.
- Thus, the findings of the study can be beneficial for a number of government organizations, National Police Service Commission to develop strategies and policies that would assist them manage the stress and improve their decision making styles.
- The findings may assist heads of the police divisions put in place mechanisms that would improve the work performance of officers under their command.
- Designing and developing training targeted at allowing officers to apply various decision making styles more effectively to reduce the stress associated with decision making and increase effectiveness.
- The previous works on Triguna Personality have emphasized the superiority of Sattva guna on rajas and tamas guna, leading to well being and effective work culture. The holistic understanding of personality emphasizing the harmony of mind and soul, thereby leading the individual qualities to grow and bringing change in temperament of guna in the person which will help to give a healthy mental health;
- The Guna theory is echoed in the Western Categorisation of values. Brown and Chatterjee have focused on the similarity between Kohlberg’s three level sequential model of cognitive development in socialization and the Guna theory. Kohlberg's work on the stages of moral development beginning from “Preconventional morality” to “Postconventional Morality” deals with the values, morality, justice etc which are the important aspects of decision making in this population. This study investigates the effect of gunas on decision making styles;
- Most of the study has been done on Big five factor theory of personality, this study aims to bridge the gap by focusing on the human temperament from a more holistic perspective;
- As they have to deal with the stressful events, the impact can be very distressful for their mental health. By understanding the nature of the guna and its relationship with decision making styles will help to plan for an intervention or to make the healthy food habits;
- This study attempts to address the shortcomings of relying only on psychological constructs for understanding the psychology of indigenous people. Studying in terms of guna classification may offer the scope to deal with some nuances inherent to non-western culture.
- The previous works on Triguna Personality have emphasized the superiority of Sattva guna on rajas and tamas guna, leading to well being and effective work culture. The holistic understanding of personality emphasizing the harmony of mind and soul, thereby leading the individual qualities to grow and bringing change in temperament of guna in the person which will help to give a healthy mental health;
- The issue of how police officers make decisions is a very important. This judgment and decision making literature has made notable progress toward understanding how decisions are made in high risks or crisis situation such as those faced by police officers.

6. Review of Literature

In order to get better understanding of the existing research on the variables, review of related research was done and is organized under three headings:

1. Perceived Stress and Decision making styles
2. Personality and Decision making styles
3. Perceived stress and Personality

Perceived Stress and Decision Making Styles

Gutshall et. al (2017) conducted a study on “The effect of Occupational Stress on Cognitive Performance in Police Officers” to investigate the occupational stress of police officers, and its effect on working memory and other psychological and behavioral factors over a two week work period have been investigated. Cognitive performance and stress levels were examined at pre and post work cycles by using a memory test and self – reporting surveys, each designed for a specific purpose and to gauge a particular set of behaviors and personality traits. The police officers were assigned to patrol duties at the time of the investigation and placed into three groups based on years of service (1-20 years). The results of the
investigation identified a deficit in working memory in Junior, veteran and Senior Officers based on the Ray Osterthell Complex Figure Scores at Baseline (pre-stress) vs Test day (post-stress). The other survey tools measuring stress impact on personality and behavior, did not demonstrate any statistical differences in the responding groups of officers in their survey performances.

Shanique and Catherine (2015) conducted a study on the Influence of police officers’ decision making style and anger control on responses to work scenarios, to investigate the decision making style and anger control on decision making using a sample of 120 police officers. Police officers were presented with a realistic decision-making scenario, and asked to choose their intended action. Results suggest that analytical and intuitive cognitive processes have an interactive effect on decision-making. The issue of how police officers make decisions is a very important. This judgment and decision making literature has made notable progress toward understanding how decisions are made in high risks or crisis situation such as those faced by police officers.

A study has been done by Martin and Carl (2015) on decision making competence, Social Orientation, Time Style and Perceived Stress among police officers because peoples’ decision-making competence, defined as tendency to follow normative rational principles in their decision making, is important as it may influence the extent that requirements are met and levels of perceived stress. In addition, perceived stress could be influenced by social orientation and time style; for example, decisions need to comply with given deadlines and the expectations of others. The research has been done on 100 police officers. Results showed that social orientation and time approach were related to levels of perceived stress, but decision-making competence was not. These results indicate that social orientation and time approach are important to consider in relation to perceived stress. The present study has various limitations, for instance, it measured three individual difference variables relating to decision making taken in a broad sense and investigated their association with perceived stress.

Nicole et al. (2014) conducted a study to determine the influence of stress and anxiety on the way in which senior learners make decisions. This study used the Flinders Decision Making Questionnaire and the Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scale (DASS) to collect the data. A sample of 157 senior learners (Grade 10 to Grade 12) participated in the study. The majorities were aged 16, female (57.3%), identified themselves as Colored (60.5%) spoke English as a home language (84.7%) and lived with both parents. The results of this study show that senior learners use a vigilant decision making style. When their anxiety increases then they could use a defensive avoidance decision making style.

This study that has been done by Allwood and Salo (2012) on Decision Making Styles and Stress to analyze the relationship between each of five decision-making styles, including rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant, and spontaneous and two indicators of stress, Perceived stress and sleep quality, among administrative officers and investigators at three Swedish public authorities: The National Tax board, the social Insurance agency, and the police authority. The tools that have been used were General Decision Making Styles questionnaire developed by Scott and Bruce and perceived stress scale developed by Cohen. Results showed that avoidant style, and to some extent the Dependent style were significantly associated with higher perceived Stress and poorer sleep. The results for the specific organizations showed that the Rational style was advantageous at the Tax Board only.

Michelle (2012) conducted a study on High School Seniors’ Perceived Stress of the college and Decision Making Style™ to investigate the relationship between the two variables and its affect in decision making. The focus of the school counselor is on every student’s academic development, career development and social development in order to promote a culture of academic excellence and college readiness (ASCA Mindsets & Behaviors, 2014). Being able to identify what students are stressed about the most can help school counselors narrow down what they need to be focusing on in preparing students for life after graduation. The purpose of the study was to determine what high school seniors perceive to be the most stressful about the post graduation decision-making process and what schools are and are not they are doing to aid in that process. Students indicated that they found the help from their school counselor helpful, but wished there were more counselors so they could access support more readily.

