

Well-Being and Stress among Police Personnel Anjana Choudhary*, Neha Kalia**, and O.P. Sharma***

Abstract

The Well-Being of police personnel is a critical concern as they face escalating levels of job stress. The demanding nature of police work, involving exposure to violence, crime scenes, and the constant pressure to maintain public safety, significantly impacts the mental and physical health of officers. The study seeks to examine the relationship between Well-Being, Emotional Intelligence, and Stress concerning Type A and B Behavioural Patterns among police personnel. The research involved 150 police officers (25-50 years). Police officers were administered using Goldberg's General Health Questionnaire (Gautam, Nijhawan & Kamal, 1987), Police Stress Inventory (Pienaar & Rothmann, 2006), Emotional Skills and Competence Scale (Vladimir & Taksic, 2010), and Type A and B Behavioural Pattern Scale (Dhar & Jain, 2002). The study involved the computation of Descriptive Group Statistics, including means and standard deviations, for all groups. Additionally, a Pearson Product-Moment correlation analysis was conducted to assess the significance of the relationship, both in terms of extent and direction, between General Health, Emotional Intelligence, and Stress concerning Type A and Type B Behavioural Patterns among Police Personnel. The findings revealed that General Health and Job Stress are highly negatively correlated with Type A and Type B Behavioral Patterns and Emotional Intelligence is strongly associated with Type A and B Behavioural Patterns. These findings could inform targeted interventions to enhance the overall Well-Being of police personnel, identifying stressors in the workplace and guiding the development of stress management programs.

Keywords: General Health, Well-Being, Emotional Intelligence, Stress, Behavioral Patterns, Police Personnel.

In the contemporary world, the well-being of police officers is a subject of critical importance, drawing attention to the intrinsic interplay between their general health, emotional intelligence, and stress. Law enforcement professionals often face a myriad of challenges, including exposure to potentially traumatic incidents, high-pressure situations, and the relentless pursuit of public safety. The pervasive nature of stress in policing underscores the need to explore strategies for managing and mitigating its impact on officers.

The Contemporary discourse on policing also underscores the importance of proactive measures to address stressors and support officers' mental health. Initiatives such as counseling services peer support programs and wireless interventions are gaining prominence as agencies strive to create a more supportive and resilient work environment. Acknowledging and addressing the well-being of police officers not only serves to enhance their job satisfaction and performance but also contributes to fostering positive community relations, A key aspect in the evolving landscape of law enforcement. As societies grapple with calls for police reform, the emphasis on the holistic well-being of officers reflects a growing recognition of the intricate relationship between their mental health, emotional intelligence, and effective execution of their duties in the contemporary world.

General Health and Stress

General Health is conceptualized as a positive state of psychological well-being, aligning with the World Health Organization's definition of health as

encompassing "an individual's capacity to form harmonious relations with others and actively contribute to constructive changes in their social or physical environment" (WHO, 1951). In this context, general health extends beyond the absence of illness and is characterized by a holistic sense of well-being. It underscores the importance of psychological and social dimensions, emphasizing an individual's ability to engage positively with their surrounding and maintain harmonious relationships. Subjective well-being serves as a synonymous term for general mental health in the field of psychology. According to Diener and Tov (2013), Subjective Well-Being (SWB) encompasses the diverse ways individuals assess and encounter their lives. Essentially synonymous with the common understanding of happiness, SWB underscores the significance of positive emotions in the overall experience of well-being.

Stress manifests as both a physiological and psychological reaction to the challenges or pressures encountered, exerting a notable influence on an individual's overall well-being. This phenomenon frequently emerges when there is a perceived disparity between the demands imposed on an individual and their capacity to effectively manage and overcome these demands.

Wiciak and Basinska(2013) found that the influence of work on Well-Being, encompassing social, economic, and health dimensions, as well as self-esteem, was contingent upon the nature of the job. Especially, among police officers, work was identified as detrimental to health, leisure, and

* Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur, (Raj.) 302004. anjana.choudhary1115@gmail.com

** Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur, (Raj.) 302004. nkkalia99@gmail.com

***Head & Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj.) 302004. opbrd65@gmail.com

economic well-being.

