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INTRODUCTION

Owing to McDougall's gregarious instinct particularly in human beings, social influence is a basic fact of social life. Most of us are on the receiving end of a large number of attempts through social influences everyday i.e. efforts by others to change our attitudes, beliefs, perceptions or behaviour (Cialdini, 1994). This is done through television and radio commercial magazines and newspaper advertisements etc. Besides these we are also encountered with direct requests from known people, friends relatives and coworkers and even strangers. All these involve efforts to influence us in some way. However, we are not only the passive targets or recipients of such influences rather we also seek to exert influence one others. Family is the institution where right kind of attitude is developed in a child as he spends maximum time at home. Many psychologists agreed that early childhood experiences play a crucial role in cognitive development, fostering many potentialities and shaping personality of the child. The roots of behaviour, intelligence and character are nurtured in childhood which help in coping with subsequent life situations.

Effective parent-child communications also help in the development of self-esteem, self-confidence, sharing family responsibilities and fulfilment of physical, mental and emotional needs.
of the child. With the increasing awareness to the external world and feeling of belongingness to the family, he learns to orient himself with routine. The initial affectionate bond between the mother and the child gradually leads to further stimulating interaction with other members of the family, neighbour, school and society. Social influence is important because it plays a key role in many social behaviours. This is why it has long been, the subject of careful study by social psychologists. Among the important forms of social influence we may name conformity, which means pressures to go along with the crowd or to behave in the same manner as other persons in one's group or society behave. It is a type of social influence in which individuals change their attitudes of behaviour in order to adhere to existing social norms. Compliance is efforts to get others say "Yes" to direct request. It is a form of social influence involving direct requests or persuasion from one person to another. Obedience is a kind of social influence in which one person simply orders one or more others to do what he wants. Obedience is thus a social behaviour in which persons obey direct orders from others to perform some actions.

Conformity occurs when individuals change their behaviour in order to adhere to existing social norms. (Nescovici, 1985). It is widely accepted rule indicating how people should behave in certain situations or under specific circumstances. Conformity represents a crucial means through which groups or even the
whole society moulds the behaviour of its members. Conformity is displayed when most people, in hospital or library, speak in whisper even if they usually prefer to speak in a louder voice. (An example of conformity can be given by the fact that most persons speak in whisper in the hospital or library even if they could usually prefer to speak in louder tone). Kiesler and Kiesler (1969) called conformity a change in behaviour or belief as a result of real or group pressure.

Conformity seems to stem from the fact that in many situations there are both spoken and unspoken rules indicating how we should or ought to behave. These are the social norms exercising much pressures. For example, a government functions through constitutions or written codes of laws. The Olympic meets or the athletic contests are usually regulated by written laws. On the other hand, we automatically behave or obey such unwritten rules like do not stare at the girls in the street”, and “do not reach late at parties or social gatherings”. Whether social norms are explicit or implicit we behave mostly in accordance with a social norm. For example, hardly any people visit restaurant without leaving a tip to the water Regardless of political beliefs everyone stands in attention when the national anthem is played.

Compliance means inducing others to 'say' yes to one's requests. For example, if a room mate asks his friends to give up smoking over which his friend complies by reducing smoking at low
frequency. Here his behaviour will be known as compliance. A well known social psychologist Robert Cialdini studied compliance professional people whose success (financial or otherwise) depended on their ability to get others say yes. These people were sales people, advertisers, political lobbyist, found-raisers, professional negotiators etc. Cialdini (1994) concluded that compliance rests on six basic principles viz., friendship, consistency, scarcity, reciprocity, social validation and authority.

Obedience occurs in a situation where the person changes behaviour in response to the commands from others. Usually the person who issues such orders has some means of enforcing submission on person who exhibits obedience. Such persons are powerful for stimulating orders or influences. For example a class teacher orders the entire class to stand up on the bench. The students have to obey the order of this authority. This will be called obedience which which has sharp difference with conformity and compliance. If all the persons are standing in the class as a call of courtesy to teacher, this is conformity. If a person requests his friend to stand up and he accepts his request it will be called compliance.

Often a person can change the behaviour of another simply by ordering the target to do something. Business executives often issue orders to the subordinates. Military officers shout commands to the army men, who are expected to follow the commands
at once. Obedience to such commands emerge through some source
authority. These authorities possess some means for enforcing their
directives. They place reward for obedience and punishment for
resistence. More surprising is the fact that under some conditions
even relatively powerless sources of authority can coerce others into
obedience (Bushman, 1984). The clearest evidence for occurrence of
such events has been reported by Stanley Milgram (1963, 1964) in a
series of famous, but controvercial experiments.

Milgram wished to see whether individuals would follow commands from an experimenter to inflict considerable pain and suffering on another person, a totally innocent stranger. To see if people would do this, he informed subjects that they were participating in a study of the effects of punishment on learning. Their task was that of delivering electric shocks to another person (actually an accomplice) each time he made an error in a simple learning task. These shocks were to be delivered by means of thirty switches on the equipment. Subject were told to move to the next higher switch each time the learner made an error. Since, first switch supposedly delivered a shock of 15 volts, it was clear that if the learner made many errors, he would soon be receiving powerful jolts. Indeed, according to the labels on equipment the final shock would consist of 450 volts. In reality of course, the accomplice (the learner) never received any shocks during the experiment. The only real shock ever used was a mild demonstration pulse from one button (Num
ber three) given to subjects to convince them that the equipment was real.

During the session, the learner (following prearranged instructions) made many errors. Thus, the subjects soon found themselves facing a dilemma should they continue punishing this person with what seemed to be increasingly pain shock? or should they refuse to go on? the experimenter pressured them to choose the former path, for whenever they hesitated or protested, he made one of a series of a graded remarks. These began with "Please go on" escalated to "it is absolutely essential that you continue" and finally shifted to "you have no other choice, you must go on".