Personality and Decision Making Styles:

A Study that has been done by Bayram et. al (2017) focused on to find out the relationship between decision making styles and personality traits among a group of university students. The study group consists of 312 participants, who are students of the public university. Results showed that the rational style and intuitive style were significantly associated with four of personality traits, except neuroticism. The avoidant style had negatively relation with extraversion, conscientiousness, openness. The dependent style had a positive relation with agreeableness and neuroticism. The spontaneous style had a negative relation with agreeableness and conscientiousness, positive relation with and neuroticism. Female had significantly higher scores on agreeableness and neuroticism personality traits as compared to men. Regression analysis showed that extraversion personality has a positive effect on decision making styles, openness had a positive effect, agreeableness had a positive effect on intuitive and dependent decision making style.

A study that has been done by Bajwa et al. (2016) was based on personality traits and decision making styles among Pakistan University students. The primary aim of the study was to explore personality traits and decision making styles. Furthermore it was also aimed to investigate if there any relationship between above said phenomena and if there is any gender differences exists. The sample of study comprised of 402 university students including both female and male. Big Five Inventory developed by John and Srivastava, and Decision Making
Style Inventory by Scott and Bruce were used as an instruments to measure personality and decision making styles respectively. The results revealed that conscientiousness leads to rational decision making. Females showed higher decision making capability than males. Urban students were more rational in decision making than rural.

Davis et.al. (2015) conducted a study on Decision Making styles: A systematic Review of their associations with parenting to examine and describe previous studies examining the associations between decision making styles and parenting approaches. The review suggests that maladaptive decision making styles were the most prevalent, which is often associated with detrimental outcomes for child and adolescent development. The review found western and non-western societies to play an important role in these associations; however age and gender did not play a significant role. The review provides a comprehensive understanding of the associations between decision making styles and parenting approaches from studies across the globe. It also highlights the gaps within literature focusing on decision making and parenting, and the continents where little research has examined the associations presented. Results were indicated that Parenting approaches play an important role in the social development of children and adolescents. In particular, the various approaches parenting have been associated with a number of psychosocial as well as behavioral outcomes. This review examined the associations between decision making styles and parenting approaches. The results indicate that there are distinct associations between decision making and parenting. Both adaptive and maladaptive decision making have been associated. The limitations of the study are that Parenting is only one of many social contexts in which decision making styles can be examined. Therefore, limiting the associations of decision making styles to parenting only can be considered a limitation, since there are a number of contextual factors to consider in decision making. Future research could also attempt to examine the associations between decision making styles and (1) personality, (2) genetics, (3) other familial and social environments (other than the parental home environment), (4) socio-economic status, (5) individualistic and collectivistic culture.

Another study that has been done by Deinz (2015) in Selcuk University focused on the investigation of decision making styles and the Five Factor Personality Traits with Respect to the attachment styles. The main aim of the research is to investigate if the attachment styles significantly predict the decision self-esteem, decision making styles and five factor personality traits. Subjects of the study were 57 students in total from different faculties of Selcuk University. The tools that were used in the test were Adjective Based Personality Scale to assess personality, Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire (1 & 2), Relationships Scales Questionnaire to assess the attachment styles. The results of the study showed that attachment styles of the students significantly predict self esteem, decision making styles and personality traits. It was seen that the secure attachment style is the most significant predictor of decision self esteem and vigilance, buck-passing, procrastination scores of decision making styles, whereas the most significant predictor of hypervigilance decision-making style . Secure attachment style is the most significant predictor of neuroticism, extraversion, agreeableness, openness to experience sub-dimensions of personality traits and the most significant predictor of conscientiousness is preoccupied with attachment styles.

Triguna Personality

A study that has been done by Kiran Kumar Cti (2013) on Creativity and Triguna Personality investigates the relationship between creativity and Triguna Personality in the management field that holds the key for success. The organizational excellence depends on innovative ideas of employee, who possesses divergent thinking, and harmony of mind and soul, and balance of temperament. Present study describes the triguna personality of 40 managers from different metropolitan cities of India and their nature of creativity. IAS rating scale, and Wallach and Kogan verbal creativity test were the two measurement tools that were surveyed through mail. Based on the descriptive analysis, the following four types of personalities were identified: Sattvic, Rajasic, Sattvic-Rajasic, and Sattvic-Tamasic personalities. Kaur and Sinha (1992) identified that Sattvic personality performance is superior than other personalities, and correspondingly the results on creativity scale show that all personality groups have a urge to be creative, but managers with Sattvic personality are able to display their creative abilities very exceptionally than other groups, thus showing their balance and harmony of mind and soul.

A study that has been done by Lakhwinder Singh (2008) on relationship between “Triguna and catellian factors of personality”. The main aim of the study was to increase realization that many of the Western psychological concepts and methods lack relevance to different cultural systems, the need for developing indigenous psychologies was recognized all over the world. So it has been found that there are intercorrelations among the measures of the gunas and with C, H, G, Q factos of Cattellian theory.

A study that has been done by Khanna et. al. (2007) on the relationship between Gunas and well being indicators such as psychological capital, personality, life satisfaction and subjective happiness. The study was conducted on two samples. Vedic Personality Inventory and Mental Health Continuum Short Form were administered to both samples. The first sample consisted of 80 Indian professionals with mean age of 28.8 years who were administered Psychological Capital Questionnaire and Big Five Personality Inventory and the second sample consisted of 110 students with mean age 21 years who were administered satisfaction with life scale and subjective happiness scale. Across both studies, Sattva was found to be positively correlated with well-being. Rajas and Tamas were negatively correlated with well being. So it has been found that there is relationship between the manifestation of gunas and their influence on the human mind and behavior.
Perceived Stress and Personality

Maryam and Saeid (2016) conducted a study on Relationship between perceived stress and personality traits in medical emergency personnel to identify paramedics who are able to maintain their work performances at high levels despite facing stressful situations. This study was conducted on emergency medical personnel from March to September 2015. This was a correlational study in which the convenience sampling method was used to select 120 men as the sample. Research instrument included demographic form, NEO Five-Factor Inventory and Cohen’s Perceived Stress Scale were employed to collect data which were then analyzed via descriptive and inferential statistics (correlation and regression) in SPSS software version 16.0. The results revealed that Neuroticism (N) was significantly and positively correlated with perceived stress. However, extraversion (E), agreeableness (A), conscientiousness (C) were negatively correlated with the perceived stress scale (P<0.001). Moreover, neuroticism (N), openness to experience (O), agreeableness (A) and conscientiousness (C) included 59.5% of variances in perceived stress. It seems that among emergency medical personnel, those who were more emotionally stable, more responsible and more willing to help people have lower perceived stress and they perform their duties more efficiently.