Subjective Well-Being encapsulates an individual's assessment of their own life, incorporating both cognitive and affective dimensions. Cognitive aspects, such as life satisfaction, contribute to one's subjective well-being, reflecting their overall evaluation of life circumstances. Subjective well-being provides a comprehensive framework for understanding mental health, acknowledging the intertwined relationship between cognitive appraisals and emotional experiences in shaping an individual's overall psychological state (Tov, 2018).

Recent research indicates a consistent rise in job stress among police officers over the past decade. Prolonged exposure to job stress has been found to have detrimental effects both on the individual and the organization. Specifically, studies by Baldwin, Bennell, Anderson, Semple, and Jenkins (2019) and Castro, Rocha, and Cruz (2019) highlighted that elevated Job Stress is linked to impaired Mental Well-Being in Police Personnel.

Ryu, Yang, and Choi (2020) and Pambudi et al. (2022) in their study identified a negative correlation between job stress and subjective well-being (SWB), implying that elevated job stress is linked to diminished positive affect.

The well-being of police officers plays a crucial role in not only safeguarding their health but also significantly impacting their professional efficacy. Furthermore, prioritizing their well-being yields tangible advantages within the workplace. In instances of compromised mental health, there is a noticeable decline in productivity, coupled with increased costs attributed to absenteeism and suboptimal job performance (Gierszewski & Pieczywok, 2021).

Emotional Intelligence

Emotional Intelligence has become increasingly recognized as a pivotal skill for personal and professional success. Emotional Intelligence pertains to the skill of comprehending and adeptly regulating one's own emotions, alongside the capability to navigate through and exert an impact on the emotions of others. In a rapidly changing and interconnected global landscape, individuals with high emotional intelligence can thrive in various aspects of their lives. In the workplace, leaders with strong emotional intelligence can foster positive team dynamics, empathize with their colleagues, and navigate complex social situations with finesse.

Alam's (2014) findings underscore that overall emotional intelligence, along with nearly all its components, exerts an impact on various aspects of the adjustments of police personnel.

Emotional Intelligence integrates cognition and affect, encompassing the ability to perceive, control, and evaluate emotions. High emotional intelligence enhances the expression and comprehension of emotions, improving work relationships and performance. It is not about being soft but represents

a distinct form of intelligence, empowering individuals to leverage emotions (Desti & Shanthi, 2015)

Emotional intelligence significantly enhances workplace success by cultivating healthy relationships, promoting effective collaboration within groups, and contributing to the development of a positive social status (Mamatha & Devyashree, 2020).

Type A and B Behavioural Patterns

The Type A and B Behaviour Patterns, conceptualized by cardiologists Meyer Friedman and Ray Rosenman in the 1950s, categorize individuals based on distinct personality traits. Type A individuals are characterized by high levels of competitiveness, ambition, impatience, and a strong work ethic, potentially making them prone to stress-related health issues. In contrast, Type B individuals exhibit a more relaxed, laid-back demeanor, are less competitive, and are generally better at handling stress.

In a study by Nuzulawati (2016), it was found that personality traits A and B were not associated with job stress. In another study by Devi et al. (2023), it was found that personality traits and job stress were weakly related.

Objectives

The investigation was undertaken with the subsequent objectives:

1. To assess the magnitude and characteristics of the correlation between General Health, Emotional Intelligence, and Job Stress in relation to Type A and Type B Behaviour Patterns among Police Personnel (Sub-Inspectors, Inspectors, and RPS Officers).
2. To scrutinize the depth and orientation of the connections between General Health, Emotional Intelligence, and Job Stress in relation to Type A and Type B Behaviour Patterns among Sub-Inspectors in the Police Force.
3. To delve into the intricacies of the relationship between General Health, Emotional Intelligence, and Job Stress in relation to Type A and Type B Behaviour Patterns among Inspectors.
4. To appraise the extent and direction of the correlations between General Health, Emotional Intelligence, and Job Stress in relation to Type A and Type B Behaviour Patterns among RPS Officers.

