CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS
In early 60s, when this study was first conducted, indiscipline posed as one of the acute problems of national concern. Slowly and gradually this evil increased to such an extent that it spread from educational campus to other spheres of life or the vice versa. From mid 60s to mid 70s it took an alarming shape and challenged the stability of our country. This was realised by the Prime Minister herself when she addressed the nation after the proclamation of emergency: "Agitations have surcharged the atmosphere, leading to violent incidents....Now we learn of new programmes challenging law and order throughout the country with a view to disrupting normal functioning ....The actions of a few are endangering the rights of the vast majority". (Indira Gandhi, 1975). It was also observed that only in Uttar Pradesh during June and October 1974 there had been 2,089 incidents of student unrest (Hindustan Times; Nov. 6, 1975). This was the magnitude to which the student turmoil had shot up. Besides, it was also realised that the student behaviour had adopted the form of collective act of indiscipline (Suri, 1960) which was to be immediately checked and remedied.

There had been a great concern about this problem and from time to time it was tried to remedy this malady, but inadventently the experts believed that extrinsic or contextual factors were basically responsible for this indiscipline which reflected from various measures that were suggested or taken
by various authorities and individuals at different occasions. Mostly, it was attempted to suppress this violent behaviour by power and authority as was the case in 1966 when the Central Government made some of the following recommendations to the State Chief Ministers for student indiscipline (Hindustan Times; Oct. 8, 1966):

1. Strikes and unlawful activities on the part of students should not, under any circumstances, be countenanced and should be put down with a firm hand even in the form of rustication, either permanent or temporary, and of closure of the institutions concerned for the necessary period.

2. Vice-Chancellors should be armed with sufficient powers to impose discipline.

3. Some machinery should be set up under which action could be taken against teachers and professors fomenting troubles.

4. The university campus or the college premises should not be used for holding political meetings.

5. Ways and means should be devised by which students should be encouraged to occupy themselves usefully during leisure hours and long vacations.

These recommendations reflect the measures that have frequently been taken by the state and local authorities and which denoted the causes speculated by the authorities.

A 'depth study', conducted by the Home Ministry sometime ago, of the 1237 cases of strikes and agitations during the period 1958–64 disclosed the causes of indisciplined behaviour (Hindustan Times; Oct. 6, 1966) not very much different from those that had been repeatedly stressed by various statesmen and educationists (See Chapter I). The most important causes mentioned were: (a) indifference to preventive measures, (b) inadequacy of teaching
staff and lack of other facilities, (c) involvement of political parties, (d) hasty police action, (e) unjustified student demands, vis. reduction of fees, revocation of disciplinary measures, postponement of examinations, etc., (f) interference in management and administration of educational institutions, (g) student politics, (h) inadequacy of facilities, and (i) group or caste politics in the management bodies of institutions, and intrigues by teachers. The study was emphatic that the most important psychological factor, encouraging indiscipline and violence, was a feeling among students that no action would be taken against them no matter what they did.

Such causes and many others that have been off and on described by the educationists and statesmen label it as the intrinsic characteristics of the student community as a whole. The difficulty with them is that they are impatient in studying and analysing the situation. They comment: "It must be pleasurable to sociologists, as the Education Commission has hinted, to continue to indulge in this facile exercise. Their studies should be helpful in perfecting long term remedies for this malady. But we urgently need a short-term remedy" (John, 1966). Such views have certainly left the ground un molested for a study like the one in hand.

We were surprised to find that, in nearly all such observations, the main stress had been laid on the factors that exist in the world outside the student himself. It had often not been taken note of the fact that "there are some young people who not only will not learn themselves, but will prevent others from learning" (John, 1966). But "these some young men" have diverted little attention of the sociologists and psychologists for a depth study that was once desired even by the Education Commission. The question still remains unanswered: Who are "these some young men"?

Probably for the first time, Siddiqi and Akhtar (1969) hinted in this direction that content factors or those that are inherent in the students
need a thorough study and an unbiased analysis to understand the problem of indiscipline. No other study of this nature had been available to the present researcher (See Chapter III).

The present effort has been made to do an intensive study of the student behaviour from social psychological point of view; the importance and significance of which had been realized by others as well. For instance, Misra (1966) asserts that "social and psychological causes are at the bottom of today's student unrest". Through our study we have endeavoured to come to certain new conclusions that may facilitate in treating the ailing group of the student community. Since long we have been realizing that there are numerous unexplored content factors of indisciplined behaviour. They are to be unearthed and the chronic disorder of the indisciplined ones is to be thoroughly and patiently investigated.