Voichita and Doinz (2014) conducted a study on the relationship between Stress and Personality Factors to investigate the stress level in a group of nurses and to correlate the stress level and its subsequent symptoms with personality factors. Materials and Methods: The study was conducted on 34 psychiatric nurses, 68% of them being female. The average age of the male subjects was 32.25 years with a standard deviation of 6.21 years, while the average age of the female subjects was 35.18 years, with a standard deviation of 8.03 years. The analysis focused on the stress level, stress symptoms, age, duration of employment and personality factors. The findings showed that female staff members were more affected by stress as they grow older and have spent a longer time on the job, while male staff members were subjected to higher stress levels at the beginning of their activity. Correlations between personality factors and stress both in concerns of perceived stress and the level of subsequent stress symptomatology were identified. Several personality factors, such as social presence, empathy, independence, good impression, intellectual efficiency, psychological intuition, work orientation, femininity render individuals more vulnerable to stress. There are significant differences between females and males in what concerns stress adaptation.

Ebstrup et. al. (2011) conducted a study on “Association between Five Factor personality traits and Perceived Stress” using a large population sample the study aimed to investigate possible associations between perceived stress and the personality dimensions of neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness, and to explore the role of general self-efficacy (GSE). A population-based cross-sectional study was conducted at the Research Centre for Prevention and Health, Denmark, in 2006-2008. Men and women (N=3471) aged 18-69, were randomly sampled in the suburbs of Copenhagen. We used the NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI), Cohen's Perceived Stress Scale and the General Self-Efficacy Scale. Negative associations were found between perceived stress and extroversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and openness - the latter initially non-significant - whilst neuroticism had a positive association. The associations with agreeableness and openness become positive and significant, respectively, when GSE was included. All five personality-stress models were mediated by GSE, with extroversion and conscientiousness having the strongest mediating effect. The strongest stress-association was found for neuroticism. GSE was shown to change the impact and interpretation of the personality dimensions on perceived stress. These results indicate that GSE is an important factor to consider in the link between personality and perceived stress.

7. Methodology

AIM: To investigate the relationship between perceived stress, personality and decision making styles among police officers;

Research Questions:
- Does stress affect decision making style among police officers?
- Is personality of a police officer mediating with the stress experienced?
- Does personality influence decision making among police officers?

Objectives:
- To study the relationship between perceived stress and decision making styles among police officers;
- To study the relationship between perceived stress and personality among police officers;
- To study the relationship between personality and decision making styles among police officers;

Variables / Correlates
- Perceived stress
- Personality
- Decision Making Style

Hypotheses:

Based on the review of literature, the following hypotheses are proposed. As the review shows a paucity of Indian research with regard to the variables on police officers, null hypotheses are formed:

3.1 There is no significant relationship between perceived stress and decision making styles among police officers;
3.2 There is no significant relationship between perceived stress and personality among police officers;
3.3 There is no significant relationship between personality and decision making styles among police officers;

- **Research Design:** The study adopted a Quantitative (Correlational) method of research. This method was chosen because it is more reliable and objective, it uses statistics to generalize a finding, it often reduces and restructures a complex problem to a limited number of variables, looks at relationships between variables and can establish cause and effect in highly controlled circumstances, test theories or hypotheses and assumes sample is representative of the population.

- **Operational Definitions:**
  
  - **Perceived Stress:** Perceived Stress is the feelings or thoughts that an individual has about how much stress they are under at a given point in time or over a given time period (Cohen, 1983).
  
  - **Personality:** According to the Indian Psychology, personality is defined as a composite framework of tri-dimensional personality to aid the understanding of the mental make up of the person, which came from Bhaghwadgeeta; The term “guna” refers to the inherent energy or tendency with which “prakriti” is created and with which human mind functions. The dynamism of “prakriti” is due to the continuous flux of three qualities- Satva (balanced), Rajas (passionate), Tamas (dull). Guna indicates the attitude with which human mind functions; Three Gunas in different proportions influence the mental intellectual caliper of every individual.

  - **Decision Making:** Decision Making is defined by the amount of information gathered and the number of alternatives considered when making a decision, the characteristic mode of perceiving and responding to decision-making tasks (Scott & Bruce, 1995).

  - **Sample Size:** The sample comprise of 48 Police officers, working in various Police Stations in Karnataka of various age group with their work experience ranging from minimum 3 to 16 years. The designation of the sample was non-gazetted officers along with the Superintendent of Police, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Circle Inspector of Police, Sub-inspector of Police, Assistant Sub-Inspector of Police.

- **Tools:**

  - Following standardized tools were used:
    
    - **Perceived stress scale:** It was developed by Sheldon Cohen (1983). It comprises of 10 items and gives a global score. It is a 5 point Likert scale and responses range from “Never” to “Very Often”. It has validity of 0.81 and reliability of 0.92. Higher PSS scores are associated with stress Measures, Self –Reported Health and Health Services Measures, Health Behavior Measures, Help Seeking Behavior etc. PSS scores are obtained by reversing responses to the positively stated items. The was standardized on 2387 respondents in the U.S.
    
    - **Mathew IAS Rating Scale:** It was developed by George Mathew (1995). It was adopted and it was developed based on Sankhya philosophy to assess personality. It consists of 35 item groupings and participants have a total of 3 points to divide among three alternatives. The reliability of the scale is 0.82 and the construct validity is 0.91. The scale has been standardized based on adult population from Kerala.
    
    - **Decision Making Styles:** General Decision Making Styles Questionnaire was developed by Scott and Bruce (1995). It has five dimensions rational, intuitive, spontaneous, avoidant, dependent. The Internal Consistency of the scale is ranging from .68 to 94. The construct validity of the scale is 0.94. The scale has been standardized on four different population from U.S.

**Procedure and Administration**

The data were collected from police officers in various parts of Karnataka. The participants were instructed to be seated comfortably and rapport has been established. The informed consent was given to them and the purpose of the study had been explained. Once all the doubts had been cleared and the participants agree to be a part of the study, the questionnaires were given to them. The responses had been kept confidential.

- **Data Collection Method:**
  
  i. The initial stage included providing brief information about the study and obtaining necessary permission and required details from each institute;
  
  ii. After the police officers agreed and proper permission was given by the institute, the participants were presented with the informed consent form (Appendix 1) followed by the socio-demographic form and the requisite details were obtained (Appendix 2);
  
  iii. Then the data collection was done and responses were collected on the three questionnaires- Perceived Stress Scale, IAS Rating Scale questionnaire and Decision Making Styles Questionnaire;

- **Data Analysis:**

  i. The responses given by each participant in the Perceived Stress Scale were scored and a global score was obtained;
  
  ii. The responses given by each participant in the Personality Rating Scale were scored on three subscales;
  
  iii. The responses given by each participant in the Decision Making Styles Questionnaire were scored on five subscales;
  
  iv. Furthermore, Spearman’s Rank Correlation was carried out to study the relationship between variables of the sample;
Statistical Analysis:

- **Descriptive Statistics**
  i. Mean-In this study, mean helped in understanding how close the group was to the minimum and maximum score, in each dimension of the variable.
  ii. Standard Deviation- In this study, standard deviation helped to understand how each person was deviating from the mean from the other.