Hypotheses

The study aimed to assess the validity of the following null hypotheses:

1. There is no statistically significant association between General Health, Emotional Intelligence, and Job Stress with Type A and Type B Behaviour Patterns among Police Personnel (Sub-Inspectors, Inspectors, and RPS Officers).
2. There is no statistically significant linkage between General Health, Emotional Intelligence, and Job Stress with Type A and Type B Behaviour Patterns among Sub-Inspectors.

3. There is no statistically significant connection between General Health, Emotional Intelligence, and Job Stress with Type A and B Behaviour Patterns among Inspectors.
4. There is no statistically significant correlation between General Health, Emotional Intelligence, and Job Stress with Type A and B Behaviour Patterns among RPS Officers.

Method

Research Design

The study utilizes a correlational research design to explore the interrelationships among the variables. The sample comprises 150 police personnel, distributed evenly among three categories: 50 Sub-inspectors, 50 Inspectors, and 50 RPS Officers. To comprehensively assess the factors under investigation, measurements were conducted for General Health, Emotional Intelligence, Job Stress, and Type A and B Behavioural Patterns within each category. This approach allows for the examination of potential associations and correlations between these key variables across different ranks within the police force.

Sample

A purposive sample of 150 Policemen (age - range 25-50 years) was selected for the present study. These Policemen comprised three different ranks — 50 Sub-inspectors, 50 Inspectors, and 50 RPS Officers and were sampled from various Police Commissionaires in Jaipur, Rajasthan.

Psychological Measures

The specified assessments were conducted with the consent of Police Personnel (Sub-Inspectors, Inspectors, and RPS Officers). Participants were assured that the results obtained would be treated with confidentiality and exclusively utilized for the purposes outlined in the current research, with no application for any extraneous purposes.

1. *Goldberg's General Health Questionnaire (GHQ)* (Gautam, Nijhawan, Kamal, 1987)

The GHQ-60 is an extended version of Goldberg's General Health Questionnaire, designed to assess mental well-being and detect psychological distress. Comprising of 60 questions, it covers various aspects of mental health such as mood, sleep, concentration, and life satisfaction.

2. *Emotional Skills & Competence Scales (ESCO - 45)* (Vladimir Taksic, 2009)

The Emotional Skills and Competence Questionnaire, crafted by Vladimir Taksic in 2009, is a 45-item assessment designed for the evaluation of Emotional Intelligence. This questionnaire encompasses three distinct subscales: Perceive and Understand, Express and Label, and Manage and Regulate. Respondents provide feedback through a scale of 6 alternatives, ranging from 1 (never) to 6 (always), where elevated scores signify a greater level of Emotional Competence.

3. *Police Stress Inventory (PSI)* (Pienaar and Rothmann, 2006)

Police Stress Inventory is utilized to evaluate Occupational Stress, with a specific focus on typical work situations recognized for their potential to elicit psychological strain. This inventory consists of 44 items, each detailing a stress-inducing event related to the job and assessing both its perceived severity and the frequency of its occurrence. In the Initial phase, participants rated the intensity of stress for each item on a nine-point scale. The subsequent section of the questionnaire addressed the frequency aspect, inquiring about the respondents' experience with the identified stressors by asking, "How many times in the last six months" did each event take place.

4. *Type A/B Behavioral Pattern Scale* (Dhar, Upinder & Jain, Manisha, 2010)

The assessment of personality utilized the Type A and B Behavioural Pattern Scale crafted by Upinder Dhar and Manisha Jain. This scale, comprising 36 items, employs a 5-point rating system. The scale is bifurcated into two distinct forms: Form A and Form B. Form A addresses items associated with Type A personality patterns, characterized by traits such as competitiveness and time urgency, while Form B encompasses questions about Type B behavior, characterized by a more relaxed demeanor. Notably, the reliability coefficients for both A and Form B were found to be 0.54.

Statistical Analysis

Group-level statistics, encompassing means, and standard deviations were calculated for each group through the utilization of SPSS_17 Software. To assess the significance, magnitude, and direction of the relationships between General Health, Emotional Intelligence, and Job Stress in relation to Type A and Type B Behaviour Patterns among Police Personnel (Sub-Inspectors, Inspectors, and RPS Officers), the study employed the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation.

