

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

In the research study “Occupational Stressors of Psychological Officers in the Three Southern Border Provinces”, the researcher mailed 144 copies of questionnaire to the commander of Psychological Battalion in order to distribute them to all 144 psychological officers in the mentioned area. However, there were only 88 officers or 61.11% of the total subjects who completely filled out and returned the questionnaire back to the researcher.

This chapter reports the results of the study based on the data collected from the respondents who completed the questionnaire. Summary tables are used to present the results and support the discussions. The results of the study are separated into 3 parts based on the parts of the questionnaire.

4.1 PARTICIPANTS’ PERSONAL INFORMATION

4.1.1 Age

The respondents’ ages ranged from 20 to 60 years old. Most of them (48.9%) were between 41-50 years old and 29.5% of them were 51-60 years old. The minority groups were those who were 30-40 years old (11.4%) and 20-30 years old (10.2%).

Table 2. Age

Age	Frequency	Percent (%)
20 – 30	9	10.2
30 – 40	10	11.4
41 – 50	43	48.9
51 – 60	26	29.5
Total	88	100.0

4.1.2 Rank

Most of the respondents (90.9%) were non-commissioned officers while only 9.1% of them were commissioned officers.

Table 3. Rank

Rank	Frequency	Percent (%)
Non-commissioned officer	80	90.9
Commissioned officer	8	9.1
Total	88	100.0

4.1.3 Marital status

The majority of the respondents (87.5%) were married while only 6.8% and 5.7% of them were single and divorced respectively.

Table 4. Marital Status

Marital Status	Frequency	Percent (%)
Single	6	6.8
Married	77	87.5
Divorce	5	5.7
Total	88	100.0

4.1.4 Educational background

Of the 88 respondents, 72.7% of them had a lower education than a bachelor's degree. The rest of them (27.3%) had a bachelor's degree.

Table 5. Educational Background

Educational Background	Frequency	Percent (%)
under bachelor degree	64	72.7
bachelor degree	24	27.3
Total	88	100.0

4.1.5 Service period in Psychological Battalion

The majority of the respondents (71.6%) had served in this battalion for more than 16 years. 18.2% and 10.2% of them worked there for 5-15 and less than 5 years respectively.

Table 6. Service period in Psychological Battalion

Service Period	Frequency	Percent (%)
under 5 years	9	10.2
5-15 years	16	18.2
over 16 years	63	71.6
Total	88	100.0

4.2 LEVELS OF STRESS CAUSED BY OCCUPATIONAL STRESSORS

4.2.1 Work conditions

The two most significant occupational stressors were having unqualified ability for the assigned tasks (mean score = 3.50) and having assigned tasks that do not match up with their skills (mean score = 3.35). The two least significant ones were having to finish heavy workload within a limited period of time (mean score = 2.49) and lacking balance between workload and number of personnel (mean score = 2.70).

Table 7. Stress Level caused by Work Conditions

Situation	Have faced the situation?			\bar{X}	SD	Level of Stress
	Yes	No	Total			
1. Having to finish heavy workload within a limited period of time	41	47	88	2.49	.952	Low
	46.6%	53.4%	100%			
2. Having inappropriate ability for the workload	10	78	88	2.90	.876	Moderate
	11.4%	88.6%	100%			
3. Lacking balance between workload and number of personnel	46	42	88	2.70	1.171	Moderate
	52.3%	47.7%	100%			
4. Conducting risky operation	56	32	88	3.09	1.149	Moderate
	63.6%	36.4%	100%			
5. Lacking balance between workload and salary	49	39	88	3.18	1.034	Moderate
	55.7%	44.3%	100%			

(table continues)

Table 7. (continued)

Situation	Have faced the situation?			\bar{X}	SD	Level of Stress
	Yes	No	Total			
	46.6%	53.4%	100%			
6. Having assigned tasks that do not match up with your skills.	17 19.3%	71 80.7%	88 100%	3.35	1.412	Moderate
7. Having to be highly responsible for lives and property	40 45.5%	48 54.5%	88 100%	3.33	1.163	Moderate
8. Having urgent assignment	41 46.6%	47 53.4%	88 100%	3.20	.843	Moderate
9. Being so bored with work that you become stressed	22 25.0%	66 75.0%	88 100%	2.86	1.356	Moderate
10. having unqualified ability for the assigned tasks	14 15.9%	74 84.1%	88 100%	3.50	1.345	High
11. Conducting the tasks in the area for too long, but having too short vacation	34 38.6%	54 61.4%	88 100%	3.32	1.147	Moderate
12. Living so far away from home that causes homesick	74 84.1%	14 15.9%	88 100%	3.14	1.077	Moderate

4.2.2 Organization roles

The two most significant occupational stressors related to this matter were having ambiguous roles and duties (mean score = 3.76) and having no freedom to express opinions related to work (mean score = 3.48). The least significant one was being assigned to do something that is not in your job description or responsibility (mean score = 2.65).

