Research Paper

Personal Value among Constable and PI Employees of Police Department

Shivani S. Raghuvanshi[1]*

ABSTRACT

The present study aimed to know the personal value among Constable and PI employees of police department. It also aimed to check personal value with reference to types of police and type of family. The Personal Value Scale (PVS) prepared by Dr. Madhullka Varma and Vindeshwari Waxar Pawar (2013) was used. The sample constituted total 120 employees out of which 60 were from constable police (30 joint family and 30 nuclear family) and 60 from PI police (30 joint family and 30 nuclear family). The data was collected from various police department of Gujarat State. The data was scored, analyzed as per the manual. 'F' test was being calculated. The result showed that (1) The constable employees group is having high personal value than PI employees group, (2) The police employees of nuclear family group is having high personal value than police employees of joint family group and (3) There is no significant difference between interactive effect of the mean score of the personal value of type of police and type of family.

Keywords: Personal Value, constable and PI employees

Value is a concept that describes the beliefs of an individual or culture. A set of values may be placed into the notion of a value system. Values are considered subjective and vary across people and cultures. Types of values include ethical/moral values, doctrinal/ideological (political, religious) values, social values, and aesthetic values. It is debated whether some values are innate.

Personal values evolve from circumstances with the external world and can change over time. Integrity in the application of values refers to its continuity; persons have integrity if they apply their values appropriately regardless of arguments or negative reinforcement from others. Values are applied appropriately when they are applied in the right area. For example, it would be appropriate to apply religious values in times of happiness as well as in times of despair. Personal values are implicitly related to choice; they guide decisions by allowing for an individual's choices to be compared to each choice's associated values.

Personal values developed early in life may be resistant to change. They may be derived from those of particular groups or systems, such as culture, religion, and political party. However,

[1] Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Psychology, Gujarat University, Ahmedabad, India
*Responding Author

personal values are not universal; one's genes, family, nation and historical environment help determine one's personal values. This is not to say that the value concepts themselves are not universal, merely that each individual possess a unique conception of them i.e. a personal knowledge of the appropriate values for their own genes, feelings and experience.

The Gujarat Police Department is the law enforcement agency for the state of Gujarat in India. The Gujarat Police has its headquarters in Gandhinagar, the state capital. The Gujarat Police Department is headed by Director General of Police (DGP-V.J DESAI). It has four Commissioners offices : Ahmedabad, Vadodara, Rajkot and Surat. There are seven ranges in the Gujarat Police: Ahmedabad, Surat, Gandhinagar, Vadodara, Rajkot, Junagadh and border Range. For police administration the state is further divided into 33 police districts and Western Railway Police.

Police Constable
Constable has to perform all duties which may be assigned to him by his higher authorities. Constable has to maintain the situation of law and order, to search the offences and crimes and to prevent them to occur, to serve the summons and warrant, to perform Naka duty, to bring and take away the criminals under his security and to perform duties as per B.P. Act at the time of transfer of money from one place to another and public and private properties. Whenever any offence occurs, constable has to immediately to detain the offenders without any warrant and to inform his higher authority forthwith. At the time of fire or fear constable has to help the public for their protection and security and to take all precautionary measures, to investigate crimes and offences and to protect the individual and the property.

Police Inspector (PI) Police Station In-Charge
PI has to perform general supervision of the Police Station. PI has the responsibility of discipline of his subordinate officers and staff. PI has to see to it whether offences occurring in the area are registered properly in the Police Station or not, whether they are property investigated or not. Furthermore he himself has to investigate in important cases and to investigate in the cases assigned by his higher officers. PI has also the responsibility to provide guidance to his subordinate officers and staff. PI has to perform his duties diligently as per the special orders of his higher officers.

Rune Glomsetha and Petter Gottschalk (2009) examined the police personnel cultures: a comparative study of counter terrorist and criminal investigation units. Differences in occupational culture can be explained by organization, structure, and task. While the Counter Terrorist Unit has to react quickly and precisely in an emergency situation, criminal investigators have to spend time to organize and carry out the investigation. The timeframe for a counter terrorist police officer to act can be extremely short, while a criminal investigation can go on for quite some time. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that the scale time firm vs. time floats receives very different scores in the two organizations.

Laima Ruibyte and Ruta Adamoniene (2012) investigated the Individual and work values of police officers: Peculiarities and Interrelation. The findings of his study enhanced the understanding of personal factors associated with teacher's subjective well-being. The constructs linked to subjective well-being promote school psychologists' interventions for better school teaching performance.

Objective
The objectives are:
1. To assess the personal value among Constable and PI employees of police department.

2. To assess the personal value among police employees of joint family and nuclear family.

METHODOLOGY

Hypotheses
1. There will be no significant difference between the mean score of the personal value among Constable and PI employees of police department.
2. There will be no significant difference between the mean score of the personal value among police employees of joint family and nuclear family.
3. There will be no significant difference between interactive effect of the mean score of the personal value of type of police and type of family.

Sample
The sample constituted total 120 employees out of which 60 were from constable police (30 joint family and 30 nuclear family) and 60 from PI police (30 joint family and 30 nuclear family) in the Gujarat State.

Research Design
A total sample of 120 police employees equally distributed between type of police and type of family from various police department of constable and PI of Gujarat State selected for the research study.

Showing the table of Sample Distribution

Type of Family	Type of Police		Total
	Constable	**PI**	
Joint Family	30	30	60
Nuclear Family	30	30	60
Total	60	60	120

Variable
Independent Variable
1. **Type of Police :** Constable and PI.
2. **Type of Family :** Joint Family and Nuclear Family

Dependent Variable : Personal Value Score.

