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SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Everyday life of every citizen is complex in these modern days. The role of behavioural science in this regard cannot be over-emphasized. Organisations, be they industrial, social, religious, service, governmental, or non-governmental have all the need for behavioural understanding. The understanding may refer to the organisation as a whole or the individuals comprising it. Police as a service and a governmental organisation needs a special attention, for obvious reasons. There are several layers of policemen in the hierarchical order of the police force of a state. The layer that comes into close contact with the public is at the lower level of the police constables and head constables otherwise referred to as constabulary.

Modern Indian socio-political scenario with all its complexity has brought new roles and responsibilities to the police force as a whole. The success of the police force depends upon, therefore, personal characteristics and capabilities as their primary assets and they are continuously influenced by the socio-political scenario on the one hand and socio-economic profile and personality of the personnel in the police force on the other. The present study focussed on the police organisation. The police organisation being very vast, majority and the crucial personnel at the cutting edge level where the common man comes into contact with the police namely the constabulary was taken for the study. In India research studies about the police organisation are very limited. The present study is a pioneer attempt at a systematic in-depth study of the police constabulary of Tamilnadu.
The Present Study:

The present exercise was an attempt to study the socio-economic profile and personality of the constabulary of the Tamilnadu police force in relation to repeated adverse notice, corruption and good conduct of the constabulary as found in the police records. The approach was psychological through the use of the 16 PF test, Form E in addition to the interview schedule for obtaining data relating to socio-economic factors.

Objectives of the Study:

1. To identify the socio-economic factors relating to the three kinds of behaviour of the police constabulary and to know differences if any in the socio-economic factors among the three groups, namely, those who came to repeated adverse notice, those who were found guilty of corruption charges and those who received awards for good conduct.

2. To identify the personality factors that differentiate the three groups.

While several factors have been related to behaviour characterised as criminal, delinquent or good, socio-economic factors and personality appear to be prominent. Therefore in the present investigation socio-economic aspects and personality factors were considered. The respondents were the police constables and head constables who came for repeated adverse notice, corruption charge and those who received awards for good conduct.
For an assessment of socio-economic aspects an interview schedule consisting of 42 questions and for the personality factors, Cattel’s 16 Personality Factor questionnaire Form E were used. For the purpose of the present study the following hypotheses were formulated and tested:

A - Socio Economic Factors

Main Hypothesis

1. The criterion groups namely, adverse notice, corruption charges and awardees of police constabulary differ in their socio-economic background.

In order to test the above hypothesis the following secondary hypotheses were formulated:

1. Misconduct and corruption are not out of ignorance
2. Adverse notice and corrupt groups deny the charges.
3. Rewardees group exhibit constructive activity outside their normal routine duties while adverse and corrupt groups do not have such worthwhile activities.
4. Awardees have more peaceful life than the adverse notice and corrupt groups.
5. The adverse notice and corrupt groups are aware of the consequences of their action.
6. Incidence of indebtedness is high in adverse notice and corrupt groups.
7. Incidence of alcoholism is high in adverse notice and corrupt groups.

8. Rewardees come from families where there is free interaction among members. They lead a happy life.

9. Adverse notice and corrupt groups blame others for their action.

10. Those detected and punished repent for their misconduct.

B - PERSONALITY

Main Hypothesis

II The criterion groups namely, adverse notice, corrupt and rewardees amongst police constabulary differ among themselves in personality:

The above stated hypothesis was approached through the following secondary hypotheses.

1. Adverse notice group and corrupt group do not differ significantly on the 16 Personality Factors.

2. Adverse notice group and corrupt group score lower than rewardees group on Factors A (reserved, detached, cool); B (less intelligent), C (emotionally less stable), G (expedient, evades rules); higher on Factor M (careless of practical matters), lower on Q3 (undisciplined self-conflict, careless of protocol).
3. Rewardees group score higher than adverse notice and corrupt groups on Factor A (outgoing, warm-hearted, participating), B (intelligent, abstract thinking, bright), C (emotionally stable), E (assertive), F (happy-go-lucky, gay, enthusiastic), G (conscientious rule bound), M (venturesome, socially bold, spontaneous), I (tender minded, sensitive), lower on N (forthright, natural, sentimental), O (placid, self-assured, confident, serene), higher on Q2 (self-sufficient, resourceful, prefers own decisions), higher on Q3 (controlled, socially precise with self concept), lower on Q4 (relaxed, tranquil, unfrustrated, low ergic tension).