No doubt, at times stresses and strains such as economic and political may ignite pent up emotions which could have outburst and might be adjudged as acts of indiscipline. But to understand the phenomena of indiscipline, such spurts have to be observed for a study like this one with academic constraints which is possible only when the investigation is stretched over a period of so much time that it can include in itself normal as well as critical phases of campus life. Though this is a Ph. D. thesis, yet we could have comfortably squeezed its period of study to two or three years. But in that haste and impatience we would have missed the real understanding of such a grave problem. From the very outset, we were quite clear about the fact that this work cannot be aimed as short-term target, which is usually done, as we earnestly wanted to understand the problem of student behaviour. Hence, we did not get frustrated with such a big lapse of time, but patiently and deliberately stretched the period of study to more than thirteen years. This length of time fulfilled our real objective of isolating and pin-pointing the social
The period extending from 1962 to 1974 covers two important points of the phases of student unrest and violence. From the day of independence to 1962 some problematic factors had become crystal clear before the nation and amongst them the one seriously noted was the alarming nature of student indiscipline. But soon after events like China war and Pakistan wars, and the war for the liberation of Bangladesh, also the famine, drought, flood, and some political and communal troubles did not permit to rectify and correct the student behaviour. In 1974, once again, the situation in academic fourwalls became explosive and it started fomenting in other fields of social, political, economic and national activities. Now, the situation which in 1962 was of serious concern posed as a danger to educational and national stability in 1974. Therefore, these two years have stood out for this study as the critical periods for comparison of the disciplined and indisciplined groups.

We have confined ourselves to the study of only eight social psychological factors which distinguish the disciplined and indisciplined students with each other in their behaviour. We know that there could be some more such factors but our physical limitations do not allow us to become too ambitious. Anyhow, these factors can be paid due attention in future studies, which will definitely be an addition to the present findings. We obviously do not claim that we have done an exhaustive work, but simply that we have tried to do our research in a least explored field.

**EMOTIONAL Maturity:**

The adolescent or the early adult has an inherent desire to manifest his emotional maturity along with his physical maturity, but the material world is not so simple that he can have a smooth expression of this trait. In the existing complex environment he often finds that the demands and expectations of the social order are ambiguous and at times contradictory. If the young
individual fails to show the psychological stability he proves to be awkward the difficult situations. This is the stage at which he betrays his emotional control. In educational campus, he is expected to prove emotionally immature. With this Hypothesis we planned to measure the role of emotional maturity in the behaviour of disciplined and indisciplined students.

Analysis of the data of this study reveals that the disciplined and indisciplined students significantly differ with each other with respect to emotional maturity and on the average the former group is more emotionally mature than the latter one, as is evident from the studies of 1962 and 1974 (Chap. V; Tables: I, II, & III). The indisciplined group has more variance in it than the disciplined one (Chap. V; Tables: I & II). When we compared the disciplined group of 1962 with that of 1974 (chap. V; Table: IV) we found that there was highly insignificant difference between the two. But in the case of indisciplined groups of 1962 and 1974 there was a significant difference between the two (Chap. V; Table: V). This difference in indisciplined groups is because at the first critical point of this study, i.e., in 1962, these students were beginning to gain prominence among other students. They had by that time not received any support or encouragement from other quarters, because indiscipline had not tempted the common man so much as it did in the latter 60s. When violence and hostilities increased to such an extent that national progress was nearly coming to an stand still, all sorts of emotional immaturities got appreciation and encouragement. Official indifference on many occasions further pampfered this immaturity (Hindustan Times; Oct. 8, 1966). Thus, at the second critical point of this study, i.e., in 1974, this group became further more immature.

Emotionally immature persons have lesser ability to bear tension; they exhibit outgrowing moodiness as well as sentimentality (Cole and Hall, 1964). As they do not possess much self control, they become overwhelmed by
emotions and exhibit outbursts of anger and passion in annoying and agitating situations (Jersild, 1963). Allport (1961) also holds the same view by asserting that the immature adult meets irritations and thwarting with tantrums of temper, or with complaining, blaming others, and self-pity. Contrarily, emotionally mature persons meet their frustrations on positive planes. They endeavour to realize their own shortcomings and mistakes, if there are any, and find out ways and means for overcoming the unfavourable situations. Saul and Pulver (1965) on the basis of their study have asserted that emotionally mature persons have a balanced adjustment with their environment which the emotionally immature persons, obviously, do not have. But those who respond to their impulses and violate important cultural sanctions, norms, and expectations, their behaviour and level of emotional maturity become maladjustive (Tucker, 1970). Emotionally mature person is stable in his emotional responses and does not swing from one emotional reaction or mood to another. "He assesses a situation critically before responding to it emotionally instead of reacting to it on its surface value" (Hurlock, 1968). Our findings further confirm that the emotionally immature group is excessively sensitive to emotional tensions and being emotionally unstable it lacks balanced adjustment with its environment. Hence, we notice that indisciplined students react in 'all-or-none' manner without delaying their overt emotional response making a significant reference to their total behavioral character.

