

Stress and coping among police officers: An integrated review of literature

Mqemane Tshababa^{1*}, Ngonidzashe Mutanana², Patrick Senderayi³

¹ Lecturer, Police Staff College, Zimbabwe

² Senior Lecturer, Department of Child Sensitive Social Policies, Women's University in Africa, Zimbabwe

³ Lecturer, Joshua Mqabuko Nkomo Polytechnic, (An Associate College of University of , Zimbabwe

Abstract

The main objective of this paper was to analyse stress related issues among police officers. The authors reviewed literature on workplace stressors, coping with stress and job burnout among police officers. From the discussions, the authors concluded that stress can be seen as the stimulation of psyche and body in reaction to strain made on them. Stress is observable at four levels; cognitive, behavioural, physical and psychological. The occupational stress that police officers experience is not an objective occurrence but is chiefly subjective in nature. There are five most common contributors to stress among police officers that have been identified as; type of work, organisational culture, personality type, interpersonal relations and management behaviour. In order to cope with major stress, the related emotions need to be managed and reduced in such a manner as to bring relief to the person. Increasing burnout rates among police officers is indicative of them facing increased and prolonged levels of stress.

Keywords: Stress, Burnout, Exhaustion, Coping, Emotions, Psyche, Relief

1. Introduction

The term stress has its roots in the Latin word *strictere*, which refers to draw tight (Cooper & Dewe, 2004). Olivier (2005) adds that the word stress is derived from the Latin word *strictus*, which literally means tightly strung. Stress is not an innate characteristic of outside circumstances, but comes from discrepancy between those circumstances and uniqueness of the person, his requirements, principles, perception, resources and skills. The literature offers a plethora of definitions of this phenomenon. Stress can be seen as the stimulation of psyche and body in reaction to strain made on them (Schafer, 2000). Another conceptualisation is to take stress as the reaction of a person to the self-perceived inequality connecting the strains of the situation presented, and the resources one has at one's disposal to respond successfully (Anderson, Litzenberger & Placas, 2002). These definitions apparently replicate the perceived association between demands on individuals and their capacity to cope with those strains. This relationship connecting stress and well-being is clearly implied.

Stress is at times used synonymously with strain. For clarity, Dollard, Winefield & Winefield (2003) ^[36] explain that strain means responses to the circumstances of stress. It is observable at four levels; *cognitive, behavioural, physical* and *psychological*. At the cognitive level it manifests through a decrease in the value of making choices or decisions, poorer levels of creativity and handicapped recollection. At the behavioural level, a person will resort to absenteeism from work, poor time management when at work, substance misuse and bad temper. At the bodily level, headache, eating disorders and cardiovascular disease are symptomatic. Finally, at the psychological level; the person will experience hopelessness, nervousness and low sense of

worth (Rothmann & Cooper, 2008) ^[2]. Viljoen & Rothman (2009) ^[35] point out that although stress and strain are characteristics of work life, these words are sometimes vaguely explained. They argue that regardless of the vagueness, stress and strain remain a cause of grave concern to experts such as, police officers. They cite two critical concerns that have a bearing on this particular study. First, stress has an economic effect because if poorly managed it can prove to be an expensive factor to organizations or companies due to low output which is usually linked to stressed workers. Stressed police officers may not perform at their best and resort to taking time-off to seek medical attention. The second is on compassionate grounds, as it is not wanted to contribute to the stress of individuals. There is no doubt, therefore, that stress emanating from work is a main trouble, together for persons in the institute and institutions themselves. Basing on this premise, it has been argued that it is in the institution's best interest to get involved and reduce the amount of stress that is caused by incessant organizational change in particular (Mack, Nelson & Quick, 1998).