Since subjects were all volunteers and were paid, in advance, for their participation, you might predict that they would be quite resistant to these orders. Yet, in reality, fully 65 percent showed total obedience. They proceeded through the entire shock series to the final 450 volt level. In contrast, subjects in a control group who were not exposed to such commands generally used only very mild shocks during the session. Of course, as you might expected, many persons subjected to the experimenter's commands often protested and asked that the session be ended. When ordered to proceed, however, a majority yielded to social pressure, and continued to obey. They continued to do so even when the victim pounded on the wall as if in protest against the painful treatment he was receiving.
In further experiment, Milgram (1965a, 1965b, 1974) found that similar results could be obtained even under conditions that might be expected to reduce such obedience. For example, when the study was moved from its original location on the campus of Yale University to a run-down office building in a nearby city, subjects' level of obedience was virtually unchanged. Similarly, a large proportion continued to obey even when the accomplice complained about the painfulness of the shocks and begged to be released. Most surprising of all, many (about 30 percent) continued to obey even when this required that they grasp the victim's hand and force it down on the shock plate. That these unsettling results were not due to special conditions present in Milgram's laboratory indicated by the fact that similar findings were soon reported in studies conducted in several different countries (e.g. Jordan, West Germany, Australia) and with children as well as adults (e.g. Kilham & Mann, 1974, Shanab and Yahya 1977). Thus they seemed to be alarmingly general in scope.

Milgram did more to reveal the extent to which people obey an authority. In his further experiments he varied the social conditions and obtained compliance ranging from zero percent to full obedience (93 percent). He has laid down four determining factors for obedience.
(a) Emotional distance of the victim:

It is easiest to deface someone who is distant or depersonalized executioners depersonalize those being executed by placing hoods over their heads. The ethics of war allow one to bomb a helpless village from height of 40,000 feet but hesitates to shoot an equally helpless villager. Like wise miligram's teachers acted with list compassion when their learners could not be seen (and could not see them). When the victim was remote and no complaints were heard, nearly all participants obeyed calmly to the end. When the learner was brought into the same room, "only" 40 percent obeyed. And full compliance dropped to 30 percent, when teachers were required to force the learner's hand into contact with a shock plate put positively. People act most compassionately towards those who are personalized. This is why those appealing on be half of the unborn or the hungry and impoverished nearly always personalized the target group with a compelling photograph or description.

(b) Closeness and legitimacy of the authority:

In another study Miligram found that obedience was affected by the physical presence of the experimenter. When he gave the commands by telephone, full obedience dropped to 21 percent. Other studies of compliance have similarly found that compliance increases when the one making the request is physically closer. For example, if given a light touch on the arm, people are more likely to lend a claim, sign a petition, or sample a new pizza (Klimke, 1977,
Moreover, the authority must be perceived as legitimate. In another twist on the basic obedience experiment, the experimenter received a rigged telephone call that required him to leave the laboratory. He said that since the equipment recorded data automatically the teacher should go ahead on his own. After the experimenter left, another subject who had been assigned a clerical role assumed command. He decided that the shock should be increased by one level for each wrong answer and commanded the teacher accordingly. With this authority of lower status 80 percent of the teachers refused to comply with. The confederate, disgusted at this defiance, they came and sat down in front of the shock generator and tried to take over the teacher's role. At this point most of the defiance participants protested. Some tried to unplug the generator. One large man lifted the zealous shoker from his chair and threw him across the room. The rebellion against an illegitimate authority contrasted sharply with the differential politeness usually shown toward the experimenter.

In a study on behaviour of hospital nurses an unknown physician ordered them to administer an obvious overdose of drug (Illoffing et.al. 1966). The nurses refused to obey the order. One explained, "I am sorry Sir, but I am not authorized to give any medicine without a written order. Specially one so large over the usual dose and one that I am unfamiliar with." Nevertheless when
22 other nurses were given the phoned over dose order, all but one proceeded to comply without delay. Thus nurses were following well practised script Doctor (a legitimate authority) orders and nurse obeys (Rank and Jacobson, 1999).

(c) Institutional Authority:

If the prestige of the authority is important one then perhaps the institutional prestige of Yale University had helped legitimize the experimenter's command. In post experimental interviews, many participants volunteered that had it not been for Yale's reputation for integrity and excellence. They would not have shocked the learner. To see whether this was true, Milgram moved the experiment to Bridgeport Connecticut, and dissociated it from Yale. He set himself up in some what run down commercial building as the "Research Associates of Bridgeport", an organization of unknown character. When the usual "heart disturbance" experiment was run with the same personnel, what percentage of the men do you suppose fully obeyed? Though reduced, the rate remained remarkably high 48 percent.

(d) Group Influences:

These classic experiments give us a negative view of conformity. Can conformity be constructive? Perhaps we can recall a time we felt justifiably upset with an unfair teacher or with our peers for their inappropriate behaviour, but were hesitant to object.
Milgram captured this liberting effect of conformity by placing the teacher with two confederate teachers who were to collaborate in conducting the procedure. During the experiment, both defied the experimenter, who then ordered the real subject to continue by himself. Did these teachers obey? No, ninety percent liberated themselves by conforming to the defiant confederates.

(A) DISOBEDIENCE:

Unlike passively watching the balls shots into net, we act in response to such forces falling us. Knowing that someone is trying to coerce us. It may even prompt us to reach in the opposite direction. Instead of obeying the command we try to exhibit disobedience, i.e., act in a negative fashion.

People value their sense of freedom and like to project the image of self efficacy (Baer et al 2001). Consequently when social pressure become so blantant that it threatens their sense of freedom they often rebel what happened to Romeo and juliet? Their love for one another was intensified by their parents oppositions. What happens to a child, asserting his freedom and independance against the authoritative figure? The child does the opposite what his parents ask. To do just opposite what is ordered to do is “reactance”. When a force is exercised by a body in a reply to another force that will be taken as reactance.
People feel uncomfortable when they appear too different from others. But they are also discomforted by appearing exactly like everyone else. As experiments by Snyder and Fromkin (1980) have shown, people feel better when they see themselves as unique and will act in ways that set them apart and maintain their sense of individuality. In one experiment by (Snyder, 1980), Purdue University students were led to believe that their “10 most important attitudes” were either distinct from or nearly identical to the attitudes of 10,000 other students. When they afterwards participated in a conformity experiment, those who had been deprived of their feelings of uniqueness were most likely to assert their individuality by nonconformity. In another experiment people who heard others express attitudes that were identical to their own, actually altered their positions in order to maintain their sense of uniqueness.

