

# Occupational Stress and Optimism as the Predictors of Work Commitment in Personnel of Paramilitary Force



**Sonam Kumari Rawat**

Research Scholar,  
Deptt. of Psychology,  
University of Lucknow,  
Lucknow, U.P. India



**P. C. Mishra**

Dean, Faculty of Arts  
Professor & Ex Head,  
Deptt. of Psychology,  
University of Lucknow,  
Lucknow, U.P. India

## Abstract

The present study examines predictive power of Occupational Stress and Optimism for Work Commitment in 200 personnel of paramilitary force; age range of respondents was 40-55 years with the mean of 47. They were all between the income-range of 20,000-65,000. All the participants were administered on Occupational Stress Index developed and standardized by Srivastava and Singh (1981), Life Orientation Test Revised (LOT-R) developed by Scheier Carver and Bridges (1994) and Work Commitment Questionnaire developed by Cohen A.. Stepwise multiple regression analysis was applied to find out predictive power of Occupational Stress and Optimism for Work Commitment in personnel of paramilitary force. Results reveal that occupational stress and optimism including their dimensions are important predictors of work commitment (overall and area-wise).

**Keywords:** Occupational Stress, Optimism, Work Commitment.

## Introduction

Personnel of Paramilitary forces play a crucial role in ensuring the security and peace of our country. In addition to securing the nation, paramilitary forces (PMF) fulfil other important duties such as: internal security, election duties and disaster management. PMF personnel are at risk exposed to acute stress because violent and threatening encounters are part of their professional situation. In addition because they do not have a fixed pattern of work and are obliged to deal with anticipated and unforeseen emergency situations for indefinite periods of time, the culminating pressure chronically increases daily stress. They are posted on non-family sites where the influence of the family is absent. In these stressful living or working situations, the PMF personnel are likely to experience multitude of mental health problems, such as negative emotions (e.g., fear and anger), physiological over reactivity (e.g., palpitations and increased blood pressure), and dysfunctional cognitions (e.g., pessimistic thoughts about oneself). These stress reactions can degrade concentration and task performance further leading to changes in job performance, commitment and quality of life.

## Occupational Stress in Paramilitary Force Personnel

Stress can be defined as a person's adverse reaction to excessive pressure or other types of demand. At present, more than half a million people report experiencing work-related stress at a level which makes them sick. Therefore, the personnel of the paramilitary forces working under adverse physical conditions, the protection of citizens and the sovereign rights of the country, are no exception to the rule. They are very prone to occupational stress or job stress in their own area and therefore require immediate attention.

Suicides and fratricidal killings in paramilitary forces in almost all regions where they are deployed attracted the attention of the higher authorities and the common people. What are the factors that pushing committed paramilitaries to the brunt of fratricide and suicidal debatable subject? Is the workload or anything else that enforces them to turn the guns on their colleagues or themselves in distress or anger? The majority of the people, including the ex-servicemansay tension prevails in uniform, which is increasingly common in conflict areas where they are active in the fight against insurgencies, to suppress riots or to maintain civil status, guarding the restive border. Unable to bear the tension, many members of the main paramilitary forces, the CRPF, the BSF, the CISF and even local police have committed suicide or shot their superiors / compatriots with

their service weapon at the scene of work or during their official accommodation.

#### **Optimism in Paramilitary Force Personnel**

Optimism refers to a generalized expectancy in people that favourable things will occur in the future, and unfavourable things will be at minimum (Carver & Scheier, 2014). An optimistic individual views life on a positive note. Optimism resources have the motivational potential that encourages effort and satisfaction in a given task (Carver & Scheier, 2014). Contemporary researchers generally consider optimism as a positive cognitive psychological resource (Carver & Scheier, 2014; Seligman 2006). Carver & Scheier, 2014 strongly argued that the optimism construct has cognitive, emotional, and motivational components. Optimism can be described as a generalized expectancy that individuals experience good outcomes in life (Gillham, 2000). Optimism could be the most powerful predictor of behavior in leading people to persist in goal pursuits. Optimism contains an expectation of a favorable outcome even when unfavorable results could occur. People who might be optimistic engage in more focused coping in stressful situations (Chemers, Watson, & May, 2000; Gillham, 2000). Optimism can help people to adapt and accept the reality of a challenge quickly such as a soldier of paramilitary being sent overseas. Optimistic individuals appear to display less signs of disengagement than someone pessimistic. This could be important for personnel of paramilitary force especially when they need to perform tasks efficiently under a great deal of stress.

An optimistic soldier of the paramilitary forces may feel that his performance deserves to remain in the paramilitary force despite the negative aspects of his career choice. Pessimism, on the other hand, can be associated with decades of poor performance, low achievement and serious psychological distress. Pessimists might be less likely to make efforts to ensure their well-being and will many times engage in self-defeating patterns (Carver & Scheier, 2002). Some pessimists may engage in habits such as substance abuse, sleeping disorders, evading personal situations, or possibly suicide, when dealing with life stress. Optimists cope better when times are tough (Carver & Scheier, 2002).