These several hypotheses were put to empirical test and within the limitation of the present study the following conclusions were derived.

CONCLUSIONS

Socio-economic factors

1. The adverse notice and corrupt groups feel that action taken against them is not justified.

2. In general the adverse notice group and corrupt group think that they can get away with their misconduct.

3. The adverse notice group and corrupt group are aware of what constitutes misconduct.
4. A bulk of adverse notice group and corrupt group believe that their bad conduct cannot be justified.

5. Opinion among both adverse notice group and corrupt group is equally divided about the possibility of avoiding misconduct.

6. Family worries do not constitute a major factor in misconduct.

7. Denial of misconduct is a common phenomena.

8. Rewardees group has some kind of constructive activities outside their normal routine duties while adverse notice and corrupt groups do not have such activities.

9. Rewardees have a more peaceful family life than the adverse notice and corrupt groups.

10. The adverse notice group feel a sense of shame and remorse on detection.

11. No specific trend could be detected as to who was responsible for misconduct of members of adverse notice and corrupt groups.

12. The adverse notice group and corrupt group feel that their friends and colleagues treat them with pitty.

13. Constabulary are aware that good conduct brings in awards.

14. While rewardees are the least indebted, adverse notice group are highly indebted with corrupt group coming in between these two groups.
15. The misconduct group feel that their bad behaviour is situational.

16. Alcoholism is very high among adverse notice group. Next comes the corrupt group while awardees are not given to alcoholism.

17. The police constabulary feel that proper training would eliminate bad conduct.

**Personality Factors**

**Inference drawn from Univariate analysis:**

18. Adverse notice group scores significantly lower than corrupt group on Factor G (Expedient Vs Conscientious).

19. Adverse notice group score significantly lower than corrupt group on Factor O (Placid, self-assured Vs Tense, lacking self assurance).

20. Adverse notice group score significantly lower than awardees group on Factor G (Expedient Vs Conscientious).

21. Adverse notice group score significantly higher than awardees on Factor O (Tense Vs Placid).

22. Adverse notice group score significantly lower than awardees on Factor Q-3 (Uncontrolled, low self concept Vs. Controlled, disciplined).
23. Awardees score lower on Factor Q4 than other groups.

24. Awardees score significantly lower than corrupt group on Factor M (Practical, bold, careful vs careless of protocol).

25. Awardees score significantly higher than corrupt group on Factor Q2 (Self sufficient Vs. low self concept).

26. Awardees score lower than corrupt group on Factor N (Forthright, Natural, Sentimental, artless).

27. Awardees score higher than corrupt group on Factor Q3 (Controlled, socially precise with self concept).

Inference drawn from stepwise discriminant function analysis

28. Adverse notice group and corrupt group are similar on discriminant Function I comprising of factors Q3, N, Q4, Q1, M and B in that order of discriminating power. Awardees group stand alone separated from these two groups on the above factors.

29. Adverse notice, corrupt and awardees groups were all found separated from one another on discriminant Function II comprising of factors, G, E, F, O, C, H, A, Q2, I, and L in that order of power of discrimination.

30. Classification of the constabulary as those coming under adverse notice, corruption charges and awardees is thus
validated by the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire.

UPSHOT

The analysis and processing of the data using a powerful multivariate method, namely, stepwise discriminant function analysis is more dependable as already described under the Chapter V (Discussion and interpretation of Data). By way of trait and criterion group descriptions, we aim at prediction using the variable which stand out in the discriminant function analysis as predictor variables. The following suggestion is worthwhile being made:

While the interview schedule did give some indications differentiating the three criterion groups, namely adverse notice group, corrupt group and awardees group, a clear picture emerged from the personality test and stepwise discriminant function analysis. The sixteen personality questionnaire Form E could be a good screening device in addition to other traditional methods already in vogue since this test is more diagnostic as revealed by the conclusions drawn above.

Conduct of Police constabulary such as corrupt practices, bad conduct, and good conduct can be brought under rubric of personality dynamics as evidenced by the present study.
RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Based on these findings, future work should be directed at devising and or adopting suitable psychological tests to ascertain the personality of aspirants to police service. This would facilitate only those with desirable personality traits being inducted into Police service.

2. Suitable curricula should also be introduced in police training institutions to correct undesirable traits of police constabulary who have already entered service.

3. This sort of study should be taken up at the level of Sub-Inspectors, Inspectors and Deputy Superintendents of Police who have entered service at the level of Sub-Inspectors of Police so that appropriate action as at (1) and (2) above could be taken.