So it seems that while we do not like being greatly deviant, we are all alike in wanting to feel distinctive. But as research on self-serving bias makes clear, it is not just any kind of distinctiveness we seek but distinctiveness in the right direction. Our quest is not merely to be different from the average, but better than average. Whatever the feeling of distinctiveness may be, it is certainly a result of an act of reactance when one is not inclined to obey.

There is an increasing tendency in the youth to defy the authority. An elder who comes to command the youth is likely to
serve as an authority. In home the parents serve as the effective authority figure, in the college and the university teachers and officials are accepted as authority. When the youth enters into some job the immediate boss and other executives in the hierarchy are treated as authority.

The youth of today has little tendency to abide by the instructions and guidance given by the authority to them. One witnesses a lack of adjustment in between the two-tier relationship of the youth and the authority. Neglect, disregard, non-compliance etc against the authority.

Request from others are a part of our social life. Spouses, lovers and roommates have direct influence on the person's life through their requests. People get compliance through direct requests but the moment one is treated as an authority he may be meted out with defiance or disobedience.

In compliance of an order the legitimacy of the authority is of prime importance (Milgram, 1965, 1974). It has been found that with authority of a lower status more than 80% of subjects fail to comply to their orders. Bushman (1984) found that the authority who possesses visible signs of his status and power is accepted for giving orders.
There are some reasons why the commands of an authority is not accepted. For example, if the individuals think that they will be responsible for the outcome of their compliance and not the authority, there is sharp reduction in obedience (Hamilton, 1978). When obedience is accepted as inappropriate, it becomes easier to disobey (Milgram, 1965; Powers and Green, 1972). Similarly if the source of the authority, their expertise and motives become questionable, there is an increase in disobedience.

In sum the power if authority figures to command obedience is certainly great, but definitely not irresistible. Under appropriate conditions it can be countered and reduced. We should hasten to add that in many cases, resisting such influence is not essential. The persons exercising authority do it appropriately, and for acceptable reasons. Grounds for suspecting that their commands are unjustified, stem from objectionable notions and produce harmful effects, the course of action is clear. In such cases, it is our obligation as well as our right, to resist.

(B) The role of power:

A person may be said to have power to the extent that he influence the behavior of others in accordance with his own intentions. Three major forms of power may be distinguished in terms of the type of influence brought to bear upon the subordinated individual. The power holder exercises force, when he influ-
ences behavior by a physical manipulation of the subordinated individual (assault, confinement, etc.); domination, when he influences behavior by making explicit to others what he wants them to do (Command, request, etc.); and manipulation, when he influences the behavior of others without making explicitly the behavior which he thoroughly wants them to perform. Manipulation may be exercised by utilizing symbols or performing acts. Propaganda is a major form of manipulation by symbols. The undermining of confidence as an enterprise by sabotaging its activities may be taken as an example of manipulation by acts.

Most power-holders claim legitimacy for their acts, they claim the "right to rule" as they do. If the legitimacy of the exercise of power is acknowledged by the subordinated individuals we speak of legitimate power. If it is not recognized we call it coercion (provided, of course, that the intention of the power-holder is realized).

Person whose general position as a power-holder is recognized as legitimate may exercises force domination, or manipulation. But, as far as the recognition of the legitimacy of individual acts of power is concerned, it is clear that manipulation cannot be a legitimate power, since in the case of manipulation there is no recognition by the subordinated individual that an act of power has been effected. Person who are subject to force (especially as an initial form of influencing behavior and not as a sanction) frequently
do not recognize the legitimacy of such acts of power. Generally, therefore, the recognition of a power-holder as a legitimate exerciser of power rests on the recognition of the legitimacy of his acts of domination. However, this need not mean that he may not also exercise force or manipulation.

Attempted domination may meet with obedience or disobedience. The motivation for obedience and disobedience is instrumental to the extent that it is based on an anticipation of losses and gains and non instrumental to the extent that it is based on ethical or effective impressiveness of conduct dictating obedience or disobedience to the commands. In the case of obedience this imperatives may derive either (a) from a belief that the recognition of power as legitimate, i.e. as legal, traditional, or charismatic, imposes obedience as a norm of conduct or (b) from norms of conduct (e.g. mores) which dictate, not obedience to the power holder but the performance of the particular acts command. In the case of disobedience the imperative will likewise derive either (a) from a belief that recognition of power as non-legitimate, i.e. coercive, imposes disobedience as a norm of conduct as or (b) from norms of conduct which dictate not disobedience to the power-holder but the non-performance of the particular acts commanded. Although one may recognize the legitimacy of power, yet one may also obey or disobey out of instrumental considerations outweighing the motivation toward conformity arising from the recognition of legitimacy.
If the attempt of person to exercise power fails, the power act may be followed either by a substitute power act or by a sanction of substitute power act. Substitution may take place both within or between types of power. Thus, a command may be substituted for a polite request (both of attempted domination), or unsuccessful propaganda may be succeeded by an outright command (manipulation and domination). A sanction is a power act initiated primarily as a reprisal of non-conformity with a prior act or power, its intent is punitive and not primarily directed towards achieving the goal of the prior unsuccessful power act. Since persons who are subjected to attempted exercise of force or manipulation do not—unlike persons subjected to command—either obey or disobey. Sanctions may most properly be spoken of as a reprisal for this obedience to a command (domination) rather than as non-conformity to other types of power. However, it may be true that an unsuccessful propagandist or unsuccessful exerciser of force may (irrationally) take actions with punitive intent against persons who fail to succumb to his propaganda or to his attempt to exercise force.

Disobedience to the command of power-holder may result not only in consciously intended sanctions but also in unintended penalizations (such as guilt feelings, loss of prestige etc.), the anticipation of which may motivate the individual to conform. Market operations afford an important case of unintended penalizations. The demands of buyers and sellers upon each other pro
duce a collective compromise expressed in the price level. Intansigent buyers and sellers are not necessarily subject to intended losses. But their incansigence is, in fact, likely to squeeze them out of the market. The conformity of the buyers or sellers to the imperatives of market conditions involves, in this case conformity, not only to the immediate demand of those with whom they have direct relations, but through them, indirectly with all persons in the market. Unintended consequences may also be derivative penalizations, i.e. they may be unintended result from the infliction of an intended sanction. Thus imprisonment may (even after release) result in the loss of job, prestige and associations.