Many scholars agree that job-related stress has the same typical features, with the exemption that it appears exclusively in the confines of the job environment, is caused by occupational factors and also has results for the work situation (Rothmann & Cooper, 2008) ^[2]. Such stress is indicative that an individual is unable to successfully handle work-related demands, such as job overwork, job clashes in the workplace and bad working environment among other stressors. It can thus be seen as the output of the incongruence between the demands made upon an individual and their ability to cope with them (Weinberg & Cooper, 2007). There is a clear correlation between the

intensity of stress a person experiences in their work situations, and the degree to which unpleasant effects like psychological and other strains take place. This correlation indicates how effectively the person copes with stressful work context. (Bhagat, Ford, Driscoll, Frey, Babakus & Mahanyele, 2001). Studies on stress indicates that professionals working in the helping professions whose core business is to deal with people, especially police officers are mainly prone to stress (Barkhuizen & Rothmann, 2008, Kyriacau, 2001) ^[2]. It has therefore come to be generally acknowledged that stress has a major influence on an expert's performance.

It is also imperative to understand what stressors are and how they influence the appraisal of stress. Generally, circumstances or environments that seem to cause stress are called stressors (Newstrom & Davis, 2002). This word is used in relation to demands made on a person (Jones & Bright, 2001), which act as an incentive for producing a response such as feelings of rage, nervousness and tension (Rothmann & Cooper, 2008) ^[2]. Stressors can either be external or internal in nature. An external stressor, such as a person's job as a police officer or colleagues at work or an internal stressor such as ambition to be promoted to a more senior rank or competitiveness can trigger stress. It has been evidenced that one stressor can cause a main stress but very frequently stressors aggregate to put pressure on an individual in a variety of ways culminating in the development of stress (Newstrom & Davis, 2002). The purpose of this study will be to examine whether there are any stressors which aggregate in causing stress police officers.

The occupational stress that police officers experience is not an objective occurrence but is chiefly subjective in nature. In this regard, it involves the police officer's deliberate explanation of his or her objective situation. It has been argued that possible stressors are not intrinsically harsh or harmful; person's unique differences in cognitive appraisal and coping style allow for the same stressor to be experienced by some as a difficult and by others as an impediment (Hendel & Horn, 2008) ^[8]. Given this, an assessment of each dimension of the stress process includes a holistic understanding of the environmental demands, the person's capacities to deal with the challenges, coping capacity, character type, feelings, and associated behaviours, bodily health, mental well-being and social performance (Gillespie, Walsh, Winefield, Dua, & Stough, 2001). Each individual police officer is thus likely to respond in a different way to the identical objective stimuli or job demands. The awareness of incapacity to deal with challenges usually vary from one person to another. When the circumstances are viewed as threatening, the person feels they are not able to deal with stress. When the condition is seen as merely challenging, but not frightening to physical or mental wellbeing, there would be no stress and no behaviours that indicate failed coping or adaptation. Job-related stress consequently happens when a person personally experiences an inappropriateness connecting himself or herself and his or her job situation, and feels not capable to deal, adjust or function successfully as a result of which he or she endures poor psychological or bodily health or engages in dysfunctional and even counterproductive

behaviours (Fako, 2010) ^[7]. Stress is sometimes viewed as a meaning of alleged control, which consists of a person's general locus of control (or perceived self-efficacy) and actual environmental control (Spector, 1998 cited in Fako, 2010) ^[7]. When perceived control over objective external demands (or stressors) is high, the individual is not likely to interpret the situation as threatening and will not perceive (or subjectively experience) stress. When perceived control over external demands is low, however, the individual is likely to perceive (or subjectively experience) stress. According to Karasek's (1979) demand-control theory of job stress, a job in which there is a high demand on the employee and low control or autonomy is stressful. By contrast, a job in which there is a high level of control or autonomy should not be stressful even if the job is demanding.

