VARIABLES LEADING TO PUBLIC SATISFACTION ON POLICING IN KANNIYAKUMARIDISTRICT- AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

B.Prabin Kumar, and Dr. P. Nixon Dhas

 1. B.Prabinkumar, Reg. No. 19223211011001, Research Scholar, St. Judes's College , Thoothoor, Affiliated to ManonmaniumSundaranar University, Abishekpatti, Tirunelveli, Tamailnadu, India.

2. Dr. P. Nixon dhas, Assistant professor and head department of Commerce, St. Jude's College, Thoothoor, Kanyakumari District , Tamilnadu, India.

ABSTRACT

The service quality has been measured to measure core quality of service of police. Service firms like police stations are realizing the significance of public philosophies and are turning to quality management approaches to help managing their business. The advantage of core service quality is that it is a tried and tested instrument which can be used comparatively for benchmarking purposes. This article attempts to analyse variables to leading public satisfaction in policing in Kanniyakumari district. It specially aims to analyse, the influence of Trustworthy, Timeliness, Accommodativeness, professionalism, Service fairness, Commitment. This paper is descriptive in nature and data has been collected through questionnaire. 799 respondents were selected for this study of which 399 were from urban area and 400 from rural area. Through the well structured interview schedule. One way analysis and "t" test were used for this study. The variables leading to public satisfaction on policing among the respondents are studied with the help six factors namely trust worthy, timeliness, accommodativeness, professionalism, service fairness, commitment. The highly viewed variable in accommodativeness by urban and rural respondents is 'flexibility in timing'. In the case of performance, these variables are assurance of safety and security and problem solving skills respectively. The highly viewed variable in service fairness by urban and rural respondents is feedback on actions and immediate action respectively. In the case of commitment, these variables are commitment to society and commitment to work.The highly viewed factors leading to public satisfaction on policing among the urban re performance and timeliness whereas among the rural, these are commitment and trustworthy. The important discriminant factors among the urban and rural respondents are professionalism and service fairness which are highly viewed by urban compared to rural respondents.

Keywords: Public satisfaction, Police service quality(POLQUAL), Trustworthy, Service fairness, Accommodativeness, Timelines, Commitment.

INTRODUCTION

Police officials measured progress towards professionalism in terms of expansion of services, development of scientific methods of criminal investigation and identification, training, communications, transportation, records, selection, executive tenure, and organisational growth (Douthit, 1975[i]). Moreover, in lieu of using myths to evaluate the quality of police service, the Police Executive Research Forum has identified three factors which must be considered in any evaluation of quality police service. These factors are: leadership, organisation, and policy characteristics (Couper, 1983[1]). These measures (training and assessment) do not seem to be good predictors of successful job performance, especially in relation to the use of force. By contrast, Burgess (1994[1]) developed

the Service Quality Model in which determinants of service quality are employed. The determinants include reliability, responsiveness, competence, access, courtesy, and credibility. As a consequence, the research concluded that breakdowns may occur in any of the following components of police service delivery: mechanical, human, scheduling, capacity, political, or weather. In addition, the known measures such as "outcome" or "performance" of police services, especially by means of preventive safety measure, are hard to define (Lenk, 1998[1]). Therefore "effects" of applied steering instruments are hardly measurable (Lange and Schenck, 2004[1]).

In recent years, as the concept of community-based policing had emerged, it continues to provide the philosophical underpinning for basic functional changes in the way police agencies operate (Moore and Trojanowicz, 1988[1]; Kelling and Bratton, 1993[1]). From 2000, failures to democratize the police during the 1990s led to the introduction of community policing, which, it was promised, could engender "a new culture of security" of police community partnerships, citizen inclusion and accountable state policing (Kyed, 2009[1]).

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In the police services, the reliability and assurance are predominant service qualities to generate trust among the public. The need for policing since the beginning of human life was and always felt it was needed. The need for policing and the parallel development of vital communities and increase the risks of living are increasing. Today, the vital importance of the policing industry in the country's economy to its growth and prosperity is inevitable. The policing industry is not only comparable to the developed countries of the world, but also lower in developing countries.

Nowadays organizations, their public, are a valuable asset of all its employees want to keep striving to serve their consent. For this purpose, it is essential to identify the factors that affect public satisfaction and help to estimate the effort of prosperity. In this perspect the variables leading to public satisfaction on policing is essential

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Hurst and Frank (2016)[1] indicated that the case to contact with the police increase favourable evaluations and reduce the crimes.

Griffiths and Winfree (2018)[1] found that experience of the police (officials) has a greater impact on the public attitudes towards the police.