- **Inferential Statistics**

Spearman’s Rank Correlation was used to evaluate relationships involving ordinal variables.

**Sampling Method:**

- Purposive Sampling and Convenient Sampling were used.

**Inclusion Criteria:**

- The police officers holding the rank of Non-Gazetted officer as Inspector of Police, Assistant Inspector of Police, Sub Inspector of Police, Assistant Sub Inspector of police officers were included in the study;
- Participants should had work experience of minimum 3 years because it takes a minimum of 3 years to master in the basics and to have an effective decision making style.
- Participants who knew English were included in the study;

**Exclusion Criteria:**

- Participants who went through major stressful events were excluded;
- Gazette police officers such as DGP, ADGP, IGP, DIGP, SP were excluded from the study;
- Police Constable were excluded from the study;

**Ethical Considerations:**

- The data and responses of each participant were kept confidential;
- Consent was taken for the participation on the study;
- The participants were informed of their rights to withdraw from the study at any point of time during the course of the study;
- No physical harm has been caused to the participants.
- Debriefing the exact nature of the study was revealed to the participant at the end of completion of the questionnaire.

8. **Results**

The main aim of the research is to find out the relationship among Personality traits, Perceived stress and Decision Making Styles among police officers. This chapter explores the relationship among three variables along with the socio-demographic details also. The previous chapter laid out the methodology employed for the current study. This present chapter looks into the analysis of the results obtained.

The results of the study are presented in the following sections:

Section 1: The Number of participants along with the gender and the relevant socio demographic details of the participants are illustrated in this section namely age, years of experience and the designation.

Section 2: This section presents the analysis (Descriptive and Inferential Statistics) of the results.

**Table 4.1:** Distribution of police officers with respect to gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of people</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 4.1: Distribution of police officers with respect to age

As it is given in Table 4.1, out of total sample of 48 participants 83% were males and 17% were females.

**Table 4.2:** Distribution of police officers with respect to their designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Number of Polices</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Superintendent of police</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circle Inspector of police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Inspector of police</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Sub Inspector of police</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Correlation**

As it is given in Table 4.3, out of total 48 of participants, 45 participants were from the years of experience ranging minimum 3 to maximum 10 years (94%), and the rest 3 participants were from the years of experience ranging minimum 11 to maximum 16 years (6%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inertia</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>10.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>10.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>65.29</td>
<td>19.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>23.41</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td>20.02</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td>20.58</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant</td>
<td>14.31</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>20.27</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 shows the Descriptive analysis (Mean and SD) of Perceived Stress, Personality and Decision Making Styles among Karnataka Police Officers. Mean Score of Perceived Stress in the sample of police officers is 16.52 (SD= 3.93). Personality Inventory has three scales- Inertia, Activation and Stability. Mean score of Inertia in the sample of police officers is 10 (SD=10.01).Mean score of Activation in the sample is 18.929 (SD=10.91). Mean score of Stability in the sample of police officers is 65.29 (SD=19.84). Decision Making Styles has five scales-Rational, Intuitive, Spontaneous, Avoidant and Dependent. Mean Score of Rational in the sample of police officers is 23.41 (SD=1.26). Mean Score of Intuitive in the sample is 20.02 (SD=3.45). Mean Score of Spontaneous in the defined sample is 20.58 (SD=3.28). Mean Score of Avoidant decision making style in the defined sample is 14.31 (SD=3.75). Mean score of Dependent decision making style in the sample of police officers is 20.27 (SD=2.92).

The Skewness and the Kurtosis has also been checked to find out whether the sample is distributed normally or it is a non-normal distribution. So, it has been found out that the range for normality is between -1 to +1. For the sample, the value for different variables were exceeding the above mentioned range, and indicating positive and negative skewness. The variables form a Leptokurtic and Platykurtic distribution, and thereby the distribution is not normal. Therefore, Spearman’s Rank correlation was done to find out the relationship among variables.

Table 4.5: Relationship between Work Experience and Decision Making Styles among Karnataka Police Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Experience</th>
<th>Rational</th>
<th>Intuition</th>
<th>Spontaneous</th>
<th>Avoidant</th>
<th>Dependent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>-.252</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-2.34*</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2 tailed).**

Table no 4.5 shows the correlation between Work Experience and Decision Making styles among Karnataka Police officers. Although no significant correlations are observed, the table indicates all the dimensions of Decision Making Styles are negatively related to the duration of Work Experience.
Table 4.6: Relationship between Perceived Stress and Decision Making Styles among Karnataka Police Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rational</th>
<th>Intuition</th>
<th>Spontaneous</th>
<th>Avoidant</th>
<th>Dependent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Stress</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-.277</td>
<td>-.168</td>
<td>.288*</td>
<td>-.216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2 tailed)**

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2 tailed)

Table 4.6 shows the correlation between Perceived Stress and Decision Making styles among Karnataka Police Officers. Although no significant correlation is observed overall, the table indicates that four dimensions of Decision Making Styles, such as Rational Decision making Style, Intuitive Decision Making Style, Spontaneous Decision Making Style and Dependent Decision Making Style are negatively related to the Perceived Stress except the Avoidant decision making style. It has a positive significant correlation with Perceived Stress.

Table 4.7: Relationship between Perceived Stress and Personality Traits among Karnataka Police Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inertia</th>
<th>Activation</th>
<th>Stability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Stress</td>
<td>.295*</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>-.118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2tailed)**

*Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2tailed)

Table 4.7 represents the relationship between Perceived Stress and Personality among Karnataka Police Officers. Although no significant correlation overall, still one of the personality type that is Inertia is positively correlated with Perceived Stress and the correlation is significant. The other personality type that is Stability has a negative relation with the Perceived Stress and the Activation type also has a positive correlation with Perceived Stress.