Researchers have argued that optimism resource serves as a pool of motivational energy to withstand work pressure in a competitive environment (e.g. Carver & Scheier, 2014; Luthans, Avolio, Avey, & Norman, 2007). Jobin, Wrosch, and Scheier (2014) found that those individuals who have high optimism scores reported less stress. Cross-sectional research also shows that optimism is developable with training interventions and indicated a positive relation with work achievements (Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa, & Li 2005; Luthans et al., 2007; Luthans et al., 2008; Luthans et al., 2010; Seligman, 1998, 2006). Research on optimism also found that optimism is positively linked with desirable workplace attitudes like organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and work happiness (Alarcon, Bowling, & Khazon, 2013;

Luthans et al., 2007; Luthans et al., 2008; Larson & Luthans, 2006).

#### **Work Commitment in Paramilitary Force Personnel**

Work commitment is defined as a set of similar, but distinctive attitudinal variables tied to specific organizational foci (Cooper-Hakim and Viswesvaran, 2005). Morrow (1993) first presented a facet design of work commitment that includes work ethic, career commitment, organizational commitment (affective and continuance), and job involvement. The concept of work commitment has received growing attention from researchers and practitioners, covering specific commitment facets such as organisation, work group, occupation, and one's job (Cohen, 1999, 2000; Morrow, 1993; Randall & Cote, 1991). Commitment is complex and a multi-faceted construct, and can take different forms. Work commitment has been defined as the relative importance between work and one's self (Loscoco, 1989). Work commitment is seen as a person's adherence to work ethic, commitment to a career/profession, job involvement, and organizational commitment (Morrow, 1993). Cohen (1993) used a definition of work commitment based on the approach suggested by O'Reilly and Chatman (1986). Accordingly, Cohen (1993 a) defined *work commitments* as affective attachments to one or more of the objects of commitment (organization, occupation, job, and union).

It will be very important to have a work commitment, not only for the benefit of employees, but also for the benefit of the organization. It is the direct result of an effort initiated by the company to increase the engagement of employees and the organizational commitment.

#### **Method**

##### **Purpose**

To find out the predictive power of Occupational Stress and Optimism for Work Commitment in personnel of paramilitary force.

##### **Objective of the Study**

To assess the predictive power of Occupational Stress and Optimism for Work Commitment in personnel of paramilitary force.

##### **Hypothesis**

1. The relationship between Occupational Stress (overall and area wise) and Work Commitment (overall and area wise) is negative.
2. The relationship between Optimism (overall) and Work Commitment (overall and area wise) is positive.
3. The relationship between Occupational Stress (overall and area wise) and Optimism (overall) is negative.
4. Occupational Stress and optimism significantly predict the work commitment in personnel of paramilitary force.

##### **Participants**

The present study was conducted on 200 personnel of paramilitary force; age range of respondents was 40-55 years with the mean of 47. They were all between the income-range of 20,000-65,000.

**Procedure**

All the respondents who consented to participate in this study were briefed about the purpose of the study. Thereafter they were asked to fill the questionnaires related to occupational stress, optimism and work commitment.

**Nature of the Study**

This is a correlational study in nature. Thus a correlational research design is applied for data analysis. The central characteristics of the design is to estimate the intensity of work commitment of paramilitary force personnel in reference to degree of occupational stress, optimism in high demanding work settings of paramilitary force personnel. Search was made on various facets of occupational stress, optimism which will serve as a basis for prediction of work commitment.

**Variables**

In the present study following variables were taken into account.

**Predictor Variables**

1. Occupational Stress
  - i. Role Overload,
  - ii. Role Ambiguity,
  - iii. Role Conflict,
  - iv. Unreasonable Group And Political Pressures,
  - v. Responsibility For Persons,
  - vi. Under Participation
  - vii. Powerlessness
  - viii. Poor- Peer Relations At Work,
  - ix. IntrinsicImprovement,
  - x. Low Status,
  - xi. Strenuous Working Condition And
  - xii. Unprofitability.
2. Optimism

**Criterion Variables**

Work Commitment

1. My Occupation
2. My Organization
3. My Job
4. My Union

**Measures****Occupational Stress Index (OSI)**

The level of occupational stress was assessed with the help of Occupational Stress Index developed and standardized by Srivastava and Singh (1981). The index assesses employees' perceived stress arising from the 12 dimensions of job life. The dimensions are role overload, role ambiguity, role conflict, unreasonable group and political pressures, responsibility for persons, under participation powerlessness poor- peer relations at work, intrinsicimprovement, low status, strenuous working condition and unprofitability. The Occupational Stress Index consists of forty-six statements with five alternative responses, namely strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree, strongly disagree. The reliability and validity of this scale are high.