Vermunt et al., (2018)[1] found that juvenile's evaluations of the police are not affected by the amount of contract a youth has had through the system. The criminal record is not correlated with negative perceptions of the police.

Taylor et al., (2011)[1] revealed that a racial hierarchy of support for the police with white and Asian juveniles being most supportive, black juveniles being the least supportive, and Hispanic and native American juveniles falling in between.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. The main objective of this study is to analyse the variables leading to public satisfaction on policing in kanniyakumari district.

METHODOLOGY

The population of the present study is the total population at urban and rural Kanniakumari district. The urban population is the population at four municipalities in the district whereas the rural population covers the population at nine blocks of the district.

TABLE 1.1

Population in Kanniakumari District

Sl.No.	Blocks/Municipalities	Number of population		Total
		Urban	Rural	
1.	Agastheeswaram	-	148419	148419
2.	Rajakhamangalam	-	137254	137254
3.	Thovalai	-	110719	110719
4.	Kurunthencode	-	165070	165070
5.	Thuckkalay	-	167262	167262
6.	Thiruvattar	-	161619	161619
7.	Killiyoor	-	156387	156387
8.	Munchirai	-	177225	177225
9.	Melpuram	-	179535	179535
10.	Nagercoil municipality	208179	-	208179
11.	Padmanapuram	20075	-	20075
12.	Colachel	23787	-	23787
13.	Kuzhithurai	20503	-	20503
	Total	272544	1403490	1676034

Source: Census data during 2010-11.

The urban and rural population of the district are 2.73 lakhs and 14.03 lakhs respectively. In urban area, the Nagercoilmunicipalities population is higher of 2.08 lakhs whereas in the rural area, the population of melpuram block is higher with the population of 1.79 lakhs.

Determination of Sample Size

Since the population of the study is known, the sample size is computed by

$n = \dfrac{N}{Ne^2 + 1}$ whereas n – sample size; n – population and e – error of acceptance (0.05). The urban and rural samples have been computed separately. The resulted sample sizes are given in Table 1.2.

TABLE 1.2

Determination of Sample Size

Sl.No.	Nature	$n = \dfrac{N}{Ne^2 + 1}$	Total sample
1.	Urban	$n = \dfrac{272544}{272544(.05)^2 + 1} = 399.41$	399
2.	Rural	$n = \dfrac{1403490}{1403490(.05)^2 + 1} = 399.88$	400
			799

The determined urban sample size of the study is 399 whereas in rural area, it comes to 400. The total sample size comes to 799 respondents.

Data Collection

Since the study is completely based on the primary data, a special care was taken to design the interview schedules. The interview schedule is prepared to collect the data from public.

Tools of Analysis

The 't' test is used to find out the significant difference between the two means among the urban and rural respondents.

In the present study, the 't' test has been administered to findout the significant difference among the urban and rural respondents regarding their level of expectation, perception and quality gap in service qualities, public's satisfaction on policing and the factors leading to policies satisfaction on policing and requirements of better police services.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. Eventhough, the sample size of police staffs are determined scientifically, the unscientific sampling procedure has been followed to determine the sample size of the respondents is identified by the sub-inspector of police stations.

2. The present study is confined its scope to only Kanniakumari district;

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSIONS

The variables leading to public satisfaction on policing among the respondents are studied with the help of six factors. The first factor namely trustworthy, consist of 5 variables they are low abiding ability, Equity in law-enforcement, law enforcement, create public trust, Believable. The second factor namely timeliness, consist of 4 variables they are timely action, timely information, timely information, timely response, timely report. The respondents are asked to rate these variables at five point scale. The mean score of the variables in the first two factors among the urban and rural respondents have been computed separately along with its't' statistics. The results are given in Table 5.1.

TABLE 5.1

Variables Leading to Public Satisfaction on Policing (VLPSP)

Sl.No.	Variables in VLPSP	Mean score among		't' statistics
		Urban	Rural	
I	**Trust worthy**			
1.	Low abiding ability	3.7446	3.7941	-0.0666
2.	Equity in law-enforcement	3.8226	3.6997	0.2676
3.	Law enforcement	3.7142	3.6142	0.1842
4.	Create public trust	3.8088	3.8444	-0.0416
5.	Believable	3.8416	3.6141	0.2549
II	**Timeliness**			
1.	Timely action	3.9444	3.5117	2.4088*
2.	Timely information	3.8994	3.4224	2.4161*
3.	Timely response	3.9241	3.5016	2.4733*
4.	Timely report	3.9049	3.4514	2.5414*

* Significant at five per cent level.