2.0 Workplace stressors among Police Officers

For a police officer to effectively cope with stress they must be able to identify the source of the stress. In the workplace, five most common contributors to stress have been identified as; type of work, organisational culture, personality type, interpersonal relations and management behaviour (Lussier, 2009) ^[14]. These stressors are further placed into two main categories namely; workplace and personal stress (Robbins & De Cenzo, 2004) ^[23]. The focus of this study was on the former category; workplace stressors. Oosthuizen & Berndt (2008) ^[20] cite Robbins & Coulter (1999) ^[22] as proposing the following stressors typical in any organisational environment.

- *Role ambiguity* frequently entails that a person (either a team member or the team leader) does not know how to perform on the job, or what the expected relationship is. There is often a mismatch in the link between performance and the consequences. This can be associated with the lack of a job description for jobs. This study thus sought to investigate the extent this stressor applied in the police officers' workplaces. Police departments work as teams and in stations there is a hierarchy from constables, sergeants, assistant inspectors and the officer in charge as the head of the team. Conflicts can occur at any level in the structure if there is no clarity on roles of individual police officers.
- *Roles overload* which refers to having to do too many things and having too many roles to play in the work situation. The use of project management within organization results in a team leader having to manage a department while also having to contribute to the project. Time management and allocation become a difficult task. In the case of police officers, the pressure to finalize investigations within stipulated a time is an example of an added policing workload. In some cases managerial/administrative work places greater demands on police officers. For instance, police officers perform a variety of such administrative duties in the stations which include, writing reports, preparing dockets and ensuring accused persons are fed and taken to court within 48 hours of detention.
- *Technological advancements*: things work quicker now than in the past due to technological development. This means there are greater changes that require adaptation,

causing stress. There is also the stress associated with keeping up to date with new systems continually being introduced. For police officers, the greatest challenge resides in the ability to use the information technology facility (ICT) in docket compilation and in writing reports. Many police officers in developing countries are grappling to acquire basic computer skills and as such may have phobia of such technologies.

- *Working conditions.* This refers to difficult working conditions that arise from attending scenes of crimes of violence or in distant areas. For police officers, this could be associated with larger areas of policing, manpower and material resource shortage.
- *Working relationships.* There are stresses between the people in the organization such as between team leaders and colleagues. The causes of these stresses are varied and can include management style and communication breakdowns. Excessive rules and regulations in the workplace: this makes it difficult to show initiative and abiding by the rules results in stress for an employee.
- *Job mismatch.* Job match refers to the person doing the job and the skills required to carry out the task. There is a mismatch when the person's skills and the skills required in the job are not the same. This places stress on the team member, as he is conscious of his lack of skills. At the height of the economic meltdown in the country (2006-2008), there was a mass exodus of qualified staff to neighbouring countries which resulted in the organization recruiting improperly qualified personnel into the system. Such police officers found themselves carrying out duties for which they had not been trained for resulting in a stressful mismatch.
- *Change* in an organization also leads to employee stress. The kind of change influences the level of stress experienced by each different individual in the workplace. Organizational change is any transformation in the design and functioning of an organization (Hellriegel, Jackson & Slocum, 2005).

Occupational stress can also lead to loss of a sense of responsibility, lack of concern for colleagues (Fairbrother & Warn, 2003), breakdown in personal relations with colleagues, low levels of mutual understanding and tolerance, irritability, indecisiveness, poor communication, poor interpersonal skills, feelings of isolation and alienation (Brown et al, 2002), loss of capability to regulate one's own emotions (Oginska-Bulik, 2005), reduced job satisfaction, poor organizational commitment (Vakola & Nikolaou, 2005) ^[32], an increase in turnover intentions (Conner & Douglas, 2005), high staff turnover rates (Salmond & Ropis, 2005), problems of staff retention (Jepson & Forrest, 2006), early retirement (Michie, 2002), and premature death (Rodham & Bell 2002).