A power relation in unilateral if only one party to the relationship exerizes power over the other and bilateral if both parties exerice power over each other. The power relationships between officers and privates in an army are typically amount of independent of initiatory, rather than dependent power. Further the impossibility of maintaining complete control over the subordinate staff and the reliance which the power holder must place on them, tends to set up a bilateral power relation between the chief power holder and his subordinates, giving the latter power over the chief power holder in addition to any independent power they may exerces over the mass.

The Analysis of Social Power:

Few problems in sociology are more perplexing than
the problem of social power. In entire lexicon of sociology concepts none is more troublesome than the concept of power. We may say about it in general only what St. Augustine said about time, that we all know perfectly well what it is until some one asks us.

The power structure society is not an insignificant problem. In any realistic sense it is both sociological and a social problem. It has traditionally been a problem in political philosophy. But, like roots which lie deeper than the polish and reach the community itself. It is apparent furthermore, that not all power is political power and that political power like economic, financial, industrial and military power—is only one of several and various kinds of social power. Society itself is shot through with power relations; the power a father exercises over his minor child, a master over his slave, a teacher over his pupils, the victor over the vanquished, the blackmailer over his victim, the warden over his prisoners, the attorney over his own and opposing witnesses, An employer over his employee, a general over his lieutenants, a captain over his crew, a creditor over his debtor, and so on through most of the status relationships of society, power, in short, is a universal phenomenon in human societies and in all social relationships.

Social power has variously been identified with prestige, with influence, with eminence, with competions or ability, with knowledge, with dominence, with rights, with force, and with authority.
since the intetion of a term varies If at all, inversily with extention — i.e. since the more things a term can be applied to the less precis its meaning it would seem to be desirable to distinguish power from at least of other concepts . let us first distinguish power from pres tige.

The closest association between power and prestige has perhaps been made by E.A. Ross in his classic work on social control . “The immediate cause of the location of power”, says Ross, “is prestige”. And further, “the class that has the most prestige will have the most power”. Now prestige may certainly be construed as one of the sources of social power and as one of the most significant of all the factors which separate man from man and group from group, it is a factor which has as one of its consequences the complex startification of modern societies to say nothing of the partial startification of non-literate societies where the chief and the priest and the medicine when occupy prestigious positions. But prestige should not be identified with power. They are independent variables. Prestige is frequently unaccompanied by power and when the to occur together power is usually the basis and gruond of pres tige rather then the reverse prestige would seem to be a consequence of power rather then a determinate of it or a necessary component of it. In any event it is not difficult to illustrate the fact that power and prestige are independent variables, that power can occur with out prestige and prestige without power.

When we turn the relationship between influence and
power we find a still more intimate connection but, for reasons which possess considerably cogency, it seems desirable also to maintain distinction between influence and power. The most important reason, perhaps, is that influence is persuasive while power is coercive. We submit voluntarily to influence while the destiny power requires submission. The Mistress of a king may influence the destiny of a nation, but only because her paramour permits himself to be swayed by her designs. In any ultimate reckoning her influence may be more important than his power, but it is ineffectual unless it is transformed into power. The power a teacher exercised over his pupils stems not from his superior knowledge (this is competence rather than power) and not from his opinions (this is influence rather than power), but from his ability to apply the sanction failures to without academic to the student who does not fulfill his requirement and meet his standards. The competence may be unappreciated and the influence may be ineffective, but the power may not be gainsaid.

(C) THE YOUTH AND THEIR ASPIRATIONS:

One of the persistent aspect of sociological enterprise is the study of youth power. In fact the striving for power is a fundamental dimension of human life and not an accident. Inherent in the relations of group and individuals to one another are the facts of power and authority (legitimate power)—the future of most, if not of all, social structure, class, status and power—the three dimensions of stratification tend, by and large to hang together.
rightly. Therefore the study of power is part of the large study of the determinent of human behavior. Our special interest here is confined to the youth power.

During 1960s the youth power received great attention all over the globe—the pattern of protest, new life-style, new values—all seemed to usher in a new era of history. An enquiry of youth's aspirations for power becomes, therefore at once more promising and significant for severals reasons. First, as youth activism developed in most all parts of the world at the same time during 1960s the perception regarding youth aspiration for power have grown into shades and patches rather then depth. Second, youths aspiration of power is possibly one of the least explored contemporary orientaions. It has largly been confined to discursive interpretation and has seldom been made the focus of systematic research. Third, on emperical investigation of youths aspiration for power at the very least may bring open the facts which otherwise remain fact and unknown. Fourth, since the youth of today are the adult of tommarow a study of there aspirations will provide an important clue to understaing wheter they are becoming power oriented or they are still docile to the traditional power stucture.

Most authors maintain that during thet life cycle, youth is period of generalised and maximized rebelliousness more valuncerable to rebellious posture than either children or adults.
Interisingly, it is also the age at which most individuals seem to crystallize their political viewpoint but there is in complete and contradictory picture of adolescent of political rebellion. It is doubtful that general rebelliousness is likely to take a political form.

What a paradox! Our society, by and large does not encourage the young to take part in politics, more particularly at the crucial period of student life, when they are building up their carrier. Elders want them to devote themselves exclusively to studies. It is taken to be a sign of waywardness, disobedience and indiscipline on their part if they indulge in political activities teachers, parents, guardians all alike frown upon such activities and totally disapprove of young men taking part in them. While this sums up the attitude of the community towards youth's involvement it can be measured by their increasing interest in burning political questions of their time not only in the countries that have recently emerged from a long spell of colonial rule and have not attained a high material standard of living, but also in the countries with relatively long tradition of freedom and prosperity, the youth have been the spearhead of socio-political change.

A number of theories have been employed to explain youth politics. Foremost among these have been the theories of class consciousness status politics, family socialization, critical mass, university and size, public vs private values, technocratic society, mor
alism, religious interpretation, a revolutionary by interpretation, phycologycal interpreation of oedipal revolt, red diper baby,archetypal student militant brusting with ambivalence, psychological moratarium, premature sophistication with a lack of responsibility internalistic, etc.

