Conclusion
The present study promises to elicit a comprehensive picture of vigilance and assess impact of all those factors on vigilance that was not explored systematically in previous researches. In absence of any scientific research in the field of obsession and vigilance, it was assumed by the present researcher that the signature characteristics of obsessionals, i.e., preoccupation with precision, is likely to improve vigilance, till obsession is limited only to a personality characteristics, not as pathology. Findings of the present research refute the assumption and shows individuals with low non-clinical obsession outperforms their counterpart in vigilance task. A significant trend among the three levels of obsession, from an order to disorder continuum, was observed where individuals with low non-clinical obsession performed best, followed by high non-clinical obsession, followed by a sharp decline in performance accuracy for individuals with OCD. The findings clearly indicate that optimum performance in vigilance requires high non-clinical obsession.

When OCD patients were compared with their non-OCD counterpart, results show reduced performance efficiency of OCD patients in vigilance as compared to their non-OCD counterparts. Findings reveal that performance anxiety in form of though action fusion actually lowered the performance of the OCD patients.

Further, the study purported to measure if individuals with sensory impairment can perform better in cross-modal vigilance compared to their non-impaired counterparts. But, the compensatory hypothesis of individuals with sensory impairment didn’t work in the present study. The clinically normals outperform individuals with HI and VI in vigilance performance.

Intelligence and speed and accuracy were found to be correlated with vigilance throughout the study, whereas, extensive analysis reveal speed and accuracy to be a better predictor of vigilance.

Finally, automated warning is found to influence performance in vigilance. More so for individuals with HI and their non-impaired counterparts but individuals with VI remain unaffected by warning signals, suggesting, individuals with VI require more intense stimulation required to evoke arousal during a cognitive task.
Further exploration reveal that individuals high in speed and accuracy could make use of warning much better than the low SA counterparts for both clinically normals and sensory impairment groups.

Finally application of positive affective stimuli found to have enhanced vigil performance for the clinically normals. Parallely, application of negative stimuli could not influence vigilance performance.

Overall it can be concluded from the present study, that personality factors like obsession have an impact on vigilance. It requires more extensive research. Whereas, application of affective stimulation improved performance in vigilance. At the same time application of cognitive stimulation improved vigilance for clinically normals as well as for individuals for hearing impairment. In fact, warning helped individuals with hearing impairment more than their clinically normal counterparts.