A study by Olivier (2005) reflected that more than 40 per cent of police officers are of the opinion that their stress is mostly caused by a lack of enough time, pressures at work, administrative paperwork, an inadequate salary, lack of administrative support, and insufficient communication channels. A further 30 per cent added the following: inadequate facilities, transformation and change, lack of promotion, and meetings. The relationship between

workload or overload and stress is well documented (Faragher, Cooper & Cartwright, 2004). Some of the factors contributing to this ambivalent relationship are physical demands related to the environment and individual effort (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner & Schaufeli, 2000), psychological and emotional demands caused by workload, pace of work, conflicting requests, role ambiguity (Demerouti *et al.*, 2000; Van der Doef, Maes, & Diekstra, 2000).

Viljoen & Rothmann (2009) ^[35] aptly point out that employees need adequate resources (training, equipment) and effective communication in order to perform their jobs effectively. Open communication in organisations can decrease levels of stress experienced by employees, but organisational communication will only be effective if it provides accurate information, thereby increasing the predictability of the working environment. A deficiency in these workplace stressors have been found to be associated with increased levels of stress (Pilkington, Mulholland & Cowie, 2001; Industrial Society, 2001). Furthermore, poor communication was found to be the third highest rated stressor in the British Industrial Society report. In a study undertaken by Tytherleigh (2003) it was found that work relationships, job security, resources and communication caused the highest levels of strain for employees in the human service industry. Levels of stress experienced by employees are also related to monetary rewards such as pay and benefits (Demerouti *et al.* 2000; Tepper, 2000)).

2.3 Coping with stress when policing

Coping has been defined variously in the literature but a widely accepted definition is that proffered by Lazarus and Folkman (1984 cited in Oosthuizen and Berndt, 2008) ^[20] who see it as encompassing the dynamic cognitive and behavioural effort to manage specific external and/or internal demands that are seen as taxing or above the resources of the individual. Coping thus can be divided on a polarity from problem-focused coping to emotion-focused coping (Essau & Trommsdorff, 1996). In order to cope with major stress, the related emotions need to be managed and reduced in such a manner as to bring relief to the person (Olivier, 2006). This requires that a person constantly changes her functioning in order to manage the demands she is experiencing as exceeding her available resources (Schafer 2000). The person can thus counteract emotional distress and succeed in coping with threatening demands.

Problem-focused coping, which is also termed direct action, is whereby a person tries to master the stressful transaction with the environment. It entails the effort to remove the threatening stimulus or diminishing its impact. Oosthuizen and Berndt (2008) ^[20] indicate that a person who employs this form of coping style will resort to action-orientated techniques which enable the individual to face the stress by giving them power to use the situation to their advantage. This also increases the resources that can be used in the situation. Problem-focused coping includes defining the problem, generating, evaluating, and selecting potential solutions, and attempting to cognitively reappraise the situation by shifting level of aspiration, reducing ego involvement, finding alternative channels of gratification, or developing new standards of behaviour (Edwards &

Baglioni, 1993) It therefore is a strategy applied externally to the environmental source of stress. A police officer who might feel that they are inadequately informed in their day-to-day activities at work might opt to directly approach his immediate superior to get information that they require to effectively carry out his duties. In this way he will directly reduce the stress of working from an uninformed position.

On the other hand, emotion-focused coping, also termed palliation or indirect coping is a strategy that is used to one's own emotions (Carver & Scheier, 1994 cited in Senderayi, (2007). Emotion focused coping entails the use of emotionally-orientated techniques which are aimed at enabling the individual to change the way they think about the stress, and as a result, change the way they think and feel about the stress. This means that the individual will adjust his perceptions of the situation (Oosthuizen and Berndt, 2008) ^[20]. Quite often, the effects of either problem or emotion focused coping are difficult to disentangle in that emotion-focused coping can facilitate problem-focused coping by excluding some of the distress that can inhibit problem focused efforts. Similarly, problem-focused coping can render the threat less forbidding, thereby directly diminishing distress emotions (Carver & Scheier, 1994 cited in Senderayi, 2007). A study by Folkman & Lazarus, (1984) found out that individuals tend to use more problem-focused coping in situations that they appraised as changeable and used more emotion-focused coping in those situations they perceived as unchangeable realities that they have to accept. Emotion-focused coping includes minimization, selective attention, avoidance, distancing, self-deception, positive comparisons, and reality distortion (Edwards & Baglioni, 1993)