Table 4.8: Relationship between Personality and Decision making styles among Karnataka Police officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Types</th>
<th>Rational</th>
<th>Intuitive</th>
<th>Spontaneous</th>
<th>Avoidant</th>
<th>Dependent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inertia</td>
<td>-.289*</td>
<td>-.265</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>-.228</td>
<td>-.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation</td>
<td>-.161</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>-.201</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2 tailed)**

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1 tailed)

Table 4.8 represents that there is no significant relationship between Personality and Decision making styles among Karnataka Police Officers. Although all the types of personality and different styles of decision making are not significantly correlated with each other, still one of the personality type that is Inertia is negatively correlated with Rational Decision Making and the correlation is not significant.

Table 4.9: Inter-correlations of Decision Making Styles With Respect to Various Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rational</th>
<th>Intuition</th>
<th>Spontaneous</th>
<th>Avoidant</th>
<th>Dependent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>-.355*</td>
<td>-.456*</td>
<td>-.456*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant</td>
<td>-.355</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>-.456**</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2tailed)**

*Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2tailed)

Table 4.9 represents the inter-correlations of various domains of Decision Making Styles. It can be seen from the table that there is negative significant correlation between dependent domain and rational domain of decision making styles.

9. Discussion

The aim of the study was to investigate the relationship between Perceived Stress, Personality and Decision Making among Karnataka Police Officers. The objectives of the research were to study the relationship between perceived stress and decision making styles among Karnataka Police Officers, to study the relationship between perceived stress and personality among Karnataka Police Officers and also to study the relationship between personality and decision making styles among Karnataka Police officers. Based on the review of literature, the null hypotheses were formed, with regard to the variables on Karnataka Police Officers. The tools that were used for the research were Perceived Stress Scale that has been developed by Sheldon Cohen (1983), to assess the personality of the individuals IAS Rating Scale was used that had been developed by George Mathew (1995), and to assess the Decision Making Style, General Decision Making Styles Questionnaire developed by Scott and Bruce (1995) was used.

The procedure was so simple for the data collection. The informed consent was given to each police station and the purpose of the study was explained. Once all the doubts got cleared and the participants agreed to be a part of the study, the questionnaires were given to them and the
responses were collected. Purposive and Convenient Sampling were used for the data collection. Descriptive Statistics such as mean and standard deviation was used to see the variance. Inferential Statistics that is, Spearman’s Rank Correlation was used to see the relationship between the variables among Karnataka Police officers. Table 4.2 represents the distribution of Police Officers with respect to the designation of the police officers where it can be seen that the most of the polices are Sub Inspectors and Assistant Sub Inspectors and the number of Polices were not same for each of the designation, so the sample is not homogeneous that means it has effect on the overall result of the study. The results were that there is no significant relationship between the variables among Karnataka Police Officers, so the null hypotheses were accepted. The reasons for accepting the hypothesis has been discussed in the following part;

Police jobs are more stressful due to the nature of work and the desired role and expectations of stakeholders in the society. Occupational stress is an extremely difficult concept to define but obviously it is the stress on the job that occurs in the person. The UP state police stated following major problems contributing to the stress which are negative public image, negative self-image, increase in the incidence of stressful events and daily hassles, which can affect their mental functioning. So this study investigated the relationship between the variables among Karnataka Police Officers.

Hypothesis Testing:

Hypothesis 3.1: There is no significant relationship between perceived stress and decision making styles among Karnataka Police Officers.

Spearman’s Rank Correlation was used to find out the relationship among the variable. According to Table 4.6, there was no significant correlation between various subscales of decision making viz. Rational, Intuition, Spontaneous and Dependent, but a negative significant correlation between Avoidant Decision Making Style, but as one of the dimensions is only correlating, the null hypothesis were accepted. This means that if they are perceiving too much stress, then the effectiveness of decision making styles will be very low. And as one dimension has negative correlation that means the higher they are perceiving stress, the more the escaping from the situation. It is quite natural that workers employed in police forces have been found to be exposed to a high risk of distress and the risk can be derived from various operational duties like (patrol activities, traffic control, criminal investigations, crime-prevention and organizing tasks also like training or recruiting of new polices.

A study that has been done by Varetto et. al (2016) on organizational and occupational stressors and the consequences and coping strategies among Italian Police Officers, where the results showed that Outdoor patrol officers and the indoor patrol officers suffered from organizational and occupational stressor. Outdoor police officers appeared more willing to use different coping strategies where indoor police officers used avoidance strategies. And the higher order mental functioning like decision making will not be effective in the situation of stress.

Martin & Solo (2012) analyzed the relationship between each of the five decision making styles and two indicators of stress, Perceived Stress and sleep quality among administrative officers and investigators at three Swedish public authorities and the results showed that avoidant style were significantly associated with higher perceived stress and poorer sleep. Perceived stress was assessed using the perceived stress scale. Sleep quality and duration were assessed using the Pittsburg Sleep quality index questionnaire. Mean hours of sleep were determined across quartiles of perceived stress using ANOVA/ANCOVA. Mean age was 42.1 years and it has been seen from the results. Perceived Stress was inversely associated with certain groups such as high ranked officers, those with high depressive symptoms, no military experience, high workload. Gender, Police Rank, depressive symptoms and workload each significantly modified the association between stress and sleep duration. And it can be seen from the present study that most of the police officers are Sub Inspector of Police Stations and Assistant sub inspector, so it can be interpreted clearly that the majority of the police officers are from that designation, so it has an effect in the overall result of the study.

Another study that has been done by Nicole et. al. (2014) on Stress, Anxiety Levels and Decision making styles of South African senior learners where the results showed that when senior learners have increased stress and anxiety there is a probability, that they will use a hyper-vigilant decision making style, and the style will not be so effective.

Bavolar and Orsova (2015) conducted a study on decision making styles and their associations with decision making competencies and mental health among police officers, where the results showed that two decision-making style (avoidant and spontaneous) served as significant predictors of the general decision making competency and another two were found to predict mental health. The intuitive decision making style was a protective factor and the avoidant style was a risk factor.

Thus, it can be said based on the results that proper interventions on both organizational and operational stressors would improve the quality of Police Officers working life and have positive repercussions on the service offered to the general public.

Hypothesis 3.2: There is no significant relationship between perceived stress and personality among police officers.

According to Table 4.7, there is no significant correlation between perceived stress and traits of personality viz. Inertia, Activation and Stability. However the one trait that is inertia has a positive significant correlation with the perceived stress. The three domains are not correlated with perceived stress even if the one has a positive significant
correlation, so the null hypothesis was accepted. This means the higher the scores of Inertia, the more the person more likely will have the tendency to perceive stress. The traits defines that they are the less active persons but ardent approval seekers, so they will make the decisions at the very end which will make them feel anxious that will lead to perceive stress. Inertia may also be viewed in terms of cybernetics and the stress theory of disease. It is an inability to respond to stress properly with negative feedback loops and instead a tendency to respond with positive feedback loops, also called vicious cycle (Wilson, 2014).