**Life Orientation Test Revised (LOT-R)**

This scale was developed by **Scheier Carver and Bridges** (1994). This LOT-R consists of 10 items. Of these 10 items, item no. 2, 5, 6, and 8 are filler items only. They are not scored as a part of the revised scale. Items number 1, 3, 4, 7, 9 and 10

are sum items to obtain an overall score. Among the sub-items, item no. 3, 7 and 9 are reverse code items. Among six items three are scored in positive direction and three are scored in negative direction. Respondents are asked to indicate the extent to which they are agreeing with each of the items using the following response format: 0-Strongly Disagree; 1 = Disagree; 2 = Neutral; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree. The reliability and validity of this scale are high.

**Work Commitment Questionnaire**

This questionnaire is developed by Cohen A. (1993). This questionnaire consists of 9 items, three for each dimensions of work commitment (identification, affiliation, and moral involvement). The list of items is organized in matrix form. In this work commitment measure the vertical portion of the matrix includes the nine items that are phrased in general form, whereas the horizontal axis lists the types of work commitment measured in the study (occupation, organization, job, and union). The respondents answer the same questions for each of these four types of commitment. Respondents are asked to answer the same question for each type of commitment using a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The reliability and validity of this scale are also high.

**Results**

The table-1 indicates that the relationship between occupational stress (overall and area wise) and work commitment (overall and area wise) is found to be negative. And the obtained coefficient of correlation is found to be significant. It means that the higher level of the occupational stress the lower will be the work commitment. Thus the H1 is supported.

It is obvious from table-1 that the relationship between optimism and work commitment (overall and area-wise) is found to be significantly positive. This ascertains that when employees have enough optimism there is an increase in work commitment leading to better performance. Therefore the H2 is supported.

The table-1 indicates that the relationship between occupational stress (overall and area wise) and optimism (overall) is found to be negative. And the obtained coefficient of correlation is found to be significant. It means that the higher level of the optimism the lower will be the occupational stress. Thus the H3 is supported.

In table no. 2 Occupational stress and its' dimensions were considered as predictor and my organization as criterion to develop a regression model. Powerlessness, Poor peer relations at work and Unprofitability, passed on the criteria and accounted for a significant amount of variance in my organization,  $R^2 = 0.326$ ,  $F(1, 196) = 4.44$ ,  $p < 0.04$ . It can be inferred that Powerlessness, Poor peer relations at work and Unprofitability explained 32.6% variance in my organization personnel of paramilitary forces. At the  $p < 0.05$  level of significance; there exists enough evidence to conclude that the slope of the regression line is not zero and, hence, that Powerlessness, Poor peer relations at work and Unprofitability are significant predictors of my

## Remarking An Analisation

organization. It suggests that changes in predictor are associated with changes in the criterion variable.

Optimism was considered as predictor and my organization as criterion to develop a regression model. Optimism overall, passed on the criteria and accounted for a significant amount of variance in my organization,  $R^2 = 0.09$ ,  $F(1, 198) = 4.44$ ,  $p < 0.001$ . Optimism overall is significant predictor of my organization.

Occupational stress and optimism including their dimensions were considered as predictors and my organization as criterion to develop a regression model. Powerlessness, Unprofitability, Optimism passed on the criteria and accounted for a significant amount of variance in my organization,  $R^2 = 0.408$ ,  $F(1, 195) = 56.41$ ,  $p < 0.001$ . Powerlessness, Unprofitability, Optimism are significant predictors of my organization.

Table no. 3 depicts Occupational stress and its' dimensions were considered as predictor and my occupation as criterion to develop a regression model. Role overload, Powerlessness, passed on the criteria and accounted for a significant amount of variance in my occupation,  $R^2 = 0.199$ ,  $F(1, 197) = 11.27$ ,  $p < 0.001$ . Cohen's effect size value ( $f^2 = 0.25$ ) suggested a medium strength of association between Role overload, Powerlessness and my occupation.

Optimism was considered as predictor and my occupation as criterion to develop a regression model. Optimism overall, passed on the criteria and accounted for a significant amount of variance in my occupation,  $R^2 = 0.037$ ,  $F(1, 198) = 7.55$ ,  $p < 0.007$ . Optimism overall is significant predictor of my occupation.

Occupational stress and optimism including their dimensions were considered as predictors and my occupation as criterion to develop a regression model. Low status, Strenuous working condition, and Unprofitability passed on the criteria and accounted for a significant amount of variance in my occupation,  $R^2 = 0.319$ ,  $F(1, 195) = 4.16$ ,  $p < 0.04$ . Low status, Strenuous working condition, Unprofitability are significant predictors of my occupation.

Table no. 4 shows that occupational stress and its' dimensions were considered as predictor and my union as criterion to develop a regression model. Role overload, role ambiguity, role conflict, low status, unprofitability passed on the criteria and accounted for a significant amount of variance in my union,  $R^2 = 0.299$ ,  $F(1, 194) = 6.94$ ,  $p < 0.009$ . Role overload, role ambiguity, role conflict, low status, and unprofitability are significant predictors of my union.