For purposes of this study a more detailed examination of coping beyond the foregoing simplistic dichotomy was seen as imperative. While it is worthy to note the problem versus emotion focused coping dichotomy, coping can be further explained as active or inactive. Active coping involves confronting or trying to change the source of the stress or oneself, whereas inactive coping strategies involve avoidance or denial of the source of stress by cognitive appraisal or physical means. The combination of the dichotomous dimensions generate four coping strategies; direct-active, direct-inactive; indirect-active, and indirect-inactive (Pines & Kafry, 1981, cited in Senderayi, 2007). Common techniques associated with direct-active strategy are confronting or finding positive aspects in the stressful situation. Direct-inactive strategies are characterised by ignoring or avoidance and it is imperative to test the hypothesis that this strategy is synonymous with introverts more than it is with extroverts in this particular research. Indirect active strategies evolve around talking about the source of stress or getting involved in some other activity that takes away the mind from the stressor. Finally, indirect-inactive coping includes behavioural consequences such as the use of drugs, alcohol or smoking more (Oosthuizen & Berndt, 2008) ^[20].

Coping is both a cognitive and behavioural effort made to master, tolerate and reduce external and internal demands and conflicts. Coping therefore functions to avoid or eliminate a stressor, containing the proliferation of

secondary stressors, altering the meaning of the situation and managing states of arousal (Pearlin & Schooler, 1978; Pearlin & Aneshensel, 1986). Coping and support, terms are terms which are at times used unclearly. Coping refers to the actions taken on one's own behalf, whereas support refers to actions undertaken by another person. In light of this, coping and social support should be taken as functionally isomorphic concepts (Aneshensel, 1997).

Social support is an important resource that enables an individual to cope with stress and prevent burnout (Bonfiglio, 2005). Social support can be described a relationship with one or more persons which is characterised by relatively frequent interactions, strong and positive feelings, and especially perceived ability and willingness to lend emotional and/or instrumental assistance in times of needs (Salami, 2009). The buffering hypothesis suggests that individuals who have high social support are able to rely on others in dealing with stressful situations. As a result, they are less adversely affected by stress and burnout. It has been found that social support can buffer the negative effects of stress (Bonfiglio, 2005; Wong & Cheuk, 2005).

A major emphasis of stress research invariably concerns whether social support acts as a stress buffer ameliorating the deleterious effects of stress. The mental health impact of stress is buffered by emotional and perceived social support but not by membership in social networks (Kessler & McLeod, 1985) This view would suggest that personality type is an important factor, as one's disposition cannot be discounted as a critical factor in emotional reactions of people in interpersonal and group situations. The work environments presented in the eight police stations are a rich ground for examining some of the emotions and reactions which the police officers understand will show. In addition, self-efficacy has to be examined in the context of it being a cognitive dimension in stress appraisal. Self-efficacy is seen as a cognitive orientation attributing such outcomes as success and failure to personal attribute, such as ability and effort. Self-efficacy can be called mastery, perceived control of the environment and instrumentalism (Mirowsky & Ross, 1984). Active problem or approach focused coping is most likely to occur among persons who feel a sense of subjective control (Thoits, 1987; Ross & Mirowsky, 1989). Examining various personality types based on the introversion-extroversion dichotomy may sharply focus attention on how each type appraises and responds to particular stress dimensions in an occupational environment, especially in the degree of control each personality type will likely to perceive or exhibit. Kim-Wan, (1991) cited in Salami, (2009) reveals that there is growing evidence that differences in personality dimension are related to job stress and in view of this, the efficacy of coping behavioural is very much situation specific.