Results

The data underwent statistical analysis to determine the viability of the hypothesis. The ensuring statistical outcomes are as follows:

Table I displays Descriptive Group Statistics i.e. Means (M) and Standard Deviations (SD) for key variables, including General Health, Emotional Intelligence, Job Stress, and Type A and Type Behavior Patterns in Police Personnel (Sub-Inspectors, Inspectors, and RPS Officers). In terms of General Health, the Mean (M) and Standard Deviation (SD) values for different components are as follows: General Illness M = 14.48, SD = 6.45; Somatic symptoms M = 13.48, SD = 6.45; Sleep Disturbance M = 15.00, SD = 6.42; Social Dysfunction M = 13.06, SD = 6.48; Anxiety and Dysphoria M = 17.51, SD = 6.46; and Severe

Depression M = 11.49, SD = 6.46. Total General Health M = 29.48, and SD = 12.85. Type A Behaviour Pattern M = 12.71 and SD = 4.98. Lastly, the Type B Behaviour Pattern M = 44.04, SD = 19.31.

Table 1: Descriptive Group Statistics for General Health, Emotional Intelligence, Job Stress, and Type A and B Behavioural Pattern

S.No.	Variables	Mean	S.D.
1.	General Health	29.48	12.85
	General Illness (GI)	14.48	6.45
	Somatic Symptoms (SS)	13.48	6.45
	Sleep Disturbance (SD)	15.00	6.42
	Social Dysfunction (SDy)	13.06	6.48
	Anxiety and Dysphoria (A & D)	17.51	6.46
	Severe Depression (S Dep.)	11.49	6.46
2.	Emotional Intelligence	144.75	54.37
	Perceiving and Understanding Emotion (P & UE)	48.53	17.73
	Expressing and Labelling Emotion (E & LE)	48.42	17.69
	Managing and Regulating Emotion (M & RE)	47.74	18.19
3.	Job Stress		
	Amount of Stress (AS)	217.08	105.81
4.	Type A Behaviour Pattern	12.71	4.98
5.	Type B Behaviour Pattern	44.04	19.31

For Emotional Intelligence, Perceiving and Understanding Emotion M = 48.53, SD = 17.73; Expressing and Labelling Emotions M = 48.42, SD = 17.69; Managing and Regulating Emotion M = 47.74, SD = 18.19. Total Emotional Intelligence M =

19.31. Table II displays Correlation Coefficients (r) of General Health, Emotional Intelligence, Job Stress, Type A and B Behavioural Patterns in all Police Personnel. In the observed findings, Type A

Table 2: Correlation Coefficients (r) of General Health, Emotional Intelligence, Job Stress, and Type A and B Behavioural Patterns in Police Personnel

S.No.	VARIABLES	r (Type A)	r (Type B)
1.	General Health	-0.87**	-0.84**
	General Illness (GI)	-0.87**	-0.84**
	Somatic Symptoms (SS)	-0.87**	-0.84**
	Sleep Disturbance (SD)	-0.87**	-0.84**
	Social Dysfunction (SDy)	-0.87**	-0.83**
	Anxiety and Dysphoria (A & D)	-0.88**	-0.85**
	Severe Depression (S Dep.)	-0.87**	0.84**
2.	Emotional Intelligence	0.89**	0.87**
	Perceiving and Understanding Emotion (P & UE)	0.89**	0.88**
	Expressing and Labelling Emotion (E & LE)	0.88**	0.87**
	Managing and Regulating Emotion (M & RE)	0.89**	0.88**
3.	Job Stress		
	Amount of Stress (AS)	-0.87**	-0.90**

**Significant at 0.01 level

144.75, and SD = 54.37. Job Stress is characterized by the Amount of Stress: M = 217.08, and SD = 105.81.