THE SOCIAL SITUATION OF THE YOUTH:

The root cause of many problem facing the youth in the contemporaray world in general and in India in particular, is the gap between the status images of the youth as perceived by him and as perceived by the community. The youth perception of the same can be correlated to the socio-economic demographic and educational transition of the century that has passed as also to more recent changes in the value system. The status of youth has implication for the kind and quality of relation between generation and for the tempo of social development. The difference between the status images of various groups of youth have a profound impact on the way they relate themselves to the society. Delinquency, youth movement, non-conformity with the pervailing values of the culture and other patterns of behavior are some of the conspicuous manifestation of the status differences.

On the economic front, youth have been placed in a social order in which avenues to afluence have been monopolized by a small elite (less then 5°), while poverty starvation stalks
more than 40% of India's population with a nascent middle class in between. During the three last decades there has been a phenomenal increase in the number of young persons seeking education. Higher education expending at a very rapid pace in India the proportion of youth in the population of countries varies greatly depending upon the demographic, economic and social factors, but generally, developed societies are likely to have a large proportion of youth than developing societies, and urban areas are likely to have a larger proportion of such persons than the rural areas. This should not therefore surprise us, for under the impact of social forces unique to his times, youth has splintered into various groups and assumed different stances.

It will be proper to clarify the meaning of terms 'youth' and 'general' youth refers to collective belonging to the age group of 18–30 years which transition from childhood to adulthood. Sociologically, youth is a period in the life of a person when the society in which he functions, ceases, to regard him/her as a child and does not accord to him/her full adult status, role and functions. The span of a generation is usually taken to be thirty three years, a figure arrived at by statistical reckoning. The terms 'youth' and 'generation' are used interchangeably because the letter is now used more in a sociological rather than biological sense.

Youth is a period in the temporal ordering of society and all societies apparently conceive of this category. Despite the
fact that in adolescence the youth attains the apex of physical maturity, the height of sexual power and the peak of intellectual capacity, he occupies a subordinate position in society, a condition that is to some extent inherent in the nature of all societies. Consequently, youth feels deprived of independent participation and recognition and happens to occupy a dependent status. In the shadow of superordinate adults cannot gain recognition, play differentiated roles, practise social skills or interest with others except as a dependent and subordinate figures. That is to say, youth is denied the adult role in the society, for he is considered not yet worthy for adult role. But in fact, he is in the pressing need of playing out these roles by virtue of his transition from youth to adulthood. It is under these circumstances that youth turns to the refusal of the status and role by the adults. Youth culture is one of negation in which the positive values of prevailing culture are distorted and inverted for uses best suited to a philosophy of youthful dissidence and protest. Youth adaptions to rolelessness in contemporary society may take the form of alienation, hedonism, political indifference and other directedness. Even if these stances of youth cannot be universal, nevertheless they may possibly be applicable in some specific sociocultural contexts. From all this, we can set out the hypothesis, that subordinate and dependent status of youth in society tends to give rise to youth dissidence and protest.

The adults society regards youth as a liability due to his dependent position. Considered prone to risk, he is subject to an
obligation. The society therefore, makes special provision for his protection and privileges while according special treatment in all major institutions ranging from family to industry. Since the law provides a rather liberal treatment for the deviance of youth, he receives a distinctive attention. At times he is accorded special indulgence and at other special stringency, which too reflects the dependency of youth. This aspect of youth's status is obvious in the political field where dependents are regarded as limited citizens. And, when the institutional system is regarded as the barrier to the satisfaction of legitimised goals the stage is set for rebellion as an adaptive response.

It should be clear from what has been stated above that youth has been accorded a 'minority status' in society for he has yet not attained maturity and also constitutes but a small fraction of population. Consequently, his dependent status excites his unquenched appetite for freedom and equality and makes him restless.

Placed as he is in a precarious position youth is frequently treated as child and frequently expected to the role of adults. He comes to occupy the position of a 'marginal man' in the society—indeed, a stage of status anxiety. The characteristic symptoms of the marginal man are emotional instability and sensitivity. They tend to unbalanced behaviour, to either boisterousness or shyness, exhibiting too much tension and frequent between extremes of contradictory behaviour. To some extent behaviour symptomatic for the mar
ginal man can be found in the adolescent. He too is over sensitive easily shifting from one extreme to the other, and particularly sensi
tive to the shortcomings of his younger fellows. In modern society, youth is generally obliged to live for many years as marginal man whose social status is rather ambiguous for he is considered neither and adult nor yet a child, neither permitted to share the prerogative of adults nor enjoy the irresponsibility of prepubescent childhood, neither taken completely seriously by adult nor ignored by them as they might ignore the antics of a young child. Much tension in youth may be attributed to his marginal position in society. Surrounded by such socio-cultural matrix youth tries to be away from childhood and prepares for adulthood, but finds himself bewildered and conf-
fused under the dominance of adult. And when societies are in a period of rapid transition, the resulting confusion in status creates added problems for adolescents who are themselves in a state of transition as they strive for adult status during the period of transi-
tion from youth to adulthood. The youth is thrust between his own developing world and the world of the older generation. Thus, the fact cannot the overlooked that the ambiguity of youthful status emanates from the responses of society to it.

Another consequence of status detendency is a persistent uncertainity and ambiguity regarding the proper stance with which youth to interact with adult. This status ambiguity may result in a higher disposition to deviant modes of conduct. It may give rise
to the hostility to the social order and endanger alienation from the norms an values regulating social behaviour. This situation provides an opportunity for association and affiliation. Gradually, comes two
develop significant aspirations: one, it seems to aspire more than equality with adults and two, domination of principle of merit by the adults results in tension and conform. The former is referred to as “runways expectations” and the latter as “galloping expectations”.

A great many studies have recently been made in an attempt to discover the attitude of youth towards adults and of adults towards youth in contemporary societies. Though the results are not as yet very conclusive the findings, by and large, suggest contradictory views. A familiar one assumes that young people have widely rejected the standards, guidance and authority of their seniors and are even united in hostility towards them. Studies into harmony and tension in child-parent relationship suggested the probability that, at are soon after puberty, boy’s attitude towards fathers and girl’s attitude towards mothers would be particularly hostile and critical. Empirical researches conducted by psychologists show that children after the age of eleven abandon parents as models for their future careers and advisers when they are in difficulties. That is to say, modern youth has refused to accept the authority and direction of adults and there is greater oneness of interest among the men of his own age.