An exploratory investigation has been done by Lakhwinder Singh (2016) on the relationship between three gunas and five factor model of personality. Sattva Guna (Stability) was negatively correlated with Tamas Gunas (Inertia) and neuroticism. Sattva Guna (Stability) has marked significant positive correlation with extraversion, openness and agreeableness and conscientiousness. Rajas Guna (Activation) negatively correlated with extraversion, agreeableness and conscientiousness. Tamas (Inertia) was positively correlated with neuroticism and negatively associated with extraversion, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness. This research indicates that the Inertia type of personality is correlated with neurotism which means that he will be having the tendency to experience unpleasant emotions, such as anger, anxiety, depression and also in emotional instability.

Another study that has been done by Morris found that personality traits play a role in how stress will be perceived. But here the results are contradictory which shows that there is no significant correlation between the personality and perceived stress. It might be influenced by the work experiences of the police officers, a prolonged training that has been given to them before joining which helped them to mould the personality in such a way, like whatever the type of the personality, they have to handle it in an acceptable way, they can’t be so impulsive, impatient or so ignorant despite of their personality traits.

The results also showed the negative correlation between the perceived stress and the stability type of personality, which is quite obvious. If a person is having this type of personality that means the person is stable enough and he is having less negative affectivity, so he will not be aroused all time and the way of perceiving stress will be different. These types of personality have more adaptable coping strategies than the other two types.

The other reasons can be that no hypothetical situations related to stress were provided at the time of assessment of perceived stress, so the police officers may not have thought from that point of view, they have given the respond in a very general approach. They might not were mindful in the time of giving response. The stress levels in their occupation may varies with the time like day to day and all, the questionnaire was so related to the last 6 months, so maybe they have not responded based on their current stressful situation. The other reason can be the differentiation in working experience. Despite being stable, active or inactive, if a person has more work experience then he will more likely has the fewer tendencies to perceive stress because he has already accustomed with this.

Table 4.5 shows that the correlation between Work Experience and decision making styles has been analyzed by Spearman’s Rank Correlation. It shows a negative significant correlation between the work experience and one of the domains of decision making style that is avoidant decision making style, which indicates that with the experience of work the police officers will less likely avoid the situation for taking decision when there is a crisis. They have been asked about the on-job-training, for which they described that the training has been given in such a way that they do not feel any trouble to take decisions in the crisis situation. The training need analysis has been done before the conduction of the training, where the need is basically job-rotation which indicates that they will be rotating through a series of related job, as for example, the police officer maybe handling one day suicidal related case, other day, maybe he has been assigned to handle the crowd for any special occasions. Both are two different poles, still they do not feel too stressed about the job. It is also so obvious, that getting a job as police officer means taking the core responsibility of the National Law and Enforcement System, so there is no other way to escape from the situation, whatever it is.

Hypothesis 3.3: There is no significant correlation between personality and decision making among Karnataka Police Officers.

According to Table 4.9, there is no significant relationship between personality and decision making styles among Karnataka Police officers. There was no significant correlation seen among specific subscales of decision making viz. Rational, Intuitive, Spontaneous, Avoidant and Dependent with the various types of personality viz. Inertia, Activation and Stability. Although one of the domains of personality that is Inertia has a negative significant correlation with Rational which indicates that the more inactive the person, the less he will make his decisions based on Rational thinking. The person is not active at all, so there is no chance of any drive which will make the person to take decisions spontaneously.

Rational Decision making has the chance of doing fewer distortions, assumptions, guesswork, subjectivity, and all major a uses for poor inequitable judgements. The domain of personality that means activation is related with the decision making styles but the relationship is not significant and the direction of the relation is negative with rational, avoidant and dependent. The activation personality type is highly negatively correlated with extraversion, agreeableness which means they are less flexible and outgoing, they are more likely to be restricted, which indicates that they will be having more dependence on others in making decisions, because they are less flexible, so they will not take decisions independently, they are more likely having dependent decisions making styles. And the other thing is the activation domain is positive correlated with neuroticism which indicates less
emotional stability, means they will be hyper-roused and they will rely on taking decisions spontaneously, and will less avoiding situations where there is a crisis. The more the person has high scores in Activation domain, the less he will be rational and for being aroused, the less he will avoid situations for taking decisions.

The Personality type Stability has a positive directional relation with intuitive, spontaneous, avoidant and dependent decision making styles and a negative directional relationship with rational, but the relationship is not significant. Stability personality types is the most pure type of personality, they have several characteristics that lead them to make decisions based on that and the type is closely associated with extraversion, agreeableness, openness to experience, which indicates that they are flexible more acceptable not restricted in a bound that help them to take spontaneous and intuitive decisions, and for them intuition is high so they can easily avoid the situations that they feel are not comfortable for them. They are also very much conscientious, which does not mean only “having a conscience”, instead it focuses on the amount of deliberate intention and thought a person puts into his or her behavior, so they will definitely have favorable attitudes towards high authority and they are dependent on them partially in making decisions. The types of the personality and all the domains of decision-making styles were not significantly correlated that’s why the null hypothesis was accepted.

Jalajas & Pullaro (2016) conducted a study on the effect of personality on Decision Making. The relationship found out by measuring personality with the Big Five Inventory, and measuring decision making through six dilemmas in the public domain drawn from the work of Daniel Kahneman and others. Regressing a combined score (i.e., the number of correct response) on each of the six dilemmas on the personality variables yielded no significant relationships between the variables that supports the research.

Bayram et.al conducted a study where it has been seen that there is a relationship between personality traits and decision making styles on University Students in Turkey. The personality traits have been assessed by using Big Five Factor Inventory and the decision making styles scale developed by Scott and Bruce were used. It has been found that dependent style has a positive relation with agreeableness and neuroticism; the avoidant style had negative correlation with extraversion, conscientiousness and openness. The spontaneous style had a negative relation with agreeableness and conscientiousness, positive relation with neuroticism. The rational style and intuitive style were significantly associated with agreeableness, extraversion, openness and conscientiousness but negative relation with the neuroticism.

The above mentioned research contradicts the present research. It can be happened for many factors like, the present research has been done on Police Officers that are quite different from the university students because they play different social roles. Police Officers have to play a strong disciplined lifestyle because they are the stakeholders of the society, where the students are flexible enough. The psychological effects of perceived power, has been seen from “Stanford Prison Experiment” that has been done by Philip Zimbardo, that was so intense and for police officers they have to the real role of the authoritarian figure, so there is an occupational stress as well as psychological stress also. The samples were also not homogeneous with respect to age, work experience and the police hierarchy, so the results are different.