Personality demonstrates a noteworthy positive correlation with diverse dimensions of Emotional Intelligence, encompassing Perceiving and Understanding Emotion (r = 0.89), Expressing and Labelling Emotion (r = 0.88), Managing and

Regulating Emotion ($r = 0.89$), and with Emotional Intelligence ($r = 0.89$). Conversely, Type A Personality exhibits a substantial negative correlation with various facets of General Health, including General Illness ($r = -0.87$), Somatic Symptoms ($r = -0.87$), Sleep Disturbance ($r = -0.87$), Social Anxiety and Dysphoria ($r = -0.88$), Severe Depression ($r = -0.87$), and with Total General Health ($r = -0.87$). Furthermore, it displays a significant negative correlation with the Amount of Stress ($r = -0.87$).

On the other hand, Type B Personality is noted for a significant positive correlation with dimensions of Emotional Intelligence, such as Perceiving and Understanding Emotion ($r = 0.87$), Expressing and Labelling Emotion ($r = 0.87$), Managing and Regulating Emotion ($r = 0.88$), and overall Emotional

Inspectors. The analysis reveals that Type A Behaviour Pattern is significantly positively correlated with Perceiving and Understanding Emotion ($r = 0.197$) and Amount of Stress (0.259). Nonetheless, a notable relationship between Type A Behaviour Patterns, and Managing and Regulating Emotion is not observed ($r = 0.080$); overall General Health ($r = -0.046$) including the sub-dimensions General Illness (r is -0.038); Somatic Symptoms (r is -0.038); Sleep Disturbance (r is -0.053); Social Dysfunction ($r = -0.035$); Social Anxiety and Dysphoria (r is -0.043); Severe Depression (r is -0.041); Expressing and Labelling Emotion ($r = -0.025$), and Total Emotional Intelligence ($r = -0.126$). Type B Behaviour Patterns are not significantly related to Sleep Disturbance ($r = 0.002$), Social

Table 3: Correlation Coefficients (r) of General Health, Emotional Intelligence, Job Stress, and Type A and B Behavioural Patterns in Sub-Inspectors, Inspectors and RPS Officers.

S.No.	VARIABLES	Sub-Inspector		Inspector		RPS Officer	
		r (Type A)	r (Type B)	r (Type A)	r (Type B)	r (Type A)	r (Type B)
1.	General Health	-0.046	-0.011	-0.046	-0.011	0.090	0.097
	General Illness	-0.038	-0.025	-0.038	-0.025	0.080	0.086
	Somatic Symptoms	-0.038	-0.025	-0.038	-0.025	0.080	0.086
	Sleep Disturbance	-0.053	0.002	-0.053	0.002	0.095	0.103
	Social Dysfunction	-0.035	0.023	-0.035	0.023	0.084	0.107
	Anxiety and Dysphoria	-0.043	-0.023	-0.043	-0.023	0.082	0.082
	Severe Depression	-0.041	-0.025	-0.041	-0.025	0.089	0.086
2.	Emotional Intelligence	-0.126	0.130	-0.126	0.130	0.114	0.046
	Perceiving & Understanding Emotion	0.197*	-0.015	0.197	-0.015	-0.197	0.078
	Expressing & Labelling Emotion	-0.025	0.052	-0.025	0.052	-0.077	-0.001
	Managing & Regulating Emotion	0.080	0.145	0.080	0.145	-0.058	0.053
3.	Job Stress						
	Amount of Stress	0.259	-0.044	0.259	-0.044	0.092	0.023

Intelligence ($r = 0.87$). Conversely, Type B Personality shows a substantial negative correlation with various facets of General Health, including General Illness ($r = -0.84$), Somatic Symptoms ($r = -0.84$), Sleep Disturbance ($r = -0.84$), Social Anxiety and Dysphoria ($r = -0.85$), Severe Depression ($r = -0.84$), and total General Health ($r = -0.84$). Additionally, it exhibits a significant negative correlation with the Amount of Stress ($r = -0.90$).