By contrast, there are studies that support with greater
clarity the rejection of young by adults. The truth of this view checked by sociologists and the findings arrived at have questioned the notion of peer group solidarity, conformity and loyalty. There are very guarded attitudes of highly selected group of adults towards the present generation of teenagers, it has also been noted that bourgeois family still enfolds its adolescents more completely and securely. The loyalty and conformity to peer group standards and behaviours have been seriously questioned.

This quickly assembled collection of instances only show the case with which two contrasting perceptions can be identified. Whatever be the position, the fact remains that youth are rejecting the adults or adults are discarding the youth.

It was said earlier that youth attains the height of physical maturity at this stage of his age, but society perpetually tries to overlook it. What a paradox! biologically the youth is a major, but powerful attempts are made by the society to treat him as minor. During the last hundred years there has been a very striking tendency for the adolescence to become mature earlier, and for the whole process of growth to be speeded up. The society has successfully treated the adolescents less mature. At present a 15 years old, in physique and very probably in brain maturity, is equal to a 16 years old of a generation ago.

The society has been astonishingly successful in ig
noring biology. Although the maturity of the young has been accelerated since the middle of the last century, we have kept them in ever longer tutelage and dependence. Youth has been kept in even longer subordination just because he is more mature and poses a threat to the old. And, where society does not permit the adolescent assume a social role compatible with his physical and intellectual development, but keeps him dependent and irresponsible at home, adult maturity comes with difficulty.

However, we must make it clear that it would be too erroneous to suppose that the entire youth community exhibits the symptoms, rather a larger proportion of youth accept indulgence and display satisfaction instead of resentment.

In the present inquiry, we have been primarily concerned with perception of adults of youth status in modern society. We focused our attention on the following aspects of youth's status in society, the subordinate and dependent status of youth, youth as a liability on society, youth as a minority group in the society, the marginal position of youth, the mutual rejection of youth and adults by each other and finally, the continued treatment of youth as a mature persons. This excursion into the status of youth was intended primarily to formulate certain hypothesis.

The society's perception of youth status in modern
society is a subject crucial to our theme. The diverse and scattered observation of the society's perception of youth exhibits some basic similarities. First, they are all given over to the live situation of youth. These consequences are rather consistently observed to be those of reinforcement of prevailing situation of youth. Second, these views affirm the control point that systems of youth status do affect their behaviour. Third, suspicion begins to emerge that these social mechanisms would be essential for the integration of society. In conclusion, the mass evidence suggests that confusion in the relationship between youth and earlier generation in mainly due to a faulty perception of youth's status in modern society.

(D) YOUTH VERSES PARENTS:

Parental behaviour is considered as a very important determinant in shaping in development of a balanced personality of a child. In modern life, it is found that with a number of family and financial problems, parents are not in a position to take proper care and to establish harmonious relationship with their children, therefore, children perceive themselves as rejected which affects the temperamental, motivational and cognitive aspects of their personality. In many studies (Sandhu & Bhargava, 1988, Bhargava and Sandhu, 1989, Bhargava and Vansal, 1996), it was noticed that rejected children has a week physique, dis-organized personality, pessimistic views of life, developed feeling of revenge and criminal tendency, having neurotic and psychotic tendencies with violent ac
tivities. Television, Radio, News Papers, Magazines etc. also play important role in developing our attitudes. Social influence being the important factor to influence the behaviour of an individual, thus, it is important to undertake this study in order to understand, control and predict the behaviour of the individuals.

Youth are likely to be challenging and sometimes trying it could hardly be otherwise, in view of the many changes taking place during these years in both child and parents and in their relationship with one another in their own way, parents too, may face an identity crisis. The parent of the average youth is entering middle age. At a time when their children are approaching the peak of their physical and sexual vigour, parents are faced with the fact that they have passed their own physical and peaks and that the rest of the road slopes downhill, however gently at first. in a society as obsessed with youth as our own and so scornful of old-age the prospect can sometimes be a painful one.

The youth of children can be a time of agonising reappraisal for parents in other ways as well. Husband are likely to be aware that they have not realised whatever dreams they may have of vocational or society glory by early forties or shortly thereafter, are not likely to realise them. Similarly a wife who have suppressed other life goals in the interest of child rearing or still more difficult to cop—who may have used her relationship with her children as a
compensation for other disappointments, must face the fact that her children soon be gone. What, she may ask, will she do then?

This is also a time when parents and their young sons and daughters must learn to establish new kinds of relationships with each other. Parents must be able to recognise and encourage the youth needs for increased independence (Storr, 1975). Continuing to think of youth simply as “out darling baby”, or “our little boy” and treating them accordingly is a prescription for latter disaster, whether it takes the form of explosive rebellion or continued and increasingly inappropriate dependence.

At the same time however, it is vital to recognise that true independence is not built in a day. Dependent needs continue to exist, often in uneasy and fragile alliance with needs for independence. Partially because so many things are changing in the youth's world, he or she urgently needs a base of security and stability in home parents-something to take for granted while more urgent concerns are worked out. Along with the increasing independence comes an inevitable shift in the emotional relationships between parent and child. If the youth, eventually going to achieve emotional, social and sexual maturity, he or she must gradually begin shifting to peers-to “best friends” and boy friends or girl friends-some of the intimate emotional attachment previously reserved largely for parents.

Obviously adaptation to this new land of relationship, is going to be more difficult for some parents and youth's than
for others. Mothers and fathers who feel unloved by their spouses may be reluctant to see their children begin leading their own lives and forming new emotional attachment outside the family, especially if the child is providing compensation for other frustrations in life, some parents consciously desire that their children lead happy and rewarding lives. But keep them tied to their apron strings through jealousy. Unconsciously, they do not want their children to enjoy good time that they themselves are missing.

Even under the most favorable circumstances the adjustment the youth emotional separation from the family is bound to have its painful moments for both parents and children. Inevitably, and quits properly, there will be occasional feeling of loss and longings for a simpler time when there was 'just the family'.