Optimism was considered as predictor and my union as criterion to develop a regression model. Optimism overall, passed on the criteria and accounted for a significant amount of variance in my union,  $R^2 = 0.05$ ,  $F(1, 198) = 10.39$ ,  $p < 0.001$ . Optimism overall is significant predictor of my union.

Occupational stress and optimism including their dimensions were considered as predictors and my union as criterion to develop a regression model. Role overload, role ambiguity, role conflict, low status, unprofitability passed on the criteria and accounted for a significant amount of variance in my union,  $R^2 =$

0.340,  $F(1, 193) = 6.24$ ,  $p < 0.01$ . Role overload, role ambiguity, role conflict, low status, unprofitability are significant predictors of my union.

Table no. 5 depicts occupational stress and its' dimensions were considered as predictor and my job as criterion to develop a regression model. Role overload and powerlessness passed on the criteria and accounted for a significant amount of variance in my job,  $R^2 = 0.203$ ,  $F(1, 197) = 14.09$ ,  $p < 0.001$ . Role overload and powerlessness are significant predictors of my job.

Optimism was considered as predictor and my job as criterion to develop a regression model. Optimism overall, passed on the criteria and accounted for a significant amount of variance in my job,  $R^2 = 0.097$ ,  $F(1, 198) = 21.19$ ,  $p < 0.001$ . Optimism overall is significant predictor of my job.

Occupational stress and optimism including their dimensions were considered as predictors and my job as criterion to develop a regression model. Powerlessness, unprofitability, optimism passed on the criteria and accounted for a significant amount of variance in my job,  $R^2 = 0.321$ ,  $F(1, 195) = 6.96$ ,  $p < 0.01$ . Powerlessness, unprofitability, optimism are significant predictors of my job.

Table no. 6 depicts occupational stress and its' dimensions were considered as predictor and work commitment as criterion to develop a regression model. Role overload, powerlessness and unprofitability passed on the criteria and accounted for a significant amount of variance in work commitment,  $R^2 = 0.290$ ,  $F(1, 197) = 6.38$ ,  $p < 0.01$ . Role overload, powerlessness and unprofitability are significant predictors of work commitment.

Optimism was considered as predictor and work commitment as criterion to develop a regression model. Optimism overall, passed on the criteria and accounted for a significant amount of variance in work commitment,  $R^2 = 0.080$ ,  $F(1, 198) = 17.17$ ,  $p < 0.001$ . Optimism overall is significant predictor of work commitment.

Occupational stress, optimism including their dimensions was considered as predictors and work commitment as criterion to develop a regression model. Powerlessness, unprofitability passed on the criteria and accounted for a significant amount of variance in work commitment,  $R^2 = 0.367$ ,  $F(1, 196) = 7.25$ ,  $p < 0.01$ . Powerlessness, unprofitability are significant predictors of work commitment

*Remarking An Analisation*  
TABLE NO- 1

Inter-correlation matrix (Occupational Stress, Optimism and Work Commitment Variables N=200)

Variables		Occupational Stress												Optimism	Work Commitment								
		X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6	X7	X8	X9	X10	X11	X12	X13	X14	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	Y7	Y8
Occupational Stress	X1	1	56**	26**	25**	-02	-45**	-38**	-04**	41**	00	64**	58**	68**	-35**	-39**	-39**	-45**	37	-44**	-34**	-38**	-44**
	X2		1	33**	02	-11	-32**	-19**	-07**	36**	24**	53**	60**	66**	-36**	-32**	-25	-39**	-26**	-29**	-31**	-28**	-34**
	X3			1	11	14*	-15**	-04**	09	11	18*	26**	19**	53**	-15	-07	-05	-02*	-01**	-01	-01	-04	-03**
	X4				1	45**	-16**	-14	-09	14	-13**	26**	09**	39	-12	-04	-17	-09**	-03**	-16	-00	-11	-09**
	X5					1	-09	-21**	09*	-09**	-24**	17*	-03	23*	-15**	-03**	-08**	-02	-01**	-03	-13	-06	-04*
	X6						1	44**	35*	-22*	36	-42**	-48**	-09*	-14*	-26*	-30*	-25**	-32**	-28**	-31**	-23**	-31**
	X7							1	10	10	13**	-36**	-33**	-02	-06**	-49**	-35	-30**	-38**	-36**	-33**	-40**	-42**
	X8								1	-22	29*	10**	-10**	29**	-12	-06	-05	-13	-02*	-04	-14*	-08	-04**
	X9									1	-03	24**	36**	49	-20	-04	-11	-23	-06**	-17*	-12	-04	-12**
	X10										1	10*	-14**	32*	-19*	-12**	-14	-15**	-13**	-14	-15*	-11	-15**
	X11											1	51**	67**	-18**	-29**	-32**	-34*	-26**	-30**	-40**	-18*	-33**
	X12												1	51**	-23**	-42**	-34**	-41**	-32**	-35**	-34**	-38**	-41**
	X13													1	-30	-20**	-23	-27	-13**	-24**	-19**	-18*	-23**
Optimism	X14													1	30	19**	22*	31**	25**	20**	29**	28**	
Work Commitment	Y1														1	72	70**	78**	81**	67**	84**	89**	
	Y2															1	83	77	89**	78**	74**	92**	
	Y3																1	79**	87**	82**	70**	91**	
	Y4																	1	85**	77**	79**	92**	
	Y5																		1	74**	75**	94**	
	Y6																			1	46**	84**	
	Y7																				1	85**	
	Y8																					1	85**