Table III displays Correlation Coefficients (r) of General Health, Emotional Intelligence, Job Stress, and Type A and B Behavioural Patterns in Sub-

Dysfunction (0.023), Expressing and Labelling Emotion ($r = 0.052$), Managing and Regulating Emotion ($r = 0.145$), Total Emotional Intelligence ($r = 0.130$), General Illness ($r = -0.025$), Somatic Symptoms (r is -0.025), Social Anxiety and Dysphoria (r is -0.023), Severe Depression ($r = -0.025$), Total General Health ($r = -0.011$), Perceiving and Understanding Emotion ($r = -0.015$), and the Amount of Stress ($r = -0.044$).

For Inspectors, the Type A Behaviour Pattern demonstrates a significant positive relationship between Perceiving and Understanding Emotion ($r =$

0.197) and the Amount of Stress (0.259). However, it is not significantly associated with Managing and Regulating Emotion ($r = 0.080$); overall General Health ($r = -0.046$) including the sub-dimensions General Illness ($r = -0.038$); Somatic Symptoms ($r = -0.038$); Sleep Disturbance (r is -0.053), Social Dysfunction (r is -0.035), Anxiety and Dysphoria (r is -0.043), Severe Depression (r is -0.041) Expressing and Labelling Emotion ($r = -0.025$), and Total Emotional Intelligence ($r = -0.126$). On the other hand, Type B Behaviour Patterns are not significantly related to Sleep Disturbance ($r = 0.002$), Social Dysfunction (0.023), Expressing and Labelling Emotion ($r = 0.052$), Managing and Regulating Emotion ($r = 0.145$), Total Emotional Intelligence ($r = 0.130$), General Illness ($r = -0.025$), Somatic Symptoms (r is -0.025), Anxiety and Dysphoria (r is -0.023), Severe Depression (r is -0.025), Total General Health ($r = -0.011$), Perceiving and Understanding Emotion ($r = -0.015$), and the Amount of Stress ($r = -0.044$).

For RPS Officers, Type A Behaviour Pattern exhibits a significant negative relationship with Perceiving and Understanding Emotion ($r = -0.197$). However, it is not significantly associated with General Illness ($r = 0.080$), Somatic Symptoms ($r = 0.080$), Sleep Disturbance (r is 0.095), Social Dysfunction (r is 0.084), Anxiety and Dysphoria (r is 0.082), Severe Depression ($r = -0.089$), total General Health ($r = 0.090$), Expressing and Labelling Emotion ($r = -0.077$), Managing and Regulating Emotion ($r = -0.058$) and Total Emotional Intelligence ($r = 0.114$). Conversely, Type B Behaviour Pattern is not significantly related to General Illness ($r = 0.086$), Somatic Symptoms ($r = 0.086$), Sleep Disturbance ($r = 0.103$), Social Dysfunction ($r = 0.107$), Anxiety and Dysphoria (r is 0.082), severe Depression ($r = 0.086$), total General Health ($r = 0.053$), Perceiving and Understanding Emotion ($r = 0.078$), Managing and Regulating Emotion ($r = 0.053$), Expressing and Labelling Emotion ($r = -0.001$), Total Emotional Intelligence ($r = 0.046$)

Discussion

Ensuring the Well-Being of Police Personnel in today's world involves addressing their general health, work stress, and emotional intelligence. Physically demanding duties necessitate a focus on regular exercise, nutrition, and sufficient sleep. Mental Health challenges, including PTSD and anxiety, require attention through awareness campaigns and accessible counseling services. The current study aimed to investigate the intricate relationship between General Health, Emotional Intelligence, Job Stress, and Type A and B Behaviour Patterns among Police Personnel (Sub-Inspectors, Inspectors, and RPS Officers). Table I provided descriptive group statistics, revealing mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) values for various components. Table II displayed correlation coefficients (r) between Type A and B Behavioural

Patterns, Emotional Intelligence, Job Stress and Type A and Type B Behavioural Patterns among Police Personnel (Sub-Inspectors, Inspectors, and RPS Officers). Type A Behaviour Patterns exhibited significant positive correlations with Emotional Intelligence and its dimensions, namely, Perceiving and Understanding Emotion, Expressing and Labeling Emotion, and Managing and Regulating Emotion. Conversely, it showed significant negative correlations with different General Health dimensions and with the Amount of Stress. These findings align with prior research conducted by Billing and Steverson (2013), Naz et al (2017), Khanna et al (2018), and Ofojebe, Okoli, & Okemefuna (2019).