Autonomy or control is a critical aspect in coping with stress by police officers. In light of this, the amount of authority an individual police officer has in making decisions regarding the way work is organised and performed refers to control. Control goes hand in hand with authority and levels of utilisation (De Jonge, Reuvers, Houtman, Bongers & Kompier, 2000; Van der Doef *et al.* 2000). Makin, Cooper and Cox (2003) explain that individuals who perceive that they can control their

environment are less likely to suffer stress than those who do not. Glass & McKnight (1996) cited in Viljoen & Rothman (2009) ^[35] found that the inability to exercise control in the workplace (uncontrollability) contributes to negative psychological states especially when there is a discrepancy between career aspirations and occupational achievement -that is, if there is career dissatisfaction.

2.3 Job Burnout among police officers

A critical dimension in the study of stress is burnout. The appraisal of and coping with work demands are central to the process of stress. Most day-to-day, work related activities may result in varying levels of stress (Rudlow, 1999). However, this does not necessarily result in burnout. In view of this, serious conceptual problems have confronted stress and burnout research (Guglielmi & Tatrov, 1998. Dorman (2003) aptly points out that early attempts to describe stress and burnout emphasized their personal nature and, accordingly, blamed the individual. A more social view of burnout that recognizes both background personality variables of the individual and institutional characteristics as contributing to burnout in police officers has however grown to supersede this perception in current studies. This study sought to examine a variety of these factors to enhance the conceptualisation of stress and burnout. This fact is buttressed by (Dorman, 2003) who opines that the issue of police officer burnout is very important to institutions of learning. For too long, burnout has been explained largely in terms of individual police officer personality characteristics. Such a narrow set of predictors has suited employers who do not wish to accept any moral or legal responsibility for burning out staff through poor organisational and managerial processes.

Burnout happens when individuals endure prolonged periods of high levels of stress. Thus, increasing burnout rates among police officers is indicative of them facing increased and prolonged levels of stress (Hamann & Gordon, 2000). Based on a realisation how demanding and stressful work environments have become, studies examining human behavioural and coping strategies have been conducted in order to better comprehend the link between personality and burnout (Zopiatis, *et al*, 2010). The concept of burnout emerged in the mid-1970s when Freudenberger (1974) noted a propensity among human service workers to experience a depletion of physical and mental resources. At this point stress research, burnout lacked definitional clarity until the development of a widely accepted instrument for its measurement, the Maslach Burnout Inventory. Maslach and colleagues (Maslach, 1993; Maslach Jackson, & Leiter, 1996; Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter, 2001) describe burnout as a syndrome consisting of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and professional accomplishment having detrimental effects for both the individual employee and his/her organization. Burnout is a concept that is closely associated with stress and personality. How the stress is processed determines how much stress is felt and how close the person is to burnout. One individual can experience few stressors, but be unable to process the stress well and thus experience burnout. Another person, however, can experience a significant amount of stressors, but process each well, and avoid

burnout. How close a person is to a state of burnout can be determined through various tests. (wikipedia.org/wiki/Burnoutpsychology, 2010)

There is consensus that burnout is a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who work with people in some capacity Excessive, prolonged stress can lead to *job burnout* (Maslach & Schaufeli, 1993 cited in Brewer & McMahan, 2004). The construct has been verified by numerous researchers (Boles, Dean, Ricks, Short, & Wang, 2000; Green, Walkey, & Taylor, 1991; Lee & Ashforth, 1993), the three-dimensional (*emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment*) structure of burnout is an integral component of the MBI definition. Each dimension represents a different construct. Emotional exhaustion refers to a feeling of being unable to psychologically give of oneself due to a depletion of emotional resources. Depersonalization describes the development of impersonal, cynical feelings toward recipients of one's services. Reduced personal accomplishment indicates a diminished feeling of competence and achievement in working with others. These dimensions are critical in the context of the current study and will be examined in the extent to which they characterise police officers in eight stations.