Tools
The Personal Value Scale (PVS) by Dr. Madhullka Varma and Vindeshwari Waxar Pawar (2013). The test contains 50 items related to following eight dimensions namely (1) Honesty (2) Love (3) Helpfulness (4) Courage (5) Good Manners (6) Faithfulness (7) Discipline and (8) Cleanliness. The content validity of the scale was established by having a discussion with the experts belonging to teachers training institutes and schools. Thus the personal value scale was found to be valid. The reliability of the personal value scale was established through test-retest method. The correlation coefficient was 0.60.

Procedure
The permission was granted from various police department for data collection in Gujarat State after the establishment of rapport, personal information and the 'Personal Value Scale (PVS)' was administrated the data was collected, scored as per the manual and analyzed. The statistical method 'F' test was calculated and results were interpreted.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table : 1 The Table showing sum of variance mean 'F' value and level of significance of type of police and type of family.

Sum of Variance	Df	Mean	F-value	Sign. Level
SS_A	1	1613.33	6.00	0.01
SS_B	1	3182.70	11.84	0.01
SS_{A*B}	1	918.53	3.42	N.S.
SS_{Error}	116	268.76	__	__
SS_{Total}	119	36891.30	__	__

A = Type of Police,   B = Type of Family
A_1 = Constable. B_1 = Joint Family
A_2 = PI B_1 = Nuclear Family.

Table : 2 The Table showing the Mean Score of personal value of Constable and PI employees of police department.

	A (Type of Police)		'F' value	Sign.
	A_1 (Constable)	A_2 (PI)		
M	89.52	82.18		
N	60	60	6.00	0.01

The above table no.2 shows the mean score of personal value among Constable and PI employees of police department. The mean score of constable employees group is 89.52 and PI employees group is 82.18. The 'F' value is 6.00 is significant at 0.01 level. This means that the two group interaction effect under study differ significantly in relation to personal value. It should be remembered here that, according to scoring pattern, higher score indicate higher personal value. Thus from the result it could be said that, the constable employees group is having high personal value than PI employees group. Therefore the hypothesis no.1 that, "There is no significant difference between the mean score of the personal value among Constable and PI employees of police department" is rejected.

Table : 3 The Table showing the Mean Score of personal value of police employees of joint family and nuclear family.

	B (Type of Family)		'F' value	Sign.
	B_1 (Joint Family)	B_2 (Nuclear Family)		
M	80.70	91.00		
N	60	60	11.84	0.01

The above table no.3 shows the mean score of personal value among police employees of joint family and nuclear family. The mean score of police employees of joint family group is 80.70 and police employees of nuclear family group is 91.00. The 'F' value is 11.84 is significant at 0.01 level. This means that the two group interaction effect under study differ significantly in relation to personal value. It should be remembered here that, according to scoring pattern, higher score indicate higher personal value. Thus from the result it could be said that, the police employees of nuclear family group is having high personal value than police employees of joint family group. Therefore the hypothesis no.2 that, "There is no significant difference between the mean score of the personal value among police employees of joint family and nuclear family" is rejected.

Table : 4 The Table showing the interactive effect of the Mean Score of personal value of type of police and type of family.

			A		'F' value	Sign.
			A$_1$	A$_2$		
M		B$_1$	91.90	90.10		
	B	B$_2$	87.13	74.27	3.42	N.A.
N			60	60		

The above table shows the interactive effect of the personal value of the type of police and type of family. The result was found to be significant from table no.4 shows that 'F' value 3.42 is not significant. This means that the two group interaction effect under study does not differ significantly in relation to personal value. The mean score is 91.90 for the constable employees of joint family group, the mean score is 87.13 for the PI employees of joint family group, the mean score is 90.10 for the constable employees of nuclear family group, the mean score is 74.27 for the PI employees of nuclear family group. Therefore the hypothesis no.3 that, "There is no significant difference between interactive effect of the mean score of the personal value of type of police and type of family" is accepted.

CONCLUSION

1. The constable employees group is having high personal value than PI employees group.
2. The police employees of nuclear family group is having high personal value than police employees of joint family group.
3. There is no significant difference between interactive effect of the mean score of the personal value of type of police and type of family.

REFERENCES

Brehm, J., & Gates, S. (1993). Donut shops and speed traps: Evaluating models of supervision on police behavior. American Journal of Political Science, 37(2), 555–581.

Feather, N.T. (1988). Values, valence, and course enrolment : Testing the role of personal values within an expectancy value framework. Journal of educational psychology, 80, 381-391.

Fielding, N. (1984). Police socialization and police competence. The British Journal of Sociology, 35(4), 568–590.

Fischer, R., Poortinga, Y., H. (2012). Are cultural values the same as the values of individuals? An examination of similarities in personal, social and cultural value structures. International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, Vol. 12 Issue 2, p.157-170.

Glomsetha, Rune and Gottschalk, Petter (2009). Police personnel cultures: a comparative study of counter terrorist and criminal investigation units. Criminal Justice Studies. Vol. 22, No. 1, p.3–15.

Gottschalk, P. (2007). Predictors of police investigation performance: An empirical study of Norwegian police as value shop. International Journal of Information Management, 27, 36–48.

Jansari, A & Prajapati, M., (2014). Inference Statistics-I, Akshar Publication, Ahmedabad.

Jansari, A & Prajapati, M., (2014). Inference Statistics-II, Akshar Publication, Ahmedabad, ISBN : 978-93-85271-07-6.

Laima Ruibyte and Ruta Adamoniene (2012) "Individual and work values of police officers: Peculiarities and Interrelation". Visuomenės Saugumas Ir Viesoji Tvarka Public Security and Public Order, ISSN 2335–2035 (online), p. 242-253.