Type B personality exhibited a significant positive correlation with the dimensions of Emotional Intelligence. Conversely, Type B personality exhibits a significant negative correlation with various aspects of General Health. It also has a significant negative correlation with the Amount of Stress. These findings align with earlier research conducted by Pasula (2009), Kanten et al. (2017), and Kumar (2022). Consequently, the null hypothesis (Ho1) asserting no statically significant association between General Health, Emotional Intelligence, and Job Stress with Type A and B behavioral Patterns among Police personnel (Sub-Inspectors, Inspectors, and RPS Officers) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis is accepted at 0.01 level of confidence.

In the case of Sub-Inspectors, it was found that Type A Behaviour Patterns correlated positively with Perceiving and Understanding Emotion and the Amount of Stress. However, no significant relationship was found between Type A Behaviour Patterns and Managing and Regulating Emotion, General Health, and its dimensions. Type B Behaviour Patterns showed no significant relationships with various Emotional Intelligence, General Health aspects, and the Amount of Stress. Empirical observations indicate that the null hypothesis (Ho2), asserting no statistically significant association between General Health, Emotional Intelligence, and Job Stress with Type A and B Behavioural Patterns in Sub-Inspectors, is neither fully rejected nor fully accepted. The untenability of accepting the alternative hypothesis is also evident.

For Inspectors, Type A Behaviour Patterns correlated positively with Perceiving and Understanding Emotion and the Amount of Stress but showed no significant relationship with other variables. Type B Behaviour Patterns have no significant associations with General Health and Emotional Intelligence. It can be inferred empirically that the null hypothesis (Ho3) asserting no statistically significant linkage between General Health, Emotional Intelligence, and Job Stress with Type A and Type B Behavioural Patterns in Inspectors is partially rejected and partially accepted and the alternative hypothesis is accepted is untenable.

For RPS Officers, Type A Behaviour Patterns exhibited a significant negative correlation with Perceiving and Understanding Emotion but no significant associations with other variables. Type B Behavioural Patterns showed no significant relationships with General Health, Emotional Intelligence, and Job stress. It can be inferred empirically that the null hypothesis (Ho4), asserting no statistically significant association between General Health, Emotional Intelligence, and Job Stress with Type A and Type B Behaviour Patterns in RPS Officers is partially rejected and partially accepted and the alternative hypothesis is accepted is untenable.

Conclusion

The study explores the nexus between General Health, Emotional Intelligence, Job Stress, and Type A and B Behaviour Patterns among Police personnel, revealing significant correlations. However, a distinction emerged when examining specific ranks. Individuals with Type A Personalities may possess heightened Emotional Intelligence but are more prone to certain health challenges and stress-related issues. Type B personalities may possess a well-rounded Emotional Intelligence profile and tend to experience lower levels of certain health-related issues and stress. To enhance and safeguard the Well-being of Police Officers, it is recommended to cultivate job resources. The cultivation of supportive mental health within the realm of police work (Wolter, Maria & Worfel, 2019).

References

Alam, S. (2014). Influence of Emotional Intelligence on Adjustment of Police Personnel. *The Indian Police Journal*, 61(1), 210-226.

Baldwin, S., Bennell, C., Andersen, J. P., Semple, T., & Jenkins, B. (2019). Stress-Activity Mapping: Physiological Responses During General Duty Police Encounters. *Frontiers Psychology*, 10, 2216.

Basinska, B.A., & Wiciak, I. (2013). Impact of Work on the Well-Being of Police Officers and Firefighters. *Internal Security*, 5(1), 247-258.

Billing, T.K., & Steverson, P. (2013). Moderating Role of Type A Personality on Stress-Outcome Relationships. *Management Decision*, 51(9), 1893-1904.

Castro, C., Rocha, R., & Cruz, R. (2019). Mental Health of the Brazilian Police Policy: Theoretical-Methodological Trends. *PsicologiaSaude and Doencas*, 20(2), 525-541.