A recent study (Zopiatis, *et al*, 2010) indicates that the first element of burnout, emotional exhaustion, has been ascribed to a number of possible sources such as *work overload* (Murray-Gibbons & Gibbons, 2007), *role conflict* (Kuruuzum, Anafarta, & Irmak, 2008), *unrealistic personal expectations* (Stevens and O'Neill, 1983), *excessive interpersonal interactions* (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993), and *the lack of effective stress coping mechanisms* (Erera-Weatherley, 1996). The current study seeks to determine the stress level of police officers across four stress dimensions and also find out how these police officers cope with the identified stressors. It was important in the context of the study to examine whether police officers perceived and experienced role conflict together with an excessive workload against the background of unstable staff levels that may exist in the police services.

The second element of burnout, depersonalization, has been ascribed to sources such as *work stress* (Perrewe, Fernandez, & Morton, 1993), *excessive interpersonal interaction* (Maslach, 1982), *excessive workload* (Burke, 1989), and the *nature of job responsibilities*, such as handling customer complaints or other difficult situations (Patton & Goddard, 2003). The final element, diminished personal accomplishment, has been attributed to *lack of recognition and/or positive feedback* (Jackson and Schuler, 1983), *the feeling of inadequacy and/or incompetence* (Janssen, 1999), *the provision of pseudoauthority* (Zopiatis & Constanti, 2005). In light of this, diminished personal accomplishment has been attributed to unrealistic expectations at work and poor management quality (Gill, Flaschner, & Schachar, 2006). In the context of this particular study, the organisational climate in the police officers' work environment is a key variable that is examined and it is important to note that this has a bearing on the police officers' expectations, which among other issues include travelling and subsistence allowances the

organisation is supposed to pay monthly but frequently do not, citing inadequate funds in the coffers.

2.4 Conclusion

Stress can be seen as the stimulation of psyche and body in reaction to strain made on them (Schafer, 2000). It is observable at four levels; *cognitive, behavioural, physical* and *psychological*. The occupational stress that police officers experience is not an objective occurrence but is chiefly subjective in nature. In this regard, it involves the police officer's deliberate explanation of his or her objective situation. In the workplace, five most common contributors to stress have been identified as; type of work, organisational culture, personality type, interpersonal relations and management behaviour (Lussier, 2009) ^[14]. In order to cope with major stress, the related emotions need to be managed and reduced in such a manner as to bring relief to the person (Olivier, 2006). This requires that a person constantly changes her functioning in order to manage the demands she is experiencing as exceeding her available resources (Schafer 2000). Increasing burnout rates among police officers is indicative of them facing increased and prolonged levels of stress (Hamann & Gordon, 2000).