The popular view of youth is that it is a period of great 'storm and stress'. Yet more broadly representative studies indicate that while this is certainly the case with some youth's, including some of the most sensitive and gifted of them as well some of the most maladjusted, it is not true of the majority of youths. Indeed some investigators has expressed dismay at the number of youth's, who have undergone 'a premature identity consolidation'. Characterised by rather blind acceptance of things as they are and "a general unwillingness to take psychic risk". This does not mean that these youths are without problems of conflicts. However this
means only that 'symptoms' will tend, with few exceptions to be mild and transitory. Conflicts with parents are natural and to be expected particularly during the earlier years of youth. For one thing, as their mental horizons expand, youths see that the family's values and way of life or not the only possible once. Younger children usually have the conviction that 'how we do it at our house' is right and the only possible way. When a mother or father says that Binit and his family members are pretty odd people, the younger child will generally accept it as a statement of fact, but not so the youth who is capable of perceiving not only that there is room for alternative values, beliefs or ways of doing things, but that the style of others parents may actually be superior to that of their own. It may take a long time but ultimately the youth is likely to conclude that, while parent do not have all the answers, their opinion and knowledge — gained from bitter experience — can be still be helpful.

Another common reason for parents — youth conflict during these years is the 'tyranny of habits'. It is often difficult for parents to realise that their little girl or boy is no longer a child, and that rules and regulation that may have been appropriate when there children were younger are no longer so. Even they do realise it, it is often to break their old habits. The problem may be further founded by inconsistencies on the part of the youth. As we have noted, youths typically have mixed feeling about independence and dependence. At one level, they know that sooner or later they will
have to become independent, make their own way in the world, and be responsible for their own actions. In many ways, the prospect of ‘freedom’ will be appealing. But the prospect of impending independence and its responsibilities can sometimes be frightening, too, and then the security of continued childhood dependence. The knowledge that a mother or father will somehow make things all right also has its appeal.

These conflicts between independent and dependent needs can lead to sudden and unpredictable swings in attitude and behavior. The youth may be surprisingly mature, independent and responsible one moment, and childlike and undependable the next. Just when a mother and father think their son or daughter has earned greater freedom, something makes happen to make the parents doubt whether he or she has grown up at all. Forgetting a vital appointment, getting plans all made for and outing and then deciding not to go promising to perform some necessary or even important task and then neglecting to do so, indignantly bucking against parental nagging about homework and then failing to prepare for a school examination—these are common causes of the marked despair that one time or another visits the parents of every youth.

Another reason for some of the conflicts between youths and their parents is the lack of clear cut guidelines in contemporary society—for either parents or their children—about what
behavior is appropriate for youth at a particular age. What rules should parents try to impose and at what age, about relation with the opposite sex, drinking, driving the family car, going on trips with peers? (Ford, 1970).

In many primitive societies, the privileges and obligations of each age group are clearly spelled out. There also tend to be clearly defined boundaries between adolescence and adulthood. Market by a 'rite of passage', or initiation ceremony, completion of this mean that the boy and girl is accepted as an adult, though junior, member of society. Not just the parents.

No such institutionalised pattern of recognition of youth’s impending or achieved maturity is provided in developed industrial societies today. All we have is a hotchpotch of often inconsistent and loosely enforced rules, which may vary from community to community across an otherwise unitary society, about when a youth may drink, drive a car, leave school, marry or own property. Society no longer bestows youth status at any one point.

The problem in contemporary society of what to expect of youths and how to persuade them to meet the appropriate expectations has been complicated by the rapidity of social, moral, and political change in recent years. So swift has change been in last several decades that today's youth has grown up in a marked differ
ent world from that of their parents whose own experience as children and youth may consequently be virtually useless as guidance in understanding their children's needs, problems and goals.

The problem of child rearing has also been made more difficult by rapidly increasing urbanisation and geographic mobility in many industrialised nations. This is particularly true in the United States, where approximately half of all families move every five years, often into unfamiliar communities far from relations and friends. America is a steadily becoming in Vance Packard's words, 'a nation of strangers'. In an earlier day, a puzzled parent could more readily turn for help to family members or close friends of others of similar cultural background.

It is not simply a matter of parents gaining a greater feeling of security and direction from living in a close knit, relatively homogenous community. Their children are also more likely to accept parental rules, standard and beliefs when they see that these are shared by other significant adults.

But many parents today find it difficult or impossible to communicate closely with other parents, and where these other parents follow different rules, the opportunities for such familiar youth blackmail techniques as all the other kids are allowed to do it, of 'Rita's parents do not act that way', are significantly increased.
Youths themselves may also be genuinely confused or sceptical about the diversity they observe in the values, beliefs and practices among peers and parents.

(E) THE GENERATION GAP:

Despite the increased difficulty of rearing children and youths in today's world, most parents and youths manage to succeed, not without some ups and downs and worrying times, but without unresolvable conflicts and serious alienation.

There is, as one might reasonably expect for persons at different stage or life cycle, a 'generation gap'. But it is neither as wise nor as novel as we have been led to believe even at the height of the youth culture of the late 1960s, the great majority of both parents and youths in the United States expressed the view that while generation gap existed, it had clearly been exaggerated (Yankelovich, 1969).

Current studies give much the same picture. In a recent survey of American youths, most of the subjects (87 percent of boys and 89 percent of girls) stated that they had a lot of respect for their parents' ideas and opinions. The percentage acknowledging 'a lot of respect' was somewhat higher for girls than for boys, and higher for younger girls than for older ones (Konopka, 1976).

Only a relatively small minority stated that they did
not feel any strong affection for their parents. And only six percent felt that ‘My parents do not really like me’. Fewer than a fifth of all youth agreed that ‘I have pretty much given up on ever being able to get along with my parents’. Indeed, two thirds of the younger Americans aged 18-28 consider family a very important value, and a similar proportion would welcome more emphasis on traditional families (Yankelovich, 1974).

In most cases, conflicts with parents involve issues of personal freedom. How many parents are familiar with such youth’s complaints as ‘I don’t see why I have to be home by twelve. None of my friends have to why do you let him (her) do it, but not me? Why do you always treat me like a baby? And you can’t make me. And how many youths have had their requests greeted with ‘Why do we want to go around with those boys (girls)? When you older, you will understand ……’, or because I known what is best?'