Desti, K., & Shanthi, R. (2015). A Study on Emotional Intelligence at Work Place. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(24), 147-154.

Devi, K., Hananingrum, P., Wahyudiono, Y.D.A. (2023). Why Does Work Stress Occur in Nurses? *The Indonesian Journal of Occupational Safety and Health*. 12(1), 95-103.

Dhar, U., & Jain, M. (2010). Type A/B Behavioural Pattern Scale. *National Psychological Corporation, Agra*.

Gautam, S., Nijhawan, M., & Kamal, P. (1987). Standardization of the Hindi Version of Goldberg's General Health Questionnaire. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 29, 63-66.

Gierszewski, J., & Preczywok, A. (2021). Subject and Situational Determinants of Well-Being in the Police. *European Research Studies Journal*. 24(4), 941-954.

Kanten, P., Gumustekin, G., & Kanten, S. (2017). Exploring the Role of A, B, C, and D Personality Types on Individuals Work-related Behaviors and Health Problems: A Theoretical Model. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*. 6(7), 29-37.

Khanna, H., Singh, P., Sarraf, S.R., & Gola, S. (2018). Stress and Job Satisfaction in Employees with Type A and Type B Personality. *The Scientific Temper*. 9(1), 11-16.

Kumar, N. (2022). Mental Health and Well-Being: An Indian Psychology Perspective (1st ed.). *Routledge India*, 68-95.

Mamatha, H.S. & Divyashree, C. (2020). A Study on Impact of Emotional Intelligence on Employee Job Performance. *SDM Institute for Management Development*, 1-20.

Naz, S., Li, C., Khan, S., & Khan, H.S. (2017). Comparative Analytical Study of Teacher's Personality Type (A and B) to Study the Consequences of Ostracism. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Science, Engineering and Technology*. 3(5), 488-502.

Nuzulawati, M.T. (2016). The Relationship Between Type A Personality and Job Stress in Tegal Muhammadiyah Vocational School Teachers. *JurnalProyeksi*, 11(1), 15-23.

Ofojebe, C.P., Okoli, P.C., & Okemefuna, O.M. (2019). The Role of Gender and Personality (Type A and Type B); on Emotional Stressful Experience. *Annals Alzheimer's and Dementia Care*. 3(1).

Pambudi, R.W.A., Rahmat, A., & Heri, H. (2022). The Effect of Job Stress on Subjective Well-Being with Coping Style as Intervening. *SainsOrganisasi*, 1(4), 276-282.

Pasula, B.J. (2004). An Analysis of the Relationship Between Organizational Culture and Occupational Stress: perceptions of Employees Following a Merger. *Edith Cowan University*, Retrieved from <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/theses/845/>

Pienaar, J., & Rothmann, S. (2006). Occupational Stress in the South African Police Service. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 32(3), 72-78.

Ryu, G.W., Yang, Y.S., & Choi, M. (2020). Mediating Role of Coping Style on the Relationship Between Job Stress and Subjective Well-Being Among Korean Police Officers. *BMC Public Health*, 20, 470.

- Sulaiman, Y., Ortega, A., D'Silva, L, J., Samah, A. A., & Omar, Z. S. (2016). A Comparison Across Ranks of Well-Being Among Police Officers in Malaysia. *Asian Social Science, 12*(1), 151-158.
- Taksic, V., Mohoric, T., & Duran, M. (2009). Emotional Skills and Competence Questionnaire (ESCQ) as a Self-Report Measure of Emotional Intelligence. *Horizons of Psychology, 18*, 7-21.
- Tov, W. (2018). Well-Being concepts and components. *Handbook of Well-Being, DEF Publishers*, 30-44.
- Tov, W., & Diener, E. (2013). Subjective Well-Being. *Research Collection School of Social Sciences. Paper 1395*.
https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/soass_research/1395
- Wolter, C., Maria, S.A., & Worfel, F. (2019). Job Demands, Job Resources and Well-Being in Police Officers: A Resource Oriented Approach. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 34*, 45-54.
- World Health Organization, (1951). Annual Report of the Director-General to the World Health Organization and the United Nations. *Geneva: World Health Organization*.