References

1. Agolla JE. Occupational stress among police officers: The case of Botswana Police. *Research journal of business management*. 2008; 3:(1-11).
2. Barkhuizen N, Rothmann S. Occupational stress of academic staff in South African higher education institutions. *South African Journal of Psychology*. 2008; 28:321-336.
3. Baron RA, Greeberg J. *Behaviour in organisations* (6th ed). USA: Prentice Hall, 1997.
4. Brown JM, Campbell EA. Sources of occupational Stress in the Police. *Work and Stress*. 1990; 4:305-318.
5. Cooper CL. *Job stress and collar work*. Great Britain: Library of Congress, 1990.
6. Corey H. Police stress and the effects on the family. An applied research project submitted to the department of Interdisciplinary Technology as part of the School of Police Staff and Command program, Madison Heights Police, 2003.
7. Fako TT. Occupational Stress among University Employees in Botswana. *European Journal of Social Sciences*. 2010; 15(3):313-326.
8. Hendel DD, Horn AS. The relationship between academic life conditions and perceived sources of faculty stress over time. *Journal of Human behavioural in the Social Environment*. 2008; 17(1/2):61-68.
9. Hilsman. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1995, 69(2).
10. Ivankova NV, Creswell JW, Clark VLP. Foundations and approaches to mixed methods research. In K. Maree (Ed.). *First Steps in Research*, 2007, 252-281. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
11. Johnson B, Christensen L. *Educational research: Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Approaches*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 2008.
12. Johnson RB, Onwuegbuzie AJ. Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*. 2004; 33(7):14-26.
13. Lakshmi. Suicide and its prevention: The urgent need in India. *Indian Journal of Psychology*. 2007; 49(2):81-84.
14. Lussier RN. *Management fundamentals: concepts, applications and skill development*. 4th Ed). Springfield: South-Western, 2009.
15. Mason J. *Qualitative researching*, 2002.
16. (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.
17. Maxwell JA. *Qualitative research*. London: Sage Publications, 2005.
18. McLeod J. *Doing counselling research*. London: Sage, 1993.
19. Olivier MAJ. How do academics handle their job-related stress? *SAJHE*. 2005; 19(2):345-358.
20. Oosthuizen TFJ, Berndt AD. Stress management behaviour among academic employees. *Journal of Contemporary Management*. 2008; 5:90-105.
21. Pienaar J, Rothman S. Occupational stress in the South African Service: *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*. 2006; 32(3):72-78.
22. Pilkington A, Mulholland RE, Cowie HA. Baseline measurements for the evaluation of the work-related stress campaign. CRR 322/2001. HSE Contract Research Report. Sudbury: HSE Books, 2001.
23. Robbins SP, De Cenzo DA. *Fundamentals of Management – Essential concepts and applications*. 4th Edition. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 2004.
24. Robbins SP. *Organisational behaviour* (6th ed). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 2004.
25. Schultz DP, Schultz SE. *Psychology and industry today*. (5th ed). USA: Prentice-Hall, 1990.
26. Senderayi P. Stress in academe: Sources of stress and coping strategies used by lecturers at Joshua Mqabuko Nkomo Polytechnic in Matabeleland South province (Unpublished Master of Education dissertation, Midlands State University), 2007.
27. Skov M. *Reward processing and extravert behaviour Brain Ethics*, 2007.
28. Suresh RS, Anatharaman RN, Ajitha A, Jaya G. Sources of Job Stress in Police Work in a Developing Country: *International Journal of Business and Management*, 2013.
29. Teddlie C, Tashakkori A. *Foundations of mixed methods research: Integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social and behavioural sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2009.
30. Tytherleigh MY, Webb C, Cooper CL, Ricketts C. Occupational stress in UK higher education institutions: a comparative study of all staff categories. *Higher Education Research and Development*. 2005; 24(1):41-61.
31. Tytherleigh MY. What employers may learn from English higher education institutions: A fort genic approach to occupational stress. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*. 2003; 29(4):101-106.
32. Vakola M, Nikolaou I. Attitudes towards organizational change: what is the role of employees' stress and commitment? *Employee Relations*. 2005; 27(2):160-174.
33. Van der Doef M, Maes S, Diekstra R. An examination of the job demand-control-support model with various

- occupational strain indicators. *Anxiety, Stress and Coping: An International Journal*. 2000; 13:165-185.
34. Van Zyl Y, Buitendach JH. Occupational stress, job satisfaction and organisational commitment of educators on senior level in the Sedibeng West district -Vanderbijlpark. Poster presented at the 2nd South African Work Wellness conference, Potchefstroom, South Africa, 2004.
 35. Viljoen JP, Rothmann S. Occupational stress, ill health and organisational commitment of employees at a university of technology. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*. 2009; 35(1):1-11.
 36. Winefield AH, Gillespie NA, Stough C, Dua J, Hapuarachchi J, Boyd C. Occupational stress in Australian university staff: results from a national survey. *International Journal of Stress Management*. 2003; 10(1):51-63.