Decimals removed from the coefficients.

p-value: .05 ≤ 0.10, .01 ≤ 0.12, .001 ≤ 0.17

X1-Role overload,X2-Role ambiguity, X3 Role conflict,X4-Unreasonable group and political pressure,X5-Responsibility for the person,X6-Underparticipation,X7-Powerlessness,X8-Poor peer relations at work,X9-Intrinsic impoverishment X10-Low status,X11-Strenuous working condition,X12-Unprofitability, X13-Overall Occupational stress,X14-Overall Optimism, Y1- My Organisation, Y2-My Occupation, Y3-My Union, Y4- My Job, Y5-Affiliation, Y6-Identification, Y7-Moral Involvement, Y8-Overall Work Commitment.

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

TABLE NO- 2

**MLRA: Occupational stress and Optimism as Predictors of My Organization (Criterion)**

Predictor	$\beta$	R	R <sup>2</sup>	$\Delta R^2$	f <sup>2</sup>	F	df	p
<b>Occupational stress</b>	(Model $Y_1 = a + \beta_7 X_7 + \beta_{12} X_{12} + \beta_8 X_8$ )							
X <sub>7</sub>	-1.41	0.49	0.236	-	0.31	61.09	(1,198)	0.001
X <sub>12</sub>	1.43	0.56	0.311	0.075	0.45	21.36	(1,197)	0.001
X <sub>8</sub>	0.41	0.57	0.326	0.015	0.48	4.44	(1,196)	0.036
Constant	45.453							
<b>Optimism</b>	(Model $Y_1 = a + \beta_{14} X_{14}$ )							
X <sub>14</sub>	0.87	0.30	0.090	-	0.10	19.57	(1,198)	0.001
Constant	35.459							
<b>Occupational stress&amp;Optimism</b>	(Model $Y_1 = a + \beta_7 X_7 + \beta_{12} X_{12} + \beta_{14} X_{14}$ )							
X <sub>7</sub>	-1.09	0.49	0.236	-	0.31	61.09	(1,198)	0.001
X <sub>12</sub>	1.07	0.62	0.388	0.055	0.63	17.91	(1,196)	0.001
X <sub>14</sub>	0.43	0.64	0.408	0.020	0.69	6.34	(1,195)	0.013
Constant	21.342							

X<sub>7</sub>= Powerlessness, X<sub>8</sub>= Poor peer relations at work, X<sub>12</sub>= Unprofitability, X<sub>14</sub>= Optimism, Y<sub>1</sub>= My Organization

TABLE NO. 3

**MLRA: Occupational stress and Optimism as Predictors of My Occupation (Criterion)**

Predictor	$\beta$	R	R <sup>2</sup>	$\Delta R^2$	f <sup>2</sup>	F	df	p
<b>Occupational stress</b>	(Model $Y_2 = a + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_7 X_7$ )							
X <sub>1</sub>	0.61	0.39	0.154	-	0.18	35.92	(1,198)	0.001
X <sub>7</sub>	-0.78	0.45	0.199	0.045	0.25	11.27	(1,197)	0.001
Constant	40.481							
<b>Optimism</b>	(Model $Y_2 = a + \beta_{14} X_{14}$ )							
X <sub>14</sub>	0.53	0.19	0.037	-	0.04	7.55	(1,198)	0.007
Constant	39.819							
<b>Occupational stress&amp;Optimism</b>	(Model $Y_2 = a + \beta_{12} X_{12} + \beta_{11} X_{11} + \beta_{10} X_{10}$ )							
X <sub>12</sub>	0.68	0.53	0.285	0.067	0.40	18.36	(1,197)	0.001
X <sub>11</sub>	0.63	0.55	0.305	0.020	0.44	5.62	(1,196)	0.019
X <sub>10</sub>	-0.56	0.57	0.319	0.014	0.47	4.16	(1,195)	0.043
Constant	2.302							

X<sub>1</sub>= Role overload, X<sub>7</sub>= Powerlessness, X<sub>10</sub>= Low status, X<sub>11</sub>= Strenuous working condition, X<sub>12</sub>= Unprofitability, X<sub>14</sub>= Optimism, Y<sub>2</sub>= My Occupation