10. Summary and Conclusion

The previous chapter presented the results of the study and discussed the same. The present chapter summarizes the study and presents the conclusions drawn from it. It also includes the limitations and implications of the study.

The present study “Perceived Stress, Personality and Decision Making Styles among Karnataka Police officers” aims to explore about the relationship between personality types and perceiving stress and the relationship between personality types and decision making styles and the relationship between perceived stress and decision making styles among Karnataka police officers.

11. Summary of the Research

- The hypothesis stating that “There is no significant relationship between Perceived Stress and Decision making styles among Karnataka Police Officers” was tested using Spearman’s Rank Correlation. There is a relationship between perceived stress and one of the domains of decision making styles that is avoidant decision making style. But overall it is not correlating. So the hypothesis 3.1 is accepted;
- The hypothesis is stating that “There is no significant relationship between Perceived Stress and Personality among Karnataka Police Officers” was tested using Spearman’s Rank Correlation. There is a significant relationship between one type of personality that is inertia, and the perceived stress. The correlation was significant and positive, but overall it is not correlating, so the hypothesis 3.2 is accepted;
- The hypothesis is stating that “There is no significant relationship between Personality and Decision Making Styles among Karnataka Police Officers” was tested using Spearman’s Rank Correlation. One of the domains of decision making style that is rational decision making style is positively correlated with Inertia and the relationship is also significant. But overall it is not correlating, so the hypothesis is accepted;

12. Conclusion

- Majority of the sample of the study that is police officers are belong to Stability Personality type;
- Perceived Stress does not correlate with Decision Making Styles among Karnataka Police officers. It can be seen that it can be due to the influence of the training on police officers, for handling the stress;
- Personality does not correlate with Decision-Making Styles, it is because of the training that despite having
different type of personality, they have to perform in various activities and they cannot leave the job for their personality that is quite different;

- Perceived Stress does not correlate with Personality Types, its also the effect of training they have gotten, so that they do not perceive the situation as so stressful and all.

13. Limitations and Recommendations

Limitations:

The limitations of the study are:

- The sample of the study is very small, so the results cannot be generalized;
- Only SI, Dep. Sup, Assistant Super, Superintendent of Police has been included in the study;
- The sample has been taken only from Karnataka Police officers;
- The socio-economic, cultural and religious backgrounds of the participants were not fully accounted in the study;
- The upper level of Karnataka Police Hierarchy such as IDGP, AGP etc were not included in the study;

Recommendations:

- The sample size can be increased to get more accurate results;
- Other categories from Law Enforcement System such as advocates, Gazetted Police Officers and also for Politicians can be studied to check the findings on them;
- The same study can be done by taking accounts of Gazetted Officers like IDGP, AGP, IPS, IS etc;
- The further study can be done to see whether the decision making styles are different or same for the Gazetted and Non-Gazetted Officers;
- The further study can be done by taking Police Officers from different part of India;
- The further study can be done to explore the way of Perceiving Stress in Gazetted and Non-Gazetted Police Officers;
- The same study can be done to find out the difference between the male and female police officers with respect to Decision-Making and Perceiving Stress;
- The same study can be done by comparing the different hierarchy of police officers’ experience, age, and considering cultural background also;
- Longitudinal study can also be done on the same sample after 3years to assess the decision making styles. That will help to know that over a long period of time and with the experiences, the decision making styles has changed or not.
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Appendix 1:

Informed Consent Form

I am conducting a study to explore the relationship among Perceived Stress, Personality and Decision Making Styles among Karnataka Police Officers. This consent form provides you with the information you will need to know to decide your participation in this study. You can choose whether or not you want to participate. You are requested to fill three questionnaires; it will take 15-20 minutes for you to answer them. I would like you to answer all the questions sincerely and honestly, as it will be used for study purpose only. In case of any confusion please feel free to ask clarification and I will explain it to you.
Participation is voluntary. You can withdraw at any time during the study. There are no costs for participation.

Statement of Consent: I agree to participate in this study conducted by Ms Chandreyee Roy of Jain (Deemed-to-be University). I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I can withdraw at any time. I know that there is no direct benefit to participation in this study. I know that I am required to complete some questionnaires and this will be used for research purpose only. In additional any personal information and identifying data will be kept completely confidential.

RESEARCHER: RESPONDENT:
NAME: NAME:
SIGN: SIGN:
DATE: PLACE:

APPENDIX 2:
SOCIO DEMOGRAPHIC FORM

NAME:
AGE:
GENDER:
○ MALE
○ FEMALE
EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION:
WORK EXPERIENCE:
DESIGNATION:
PHONE NUMBER:
E-MAIL ID:

ANY MAJOR STRESSFUL EVENT EXPERIENCED:

APPENDIX 3:

SCALE 1

The Questions in this scale ask you about your feelings and thoughts during the last month. In each case, you will be asked to indicate by circling how often you felt or thought a certain way.

0=Never 1=Almost Never 2=Sometimes 3=Fairly Often 4=Very Often

1. In the last month how often have you been upset because of something 0 1 2 3 4 that happened unexpectedly?
2. In the last month, how often have you felt that you were unable to control 0 1 2 3 4 the important things in your life?
3. In the last month, how often have you felt nervous and “stressed”? 0 1 2 3 4
4. In the last month, how often have you felt confident about your ability to 0 1 2 3 4 handle your personal problems?
5. In the last month, how often have you felt that things were going your way? 0 1 2 3 4
6. In the last month, how often have you found that you could not cope with 0 1 2 3 4 all the things that you had to do?
7. In the last month, how often have you felt that you were on top of things? 0 1 2 3 4
8. In the last month, how often have you been able to control irritations in 0 1 2 3 4 in your life?
9. In the last month, how often have you been angered because of things 0 1 2 3 4 that were outside of your control?
10. In the last month, how often have you felt difficulties were piling up so 0 1 2 3 4 high that you could not overcome them?

APPENDIX 4:

SCALE 2

There are three columns I, A and S and there should be 35 rows corresponding to the 35 Sub-Scales. Each scale has three set of descriptions or qualities designated by the letters I, A and S. You have a total of 3 points to divide among three alternatives. If you feel that the rate possesses the three equally as seen in his general behaviour, you can divide the three points equally (as 1, 1, 1). If you think that he possesses only one and not the other two, you can give all the three points to that and zero to each of the other two. On the other hand, if you feel that he possesses one among the three to a larger degree, another to a smaller degree and he does not possess the third you can distribute the points as 2, 1, and 0 of course writing the three numbers under the appropriate letters.