Table 8. Stress Level Caused by Organization Roles

Situation	Have faced the situation?			\bar{X}	SD	Level of Stress
	Yes	No	Total			
13. Having no freedom to express opinions related to work	29 33.0%	59 67.0%	88 100%	3.48	1.122	High
14. Having ambiguous roles and duties	17 19.3%	71 80.7%	88 100%	3.76	1.091	High
15. Having unfair division of duties and responsibilities	13 14.8%	75 85.2%	88 100%	3.15	1.463	Moderate
16. Being assigned to do something that is not in your job description or responsibility	40 45.5%	48 54.5%	88 100%	2.65	1.001	Moderate
17. Having no opportunity to participate in decision-making	29 33.0%	59 67.0%	88 100%	3.10	1.175	Moderate
18. Lacking freedom to conduct your mission	22 25.0%	66 75.0%	88 100%	3.27	1.162	Moderate

4.2.3 Work relationships

The two most significant occupational stressors of this group were lacking cooperation from the local units/ organizations (mean score = 3.44) and being suspicious of people around you (mean score = 3.28). The least two significant ones were having no acceptance in work capability from colleagues (mean score = 2.25) and lacking coordination from colleagues (mean score = 2.50).

Table 9. Stress Level Caused by Work Relationship

Situation	Have faced the situation?			— X	SD	Level of Stress
	Yes	No	Total			
19. Lacking smooth relationship with commanders	19	69	88	2.84	1.385	Moderate
	21.6%	78.4%	100%			
20. Having commanders who do not trust your ability.	14	74	88	2.86	1.167	Moderate
	15.9%	84.1%	100%			
21. Lacking counsel/ advices from the commanders	13	75	88	3.00	1.354	Moderate
	14.8%	85.2%	100%			
22. Having no confidence in commanders' ability	8	80	88	2.75	1.581	Moderate
	9.1%	90.9%	100%			
23. Lacking cooperation from the local units/ organizations	18	70	88	3.44	1.097	High
	20.5%	79.5%	100%			
24. Lacking support/ advices from colleagues	8	80	88	2.75	1.282	Moderate
	9.1%	90.9%	100%			
25. Lacking coordination from colleagues	10	78	88	2.50	1.269	Low
	11.4%	88.6%	100%			
26. Having no acceptance in work capability from colleagues	4	84	88	2.25	1.258	Low
	4.5%	95.5%	100%			
27. Lacking no cooperation from the local people	27	61	88	3.04	1.344	Moderate
	30.7%	69.3%	100%			
28. The locals do not trust you	21	67	88	3.10	1.261	Moderate
	23.9%	76.1%	100%			
29. Conducting missions that are being affected by different religions and languages	42	46	88	3.26	1.083	Moderate
	47.7%	52.3%	100%			
30. Being suspicious of people around you	29	59	88	3.28	1.251	Moderate
	33.0%	67.0%	100%			

4.2.4 Career improvements

Lacking training or opportunity to improve oneself as expected was the most significant occupational stressor in this group (mean score = 3.32) followed by

lacking opportunity to get promotion (mean score = 3.25). The two least significant stressors were lacking pride in work (mean score = 2.29) and lacking support in general (mean score = 2.68)

Table 10. Stress Level caused by Career Improvements

Situation	Have faced the situation?			\bar{X}	SD	Level of Stress
	Yes	No	Total			
31. Lacking support in general	63	25	88	2.68	1.280	Moderate
	71.6%	28.4%	100%			
32. Lacking training or opportunity to improve yourself as expected	22	66	88	3.32	1.249	Moderate
	25.0%	75.0%	100%			
33. Being underestimated by commanders	11	77	88	3.18	1.401	Moderate
	12.5%	87.5%	100%			
34. Lacking opportunity to get promotion	24	64	88	3.25	1.294	Moderate
	27.3%	72.7%	100%			
35. Lacking pride in work	7	81	88	2.29	1.113	Low
	8.0%	92.0%	100%			

4.2.5 Organizational structure and climate

The two most significant stressors were being treated unfairly by the commander (mean score = 3.54) and having no transparency in operational budget spending and provision of benefit, allowance and welfare (mean score = 3.41). The two least significant ones were being assigned to work in a unit that you are not familiar with because of the lack of personnel (mean score = 2.66) and ineffective communication in the unit (means score = 2.68).