The highly viewed variable in Trustworthy among the urban and rural respondents are believable and low abiding ability since its mean score are 3.8416 and 3.7941 respectively. In the case of 'timeliness' these two variables is 'timely action' since its mean score are 3.9444 and 3.5117. The significant difference among the urban and rural respondents have been noticed in their view on all four variables in timeliness since its 't' statistics are significant at five per cent level.

The third factor namely Accommodativeness, consist of 5 variables they are understand personal needs, knowledge on area and people, accept the public opinion, communication with local people, flexibility in timing. The fourth factor namely professionalism, consist of 5 variables they are problem solving skills, deduction skills, controlling abilities, consistency, assurance of safety and security. The respondents are asked to rate the variables at five per cent level. The mean score of variables in accommodativeness and professionalism among the urban and rural respondents have been computed separately along with its't' statistics. The results are shown in Table 5.2.

TABLE 5.2

Respondents View on Variables in Second Two Factors

Sl.No.	Variables in VLPSP	Mean score among		't' statistics
		Urban	Rural	
III	**Accommodativeness**			
1.	Understand personal needs	3.8441	3.4246	2.4117*
2.	Knowledge on area and people	3.8694	3.4024	2.4683*
3.	Accept the public opinion	3.8997	3.4171	2.4769*
4.	Communication with local people	3.9117	3.4088	2.5664*
5.	Flexibility in timing	3.9242	3.4663	2.5179*
IV	**Professionalism**			
1.	Problem solving skills	3.9441	3.5142	2.4177*
2.	Deduction skills	3.9088	3.5022	2.4088*
3.	Controlling abilities	3.9714	3.4088	2.5667*
4.	Consistency	3.9246	3.4117	2.5842*
5.	Assurance of safety and security	3.9771	3.3664	2.6446*

* Significant at five per cent level.

The highly viewed variables in accommodativeness among the urban and rural respondents is 'flexibility in timing' since its mean score are 3.9242 and 3.4663. In the case of professionalism, these two variables are assurance of safety and security, and problem solving skills since its mean score are 3.9771 and 3.5142 respectively. The significant difference among urban and rural respondents have been noticed in the case of all variables in accommodativeness and professionalism since its 't' statistics are significant at five per cent level.

The variables included in service fairness are immediate enquiry, immediate recording, immediate consultation, feedback on actions, immediate action. The variables included in commitment are commitment to public, commitment to work, commitment to government, commitment to society, self discipline. The respondents are asked to rate these variables at five point scale. The mean score of variables

in the above said two factors among the urban and rural respondents have been computed separately along with "t" statistics. The results are shown in Table 5.3.

TABLE 5.3

Respondents View on Last Two Factors

Sl.No.	Variables in VLPSP	Mean score among		't' statistics
		Urban	Rural	
V	**Service Fairness**			
1.	Immediate enquiry	3.7886	3.3881	2.4171*
2.	Immediate recording	3.7891	3.4082	2.2916*
3.	Immediate consultation	3.8224	3.4017	2.4088*
4.	Feedback on actions	3.8646	3.3699	2.5669*
5.	Immediate action	3.7973	3.4117	2.2088*
VI	**Commitment**			
1.	Commitment to public	3.8188	3.9446	-0.1886
2.	Commitment to work	3.7082	3.9667	-0.2986
3.	Commitment to Government	3.8099	3.8678	-0.1044
4.	Commitment to society	3.8664	3.8442	0.0991
5.	Self discipline	3.7699	3.8941	-0.1394

* Significant at five per cent level.

The highly viewed variable in service fairness by urban and rural respondents are feedback on actions and immediate action since its mean score are 3.8646 and 3.4117 respectively. In the case of commitment, these two variables are commitment to society and commitment to work since its mean score are 3.8664 and 3.9667 respectively. The significant difference among the urban and rural respondents have been noticed in the case of view on all five variables in service fairness since its 't' statistics are significant at five per cent level.

Respondents View on FLPSP

The respondents view on FLPSP have been examined by the mean score of all six factors. The score of each factor has been derived by the mean score of variables in each. The mean score of each factor among the urban and rural respondents have been computed separately. The 't' test has been applied to findout the significant difference among urban and rural respondents regarding their view on factors. The results are shown in Table 5.5.

TABLE 5.5

Respondents View on FLPSP

Sl.No.	FLPSP	Mean score among		't' statistics
		Urban	Rural	
1.	Trustworthy	3.7864	3.7133	0.1172
2.	Timeliness	3.9182	3.4717	2.4119*
3.	Accommodativeness	3.8898	3.4238	2.4641*
4.	Professionalism	3.9452	3.4407	2.5669*
5.	Service fairness	3.8125	3.3959	2.4021*
6.	Commitment	3.7946	3.9035	-0.2141

* Significant at five per cent level.