1. Activity Level
   I. Underactive, Unable to become active, not acting when required
   A. Restless, acting even when not required, Overactive, Blind action
   S. Right action at the right time, Appropriate controlled action, Acting without ego-involvement, restful detached action
2. Energy
   I. Lazy, Lethargic, Lacks energy
   A. Too much, uncontrolled energy
   S. Balanced, controlled energy
3. Speed and Accuracy
   I. Slow and careless, Overcautious
   A. Fast, Overspend, Unable to act slowly
   S. Fast and accurate, Fast or slow as the situation demands
4. Punctuality
   I. Usually late
5. Perspective

I. Concerned with immediate present problems only
A. Efficient in planning and anticipating practical things for the future
S. Philosophical, Wise, concerned with ultimate, has wide perspective

6. Mentality

I. Not particularly thoughtful
A. Analytical, thoughtful and inventive in practical matters
S. Integrative, Intuitive, Holistic

7. Risk Taking

I. Not Venturing
A. Taking too many risks, Adventurous
S. Taking calculated risks

8. Temperament

I. Timid, Inhibited
A. Impulsive, Excitable
S. Balanced, Mature

9. Courage

I. Fear
A. Blind, physical, rash courage
S. Mental strength and courage, Courage of conviction, Moral courage

10. Approach to Life

I. Brooding, Withdrawn
A. Pushing, Grabbing, Go-getting
S. Open, Warm, Detached

11. Motivation

I. Unrealistic ambitions, Daydreaming, Having vain desires
A. Intense and realistic ambitions and actions, Greed
S. Self-sufficient, Contented, Meta-motivation

12. Adjustment

I. Shallow temporary emotions like anxiety, Hysteria
A. Maniacal, Excitable, Depressive, Definite moods
S. Even tempered, Stable, Relaxed, Peaceful, High stress-tolerance, Capacity for deep prolonged emotions

13. Emotionality

I. Weak emotionality (low libidinal level)
A. Passionate, High drive, Ego-involvement, Strong identifications
S. Dispassionate, Sublimated and controlled emotions

14. Will

I. Weak-willed, Highly suggestible
A. Struggling with oneself, Having conflicts
S. Fully controlled, Easy control of self

15. Rights and Duties

I. Not conscious of one's rights or duties
A. Fighting for one's rights, but not conscious of one's responsibilities
S. Aware of and discharging one's responsibilities and duties

16. Leadership

I. Submissive, Inability to be a leader, Inability to command
A. Autocratic leader, Dominant, Egoistic, Inability to be a follower
S. Democratic, Can be a leader or follower with equal ease

17. Assertiveness

I. Inability to demand or protest, Inability to refuse or argue
A. Rude, Arrogant, Inability to suffer silently
S. Ability both to strongly voice one's opinion or suffer in silence as the occasion demands

18. Anger

I. Inability to show anger
A. Short temper, Inability to control anger
S. Can make a show of anger, without really losing control

19. Fairness

I. Allows oneself to be exploited by others
A. Aggressive, Exploits others
S. Just and fair to oneself and others

20. Relation to People

I. Oversensitive, Delicate, Easily hurt
A. Thick-skinned, Clever, Manipulative, Self-centred
S. Tolerant, Kind, Considerate, Loving, Unselfish

21. Relation to Possessions

I. Letting possessions go because of inability to hold them
A. Attached, Proud, Possessive, Greedy
S. Altruistic, Detached

22. Self-Concept

I. Inferiority feelings, Low self-confidence
A. Superiority complex, Boastful, Over-confidence, Likes to show off
S. Self-acceptance, Self-sufficient
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23. Values
I. Values only pleasure, No values
A. Values power, fame, Position and status
S. Values friendship, wisdom and character

24. Aggression
I. Punishing oneself (intropunitive), Masochistic (inflicting pain on oneself), Unable to defend oneself
A. Sadistic, Extra punitive, No difficulty to punish others
S. Impunitive, Forgiving and kind to oneself and others

25. Attitude to Strangers
I. Feels upset in the company of strangers, Inability to relate to or mix with strangers
A. Mixes with everybody, can easily make friends, Feels upset when alone
S. Can remain alone or mix with people with equal ease, but prefers to have a few close friends

26. Sociability
I. Keeping aloof, Shut-in, Does not enjoy company, Lacks sociability
A. Has social skills, Enjoys large gatherings, Cannot tolerate loneliness
S. Comfortable and happy both in being alone as well as with people

27. Speech Making
I. Nervous, Has stage fright, Talking difficulty, Inability to make a speech
A. Likes to talk, Finds it difficult to remain silent
S. Good listening ability and good speaking talent, Likes both

28. Opposite Sex
I. Shy before the opposite sex, Sexually inhibited
A. Aggressively sexed
S. Transcending Sex, Control

29. Conformity
I. Blind conformity to group, Identifies with group, Collectivist
A. Individualistic, Competitive, Deliberately deviates from group, Rebel

APPENDIX 5: SCALE 3

Instructions: Please be seated comfortably. There are 25 items on this questionnaire. Please read it carefully and give your response based on your preferences. A five point scale has been given ranged from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree”. Please let me know if you face any difficulty regarding giving the responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I double check my information sources to be sure I have the right facts before making decisions. (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make decisions in a logical and systematic way. (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My decision making requires careful thought. (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When making a decision, I consider various options in terms of a specific goal. (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When making decisions, I rely upon my instincts. (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I make decisions, I tend to rely on my intuition. (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I make a decision, it is more important for me to feel the decision is right than to have a rational reason for it. (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I make a decision, I trust my inner feelings and reactions. (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often need the assistance of other people when making important decisions. (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rarely make important decisions without consulting other people. (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I have the support of others, it is easier for me to make important decisions. (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the advice of other people in making my important decisions. (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to have someone to steer me in the right direction when I am faced with important decisions. (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I avoid making important decisions until the pressure is on. (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I postpone decision making whenever possible. (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often procrastinate when it comes to making important decisions. (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I generally make important decisions at the last minute. (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I put off making many decisions because thinking about them makes me uneasy. (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I generally make snap decisions. (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make quick decisions. (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often make impulsive decisions. (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When making decisions I do what seems natural at the moment. (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I explore all my options before making a decision. (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I generally make decision that I feel right for me. (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>