TABLE NO- 4

<b>MLRA: Occupational stress and Optimism as Predictors of My Union (Criterion)</b>									
Predictor	$\beta$	R	R <sup>2</sup>	$\Delta R^2$	f <sup>2</sup>	F	df	p	
<b>Occupational stress</b> (Model $Y_3 = a + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_{12} X_{12} + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_{10} X_{10}$ )									
X <sub>1</sub>	0.59	0.45	0.198	-	0.25	49.04	(1,198)	0.001	
X <sub>12</sub>	0.34	0.48	0.231	0.033	0.30	8.25	(1,197)	0.005	
X <sub>3</sub>	-0.53	0.50	0.254	0.023	0.34	6.02	(1,196)	0.015	
X <sub>2</sub>	0.77	0.52	0.274	0.020	0.38	5.57	(1,195)	0.019	
X <sub>10</sub>	-0.79	0.55	0.299	0.025	0.43	6.94	(1,194)	0.009	
Constant	37.111								
<b>Optimism</b> (Model $Y_3 = a + \beta_{14} X_{14}$ )									
X <sub>14</sub>	0.61	0.22	0.050	-	0.05	10.39	(1,198)	0.001	
Constant	38.650								
<b>Occupational stress&amp;Optimism</b> (Model $Y_3 = a + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_{12} X_{12} + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_{10} X_{10}$ )									
X <sub>1</sub>	0.36	0.45	0.198	-	0.25	49.04	(1,198)	0.001	
X <sub>12</sub>	0.45	0.52	0.274	0.039	0.38	10.56	(1,196)	0.001	
X <sub>3</sub>	-0.54	0.54	0.296	0.022	0.42	6.17	(1,195)	0.014	
X <sub>2</sub>	0.77	0.56	0.319	0.023	0.47	6.30	(1,194)	0.013	
X <sub>10</sub>	-0.73	0.58	0.340	0.021	0.52	6.24	(1,193)	0.013	
Constant	20.876								
<i>X<sub>1</sub>= Role overload, X<sub>2</sub>= Role ambiguity, X<sub>3</sub>= Role conflict, X<sub>10</sub>= Low status, X<sub>12</sub>= Unprofitability, X<sub>14</sub>= Optimism, Y<sub>3</sub>= My Union</i>									

Table No- 5

<b>MLRA: Occupational stress and Optimism as Predictors of My Job (Criterion)</b>									
Predictor	$\beta$	R	R <sup>2</sup>	$\Delta R^2$	f <sup>2</sup>	F	df	p	
<b>Occupational stress</b> (Model $Y_4 = a + \beta_7 X_7 + \beta_1 X_1$ )									
X <sub>7</sub>	-0.90	0.38	0.146	-	0.17	33.84	(1,198)	0.001	
X <sub>1</sub>	0.49	0.45	0.203	0.057	0.25	14.09	(1,197)	0.001	
Constant	46.691								
<b>Optimism</b> (Model $Y_4 = a + \beta_{14} X_{14}$ )									
X <sub>14</sub>	0.81	0.31	0.097	-	0.11	21.19	(1,198)	0.001	
Constant	38.065								
<b>Occupational stress&amp;Optimism</b> (Model $Y_4 = a + \beta_{12} X_{12} + \beta_7 X_7 + \beta_{14} X_{14}$ )									
X <sub>12</sub>	0.70	0.53	0.275	0.056	0.38	15.39	(1,197)	0.001	
X <sub>7</sub>	-0.61	0.55	0.297	0.022	0.42	5.98	(1,196)	0.015	
X <sub>14</sub>	0.44	0.57	0.321	0.024	0.47	6.96	(1,195)	0.009	
Constant	17.669								
<i>X<sub>1</sub>= Role overload, X<sub>7</sub>= Powerlessness, X<sub>12</sub>= Unprofitability, X<sub>14</sub>= Optimism, Y<sub>4</sub>= My Job</i>									

Table No- 6

<b>MLRA: Occupational stress and Optimism as Predictors of Work Commitment (Criterion)</b>									
Predictor	$\beta$	R	R <sup>2</sup>	$\Delta R^2$	f <sup>2</sup>	F	df	p	
<b>Occupational stress</b> (Model $Y_5 = a + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_7 X_7 + \beta_{12} X_{12}$ )									
X <sub>1</sub>	1.66	0.44	0.194	-	0.24	47.70	(1,198)	0.001	
X <sub>7</sub>	-3.28	0.52	0.267	.073	0.36	19.57	(1,197)	0.001	
X <sub>12</sub>	3.11	0.54	0.290	.023	0.41	6.38	(1,197)	0.012	
Constant	161.475								
<b>Optimism</b> (Model $Y_5 = a + \beta_{14} X_{14}$ )									
X <sub>14</sub>	2.82	0.28	0.080	-	0.09	17.17	(1,198)	0.001	
Constant	151.993								
<b>Occupational stress&amp;Optimism</b> (Model $Y_5 = a + \beta_{12} X_{12} + \beta_7 X_7 + \beta_{14} X_{14}$ )									
X <sub>12</sub>	4.72	0.59	0.344	0.107	0.52	32.01	(1,197)	0.001	
X <sub>7</sub>	-2.13	0.61	0.367	0.023	0.58	7.25	(1,196)	0.008	
Constant	60.022								
<i>X<sub>1</sub>= Role overload, X<sub>7</sub>= Powerlessness, X<sub>12</sub>= Unprofitability, X<sub>14</sub>= Optimism, Y<sub>5</sub>= Work Commitment</i>									

**Discussion**

It is to be pointed out that work commitment by and large is considered as the enthusiasm of an employee for his assigned tasks at a workplace. It is the sense of responsibility someone has for the goals,

mission and vision of the organization with which they are associated.