Table 11. Stress Level Caused by Organizational Structure and Climate

Situation	Have faced the situation?			\bar{X}	SD	Level of Stress
	Yes	No	Total			
36. Having inappropriate organizational structure or labor division	21	67	88	3.33	1.238	Moderate
	23.9%	76.1%	100%			
37. Working for commanders who do not have a clear administrative policy	16	72	88	3.13	1.204	Moderate
	18.2%	81.8%	100%			
38. Having opinions which are inconsistent with your unit's concept of operation	13	75	88	2.77	1.166	Moderate
	14.8%	85.2%	100%			
39. Discrimination, obstruction or covert support in your unit	16	72	88	3.06	1.237	Moderate
	18.2%	81.8%	100%			
40. Being threatened to be discharged or relocated	8	80	88	3.13	1.246	Moderate
	9.1%	90.9%	100%			
41. Ineffective communication in the unit	19	69	88	2.68	1.250	Moderate
	21.6%	78.4%	100%			
42. Gaining no protection nor responsibility on your tasks from your commanders	10	78	88	3.40	1.265	Moderate
	11.4%	88.6%	100%			
43. Being assigned to work in the unit that you are not familiar with because of the lack of personnel	35	53	88	2.66	1.110	Moderate
	39.8%	60.2%	100%			

(Table continues)

Table 11. (continued)

Situation	Have faced the situation?			\bar{X}	SD	Level of Stress
	Yes	No	Total			
44. Unreasonable criteria for performance evaluation in the unit are not reasonable	16	72	88	3.13	1.408	Moderate
	18.2%	81.8%	100%			
45. Inadequate and/or ineffective unit's weapons, tool and equipment	69	19	88	3.35	1.258	Moderate
	78.4%	21.6%	100%			
46. Having no transparency in operational budget spending and provision of benefit, allowance and welfare	44	44	88	3.41	1.187	High
	50.0%	50.0%	100%			
47. Being treated unfairly by the commander	13	75	88	3.54	1.391	High
	14.8%	85.2%	100%			
48. Having sensitive issues, for example misunderstanding and disunity among colleagues in your unit	14	74	88	3.07	1.385	Moderate
	15.9%	84.1%	100%			
49. Unsuitable physical environment for working, for example the weather is too hot, the office is too small and too noisy	22	66	88	3.05	.999	Moderate
	25.0%	75.0%	100%			
50. Lacking of incentive, for example daily allowance, hazardous duty pay and effective medical care promotion to create a good morale	33	55	88	3.12	1.269	Moderate
	37.5%	62.5%	100%			

4.2.6 Overview of levels of stress caused by 5 main occupational stressors

Overall, the most significant occupational stressor of psychological officers in the three southern border provinces was organization role (mean score =

3.16) followed by organizational structure and climate (mean score = 3.15); work conditions (mean score = 3.07); and work relationship (mean score = 3.06). The least significant occupational stressor was career improvement factor (mean score = 2.92). All of these main occupational stressors contributed to a moderate level of stress to the psychological officers in the deep South.

Table 12. Level of Stress Caused All 5 Main Occupational Stressors

Occupational Stressor	Very high	High	Moderate	Low	Very low	Total	\bar{x}	SD	Level of Stress
Work Conditions	53 11.9%	96 21.6%	166 37.4%	86 19.4%	43 9.7%	444 100%	3.07	1.128	Moderate
Organization Roles	27 18.0%	26 17.3%	51 34.0%	36 24.0%	10 6.7%	150 100%	3.16	1.176	Moderate
Work Relationships	38 17.8%	33 15.5%	70 32.9%	48 22.5%	24 11.3%	213 100%	3.06	1.244	Moderate
Career Improvements	20 15.7%	24 18.9%	27 21.3%	38 29.9%	18 14.2%	127 100%	2.92	1.301	Moderate
Organizational Structure & climate	47 13.5%	110 31.5%	82 23.5%	67 19.2%	43 12.3%	349 100%	3.15	1.234	Moderate

4.3 COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.3.1 Indicators of stress

Most of the respondents (40.9%) did not give any response so it was difficult to report whether they did not have any indicators of stress or they just did not want to answer. 39.8% of them identified that they did not have any indicator of stress. 17% of them stated that they felt irritated. There were two of them (1.1%) had decreased sexual satisfaction and felt worried.

Table 13. Indicators of Stress

Response	Frequency	Percent (%)
No answer	36	40.9
No indicator	35	39.8
Feel irritated	15	17.0
Have decreased sexual satisfaction	1	1.1
Feel worried	1	1.1
Total	88	100.0

4.3.2 Additional comment or recommendation about occupational stress

There were only 3.4% of the respondents responded to this part of questionnaire, and all of them made the same statement that they received their allowance later than expected.

Table 13. Additional Comment or Recommendation

Response	Frequency	Percent (%)
No answer	85	96.59
The payment for soldiers' allowance was delayed	3	3.4
Total	88	100.0

The findings of the study will be summarized and discussed in the next chapter.