The highly viewed factors by urban respondents are professionalism and timeliness since its mean score are 3.9452 and 3.9182 respectively. Among the rural respondents, these two factors are trustworthy and commitment since its mean score are 3.7133 and 3.9035 respectively. Regarding the view on FLPSP, the significant difference among the urban and rural respondents have been noticed in their view on four out of six factors since its 't' statistics are significant at five per cent level.

Association between the Profile of Respondents and their View on FLPSP

The present study has made an attempt to examine the significant association between the profile of respondents and their view on FLPSP with the help of oneway analysis of variance. All the 13 profile variables and the some on all six factors are included for the analysis. The results are given in Table 5.6.

TABLE 5.6

Results of Oneway ANOVA View on FLPSP

Sl. No.	Profile variables	F Statistics in					
		Trustworthy	Timeliness	Accommo-dativeness	Professionalism	Service fairness	Commitment
1.	Nativity	3.4145	3.6446	3.8811*	3.6179	3.5969	3.2678
2.	Age	2.4541*	2.1886	2.4086*	2.5242*	2.1173	2.3969*
3.	Gender	3.9114*	3.0894	3.3684	3.2682	3.3886	3.5144
4.	Level of education	2.8668*	2.7084*	2.6611*	2.8042*	2.7141*	2.8661*
5.	Occupation	2.4141*	2.0886	2.0414	2.1177	2.6689*	2.5181*

6.	Marital status	2.4088	2.1471	2.5141	2.5881	2.4086	2.3441
7.	Spouse's level of education	2.3911	2.3088	2.2141	2.0991	2.1741	2.2462
8.	Personal income per month	2.6899*	2.7082*	2.8186*	2.9084*	2.6247*	2.5089*
9.	Nature of family	3.1171	3.2664	3.6086	3.7117	3.6556	3.5088
10.	Family size	2.1082	2.1172	1.8899	2.4411*	2.5088*	2.4694*
11.	Number of educated per family	2.8866*	2.7171*	2.9042*	2.5141	2.4088	2.6891*
12.	Number of earning members per family	2.9141	2.8042	2.6888	2.7141	3.4141*	2.9661
13.	Family income	2.8141*	2.9242*	2.8686*	2.5686*	2.4117*	2.5086*

* Significant at five per cent level.

The significantly associating profile variables regarding the view on trustworthy are age, gender, level of education, occupation, personal income, number of educated population, and family income since its 'F' statistics are significant at five per cent level. Regarding the view on 'timeliness', the significantly associating profile variables are level of education, personal income, number of educated population and family income.

Regarding the view on 'accommodativeness' the significantly associating profile variables are nativity, age, level of education, personal income, number of educated population and family income whereas in the case of view on professionalism, these profile variables are age, level of education, personal income, family size and family income. The significantly associating profile variables regarding the view on service fairness are level of education, occupation, personal income, family size, number of earning members per family and family income whereas in the case of view

on commitment, these profile variables are age, level of education, occupation, personal income, family size, number of educated population and family income since its 'F' statistics are significant at five per cent level.

CONCLUSIONS

The factors leading to public satisfaction on policing is discussed by trustworthy, timeliness, accommodativeness, professionalism, service fairness and commitment. The highly viewed variable in Trustworthy by the urban and rural respondents are believable and create public trust respectively. The highly viewed variable in timeliness by urban and rural respondents is 'timely action'. The significant difference among the urban and rural respondents have been noticed in the case of view on all four variables in timeliness.

The significantly associating important profile variables regarding the view on factors are age, level of education, personal income, number of educated population, and family income. The important discriminant factors among the urban and rural respondents are professionalism and service fairness which are highly viewed by urban compared to rural respondents.

REFERENCES

Burgess, T.P. (1994), "Service breakdown and service recovery", **The Police Journal**, Vol. 67 No. 1, pp. 26-38.

Burgess, T.P., (1994), "Service break down and service recovery", **The Police Journal,** 67(1), pp.26-38.

Cao, L., Frank, J., and Cullen, F.T., (2016), "Race, Community Context and Confidence in Police", **American Journal of Police**, 15(1), pp.3-22.

Donnelly, M., Kerr, N., Rimmer, R. and Shiu, E. (2006), "Assessing the quality of police services using SERVQUAL", **Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management**, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 92-105.

Donnelly, M., Kerr, N.J., Rimmer, R. and Shiu, E.M., (2016), "Assessing the Quality of Police Services Using "SERVQUAL", **Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management**, 29 (1), pp.92-105.