The high level of employee satisfaction in an organization is related to the work commitment and their involvement in their organization. This translates

into higher business performance, resulting in higher profitability, productivity, employee retention and overall improvement of the working environment.

The study suggests that work commitment may be influenced by occupational stress, optimism. Gaining a greater understanding of the processes related to work commitment has implications for employees, organizations, and society as a whole. Thus work commitment would appear to have potentially serious consequences for overall performance.

Occupational stress has become a serious health issue, not just in terms of an individual's mental and physical well-being, but also for employers and governments who have begun to assess the financial consequences of work stress. Lou and Shiao (1997) estimate that occupational stress causes half of all absenteeism, 40% of turnover, and that 5% of the total workforce accounts for the reduced productivity due to preventable stress (300 billion dollars for the US economy annually).

Interacting with these work stressors are the individual's characteristics. These are brought to the workplace rather than being a function of it, but they are important ingredients in occupational stress nonetheless. These characteristics include the worker's level of anxiety, tolerance of ambiguity; Type A behaviour pattern, and others (Greenberg, 1990). Perhaps the most predictable consequence of job stress is the report of overall job dissatisfaction. The employee feels little motivation to go to work, to do a good job while at work, or to stay on the job (Rice, 1992).

Optimism has demonstrated some effects on stress reduction and facilitated psychological functioning as well. People who hold generalized positive expectancies (dispositional optimists) have reported less mood disturbance in dealing with a variety of stressors, including adaptation to college (Aspinwall & Taylor, 1992; Scheier & Carver, 1992), breast cancer biopsy (Stanton & Snider, 1993) and breast cancer surgery (Carver et al., 1993). Positive thinking may serve as a safeguard against the health-threatening effects of stress (Peterson, 2000). The potential to cope actively and proactively with respect to health may help to lessen adverse physiological effects of stress.

The role of optimism in employee performance is positively linked to work motivation and life satisfaction (Alarcon et al. 2013; Avey, Reichard, Luthans, & Mhatre, 2011). Campbell et al. (1993) argued that effort is one of the key factors of human performance. According to expectancy-value theory an optimistic employee expects positive outcomes, and is therefore, likely to put in constant efforts, and thereby, his performance may get enhanced (Bandura, 1995; Larson & Luthans, 2006; Luthans et al., 2007; Youssef & Luthans, 2007). Optimistic explanatory style increase job satisfaction, well-being, and organizational commitment at work because optimistic individuals attribute failure to external causes and assume that adverse situations are beyond their personal control (Seligman, 1998; Youssef & Luthans, 2007).

## Conclusion

In the present study multiple regression analysis suggests that three dimensions of occupational stress (Powerlessness, Poor peer relations at work and Unprofitability) and optimism are the important predictors of my organization. Analysis also suggests that two dimensions of occupational stress (Role overload, Powerlessness) and optimism are the important predictors of my occupation. Analysis suggests that five dimensions of occupational stress (role overload, role ambiguity, role conflict, low status, unprofitability) and optimism are the important predictors of my union. Multiple regression analysis suggests that two dimensions of occupational stress (role overload, powerlessness) and optimism are the important predictors of my job. This analysis suggests that three dimensions of occupational stress (role overload, powerlessness, unprofitability) and optimism are the important predictors of work commitment. It suggests that changes in predictor are associated with changes in the criterion variable. The present study was conducted only on paramilitary force. Further studies can be conducted on different forces or department. In this study only global work commitment score was studied with occupational stress and optimism. We could also study the dimensions of work commitment with occupational stress and optimism separately. Indian paramilitary force personnel are always subject to call, "overworked, overburdened and overused, it's a hard day's life for paramilitary force personnel who is just not seen as the friendly neighbourhood cop by the common man." Thus Occupational Stress associated with personnel can be managed by following optimistic training, by following this personnel can provide a quality service to the country and maintain their work commitment.