The fact is that, while they may seem earth shaking at the time, and most parent–youth conflicts are about relativity minor matters. These include getting to bed by a certain time, being able to go to parties or on trips with peers, using the family car, doing chores, spending allowance money, choosing clothes or hair style, seeming to much of some particular member of the opposite sex and the like.

Why do some parents succeed while others fail? Why do some youths grow in to adulthood confident, competent, caring, secure in their own sense of identity and in their relations with their families, while others emerge from youth directionless, lacking in independence, low in self-esteem ineffective, angry and alienated or victims of psychological disturbance? Obviously, there is no simple answer. Many factors may play a part viz, social disorder, disruptive peer influence, discrimination, poverty, poor schooling.

Nevertheless, an impressive body of research and clinical investigation makes it clear that the single most important influence in helping or hindering the average youth to cope with the developmental demands of youths in today's world is his or her parent. But what kind of parents? Parents may be loving or rejecting, calm or anxious, rigid or inflexible, involved or uninvolved: But there are two dimensions of parental behaviour that are of particular importance.

The first of these dimensions may be labelled love—hostility or acceptance-rejection. The need of youths for loving, caring parents whom they can have confidence has been demonstrated repeatedly both in clinical work and in systematic research with normal, neurotic and delinquent youths without strong and clear manifestations of parental love, the youth has little chance of developing self-esteem, constructive and rewarding relationships with oth-
ers and a confident sense of his or her own identity.

With real parental warmth and caring, however, the youth is often able to overcome many seemingly insuperable obstacles. A 17-year old, spoke of her family: “I guess really they are the most important. Because they are always there and I always can go to them and they always say something that will make me feel better. And they support me in my activities and I donot know, they are just good all around”. Parental hostility, rejection, or neglect consistently occur more often than acceptance, love and trust in the back-grounds of children with a very wide variety of problems. These range from intellectual and academic difficulties and impaired social relationships with peers and adults to neurotic disorders, psychosomatic disturbances and character problem such as delinquency (Elder, 1963).

Perhaps less obvious, but equally impotant is the parents position on the question of control versus freedom. To cope effectively with today’s and tomorrow’s world youths need discipline (ultimately self discipline). But they also need independence, self-reliance adaptability and a strong sense of their own values. Research has shown that there qualities are fostered best by prants who show respect for their youths, involve them in family affairs and decision-making and encourage the development of age-appropriate independence—but who also retain ultimate responsibility with confidence.

Such parents are, in the words of psychologist.
Baumrind (1968), authoritative without being authoritarian. They value both autonomous self will and disciplined behaviour. They encourage verbal give and take, and when they exercise parental authority in the form of demands or prohibitions, they explain their reasons for doing so. This description by a 16 year old girl is typical of such parents. "I guess the thing I think is great about my parents, compared to those of a lot of kids, is that they really listen. And they realise that eventually I am going to do with it. A lot of the time when I explain what I want to do, they will go along with it. Sometimes, they will warn me of the consequences I will have to face if I am wrong, or just give me advice. And sometimes, they just plainly tell me no. But when they say so, they explain why and that makes it easier to take".

In contrast to the authoritative parent is the authoritarian parent, who just tells the child or youth what to do and feels no obligation to explain why. Such parents favour obedience as an absolute virtue, and tend to deal with any attempt to protest with punitive, forceful measures. Any sort of free discussion or two-way interaction between the parent and youth is discouraged, in the conviction that the young person should unquestionably accept the parent's word for what is right.

Some parent may take this stance out of a feeling of hostility, or simply because they cannot be bothered. Others, how
ever, may be doing so because they think that this is the way to develop respect for authority. A mistake they make is it that while they may suppress dissent, they do not usually eliminate it. They may even encourage resentment. Many children of autocratic or authoritarian parents—because they are not given a chance to test out their own ideas or take independent responsibility, and because their opinions are not treated as worthy of consideration—emerge from youth lacking in self-confidence and self-esteem, or unable to be self-reliant, act independently, or think for themselves. As youths, the children of authoritarian and aristocratic parent are far more likely than the children of authoritative parents to say. They felt unwanted by both fathers and mothers. They are also less likely as youth to have a mature conscience based on internalised, independent, moral standards rather than a weakly developed and changeable conscience based more on external rewards and punishments.

Parents who are laissez-faire or who assume false and exaggerated egalitarianism, also fail to provide the kind of support that their youths need in today's world. In several recent studies of middle-class youths, high risk drug use and other forms of socially deviant behaviour were found to occur most frequently among the youth of parents who outwardly expressed such values as individuality, self-understanding, and the need for egalitarianism within the family but actually used these proclaimed values to avoid assuming parental responsibility. By setting up the family as a pseudo democ
racy these parents are able to abdicate from decision-making powers, responsibility, and unequal status. But by placing themselves on the footing of peers, they end up leaving their children to drift essentially rudderless in an uncharted sea.

No matter how much youths may protest at times, they do not really want their parents to be equals. They want and need them to be parents friendly, understanding parents, but parents nonetheless are models of youth behaviour.

Parents in contemporary society therefore face the problem of steering a delicate course between authoritarianism on the one hand and over permissiveness, egalitarianism, or neglect on the other. But for those who are able to achieve this balance, the results can be rewarding to both parent and youth. As an 18 years old Chicago girl said of her mother, 'she has given me confidence in myself and sometimes she tries to make me understand her point of view. Then when she says something and it is right even though it hurts me. I like to listen to her even though I pretend, I am not listening, I turn my face and she makes me believe in myself, even when I am down'. Or this from a 16 year old boy, "My dad's kind of special I guess. Like he takes me camping, and he sits down and talks to me about trouble at school. He wants to know what I am doing, where I am going. He helps me to learn things, and I admire him for being smart and strong and able to handle problems".
All of this does make sense in today's world. Authoritative patterns of parental behaviour may have been more workable in simpler and less rapidly changing times. When a youth could expect to be successful by simply following in father's or mother's footsteps. Today however, parents can under favourable circumstances, still provide their youths with models of successful independent, flexible, realistic behaviour. But they can not provide detailed blueprints for mastering the changing of a world in headlong transitions.