## References

- Alarcon, G. M., Bowling, N. A., & Khazon, S. (2013). Great expectation: A meta-analytic examination of optimism and hope. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 54 (7), 821-827, doi:10.1016/j.paid.2012.12.004
- Aspinwall, I.G., & Taylor, S.E. (1992). Modeling cognitive adaptation: A longitudinal investigation of the impact of individual differences and coping on college adjustment and performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 989-1003.
- Avey, J. B., Reichard, R. J., Luthans, F., & Mhatre, K. H. (2011). Meta-analysis of the impact of positive psychological capital on employee attitudes, behaviours, and performance. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 22 (2), 127-152, doi:10.1002/hrdq.20070
- Bandura, A. (1995). Exercise of personal and collective efficacy in changing societies. In A. Bandura (Eds.), *Self-efficacy in changing societies* (pp.1-45). Cambridge, New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, J. P. McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H., & Sager, C. E. (1993). A theory of performance. In N.



- Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp.35-70). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier M. F. (2002). *Optimism*. In C. R. Snyder, & S. J. Lopez (Eds.). *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 231-243). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (2014). *Dispositional Optimism*. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 18 (6), 293-299. doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2014.02.003
- Chemers, M. M., Watson, C. B., & May, S. T. (2000). *Dispositional affect and leadership effectiveness: A comparison of self-esteem, optimism, and efficacy*. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 267-277.
- Cohen, A. (1993a). "Organizational Commitment and Turnover: A Meta- Analysis." *Academy of Management Journal*, 36 (5): 1140-1157.
- Cohen, A. (1993b). "Work Commitment in Relation to Withdrawal Intentions and Union Effectiveness." *Journal of Business Research*, 26(1): 75-90.
- Cohen, A. (1999). "Relationships among Five Forms of Commitment: An Empirical Assessment." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20 (3): 285-308.
- Cohen, A. (2000). "The Relationship Between Commitment Forms and Work Outcomes: A Comparison of Three Models." *Human Relations*, 53 (3): 387-417.
- Cooper-Hakim, A. and Viswesvaran, C. (2005), "The construct of work commitment: testing an integrative framework", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 131 No. 2, pp. 241-59.
- Gillham, J. (2000). *The science of optimism and hope*. Radnor, PA: Templeton Foundation Press.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). *Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow*. *Journal of Management*, 16, 399-432.
- Jobin, J., Wrosch, C., and Scheier, M. F. (2014). *Associations between dispositional optimism and diurnal cortisol in a community sample: When stress is perceived as higher than normal*. *Health Psychology*, 33 (4), 382-391. doi:10.1037/a0032736
- Larson, M., & Luthans, F. (2006). *Potential added value of psychological capital in predicting work attitude*. *Journal of Leadership and Organisational Studies*, 13 (2), 75-92, doi:10.1177/10717919070130020601
- Loscocco, K. A. (1989). *The interplay of personal and job characteristics in determining work commitment*. *Social Science Research*, 18, 370-394.
- Lou, L. & Shian, C (1997). *Occupational stress in clinical nurses' .Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 10(1), 39-51.
- Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2007). *Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction*. *Personnel Psychology*, 60 (03), 541-572. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00083.x
- Luthans, F., Avey, J. B., Avolio, B. J., & Peterson, S. J. (2010). *The development and resulting performance impact of positive psychological capital*. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 21 (1), 41-67. doi:10.1002/hrdq.20034
- Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Li, W. (2005). *The psychological capital of Chinese workers: Exploring the relationship with performance*. *Management and Organizational Review*, 1 (2), 247-269. doi:10.1111/j.1740-8784.2005.00011.x
- Luthans, F., Norman, S. M., Avolio, B. J., & Avey, J. B. (2008). *The mediating role of psychological capital in the supporting organizational climate-employee performance relationship*. *Journal of organizational behaviour*, 29 (2), 219-238. doi:10.1002/job.507
- Morrow, P.C. (1993), *The Theory and Measurement of Work Commitment*, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT.
- O'Reilly, C.A., & Chatman, J. (1986), *Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification and internalization on prosocial behavior*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 492-499.
- Peterson, C. (2000). *The future of optimism*. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 44-55.
- Randall, M. D., & Cote, J. A. (1991). "Interrelationships of Work Commitment Constructs." *Work and Occupation*, 18 (2): 194-211.
- Rice, P. L. (1992). *Stress & Health* (2nd Ed.) Pacific Grove, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Singh Lather A., Aggarwal V., Samantray L. M., University School of Management Studies, GGS Indraprastha University, Delhi. *Symbiosis Centre for Management and HRD Vol 3, No. 2*
- Scheier, M.F., & Carver, C.S. (1992). *Effects of optimism on psychological and physical well-being: Theoretical overview and empirical update*. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 16(2), 201-228.
- Seligman, M. (1998). *Learned Optimism*, New York, NY: Pocket Books.
- Seligman, M. E., (2006). *Learned Optimism. How to change your mind and your life*. New York: Vintage.
- Stanton, A.L., & Snider, P.R. (1993). *Coping with a breast cancer diagnosis: A prospective study*. *Health psychology*, 12. 16-23.
- Youssef, C. M., & Luthans, F. (2007). *Positive organizational behaviour in the workplace the impact of hope, optimism, and resilience*. *Journal of Management*, 33 (5), 774-800, doi:10.1177/0149206307305562