SOCIAL MATURITY:

Social maturity has a close proximity with emotional maturity. Lindgren (1969) argues that the source of much abnormal and anti-social behaviour are emotional and social immaturities. Besides, emotional immaturity does not limit the closest sphere of individual behaviour alone, but it manifests itself into other behaviours too which are obviously social interactions of the individual with the people around him. These interactions conform to some
social norms and values which every individual of the society has to honour in some way or the other. It is at this stage where social maturity plays its expected role. The socially mature person is willing and able to orient himself "in the various activities and customs of the group, to make a proportionate contribution to the work to be done, to take a suitable part in the social exchange, to assume a reasonable amount of responsibility, and to adjust himself to the inevitable limitations and restrictions of community life without waste of energy or loss of satisfaction" (Pressey and Kuhlen, 1957). He can be original and yet conform to the broader pattern of his cultural environment (Hurlock, 1968).

Results of the present study reveal that the indisciplined students on the average as a group are socially immature whereas the disciplined ones are significantly socially mature (Chap. V; Tables: VI, VII, and VIII). Further, the indisciplined group is more variegated in comparison with the disciplined ones (Chap. V; Tables: VI and VII). The disciplined group of 1962 and that of 1974 are more or less identical (Chap. V; Table: IX), but in the case of indisciplined ones the two, viz., 1962 and 1974 groups, significantly differ with each other (Chap. V; Table: X). This difference between the two indisciplined groups is probably because of the same facts that have been presented while discussing the two indisciplined groups for their emotional immaturity (See page, 6). The results of 1962 and 1974 indisciplined groups (Chap. V; Table: X) further strengthen our argument that these students have become still more immature because of the circumstances which did not provide any opportunity for their social and emotional adjustments. As indiscipline is a social nuisance, it becomes logical to uphold that the indisciplined students are socially immature. As such, they turn into anti-social individuals who are generally less able to perceive, evaluate, and act in accordance with the demands of the physical and social environment. They are dominantly ego-
centric and selfish, always appreciating a pleasure-and-thrill-seeking way of life, which leads to the exploitation of their own body, their associates, and their social and physical environment. An anti-social individual will have lesser feelings of guilt and anxiety than other persons. He is so much overpowered by his feeling of importance that he never considers about being wrong or immoral or misguided (Lindgren, 1959). We have marked such deficiencies in socially immature students in the course of this study. Their social immaturity does not enable them to recognize their academic and social obligations, so they develop a great grudge and antagonism against the established norms and values which often provoke them for antisocial behaviour.

ASCENDANCE-SUBMISSION:

Emotional tantrums and anti-social behaviour always seek expression through assertion and dominance, for organization of mass-demonstrations and instantaneous formations cannot materialize without the factor of ascendance in the personality of agitators and violence provocators. This type of dominance in general is so conspicuous that we often ignore to think about the positive and constructive dimension of leadership. We mostly do not expect a leadership amongst the disciplined groups as they never attempt to exploit the unfavourable situation for their short-term benefits. We generally come across the organizations and their destructive expositions sponsored by indisciplined students, but we have never attempted to realize the potentiality of constructive organizations of disciplined students who have the strength to stand against negative forces. This neglected fact drew our attention and we endeavoured to find out whether it was assertion and ascendance that pulled up emotionally and socially immature individuals to manifest their mal-adjustment through eruptive group reactions against the society with which they were dissatisfied.

Findings of this study reveal it as a mere presumption that indisci­iplined students would be more ascendant as compared with the disciplined
ones. The fact is that the two groups, viz., disciplined and indisciplined, neither on the average nor as a group significantly differ with each other (Chap. V; Tables: XI, XII, and XIII). Furthermore, the disciplined and indisciplined groups of 1963 as well as of 1974 have insignificant differences in their structure and behaviour except that they represent two different types of ascendance (Chap. V; Tables: XIV and XV). This insignificance in difference between the two groups is reasonable because, every every group demands a few leaders and a good lot of followers. If all the indisciplined students would have been ascendants it would have been difficult for them to form a group and give the banner of leadership in the hands of one or a few individuals.

It is generally upheld that all types of groups comprise some ascendants and many submissive persons. But the nature of their ascendance or dominance depends on the requirements of the situation. If the individual is unable to assert in one sphere of life he finds out some other field of assertion for his ego-satisfaction (Coleman, 1960). The individuals who cannot show ascendance in a constructive direction they eventually indulge in some destructive activities for out-witting those who have outshined with their positive merits. Besides, in the case of submissives, they feel certain obligations of their peer group on themselves. Their conformities mostly depend on the type of friendships they have established (Sarnoff, 1962; Watson, 1965). When the group pressure becomes enormous it becomes difficult or virtually impossible for him to deviate from it.

Present study affirms the fact that ascendant and submissive personalities exist in both the groups of positive and negative ideals. The ascendants gather round themselves the individuals who suit their reaction to the situation. The nature of their responses determines whether they are dominative or integrative (Anderson, 1940), dominative or constructive (Schiedlinger, 1953), and socially acceptable or socially unacceptable (Thompson, 1962).
Discontentment or dissatisfaction with the society will provoke the negative or socially unacceptable ascendants to hostilities, violences and ugly aggressive behaviour whereas the reasonable ascendants will try to find out a healthy and constructive way of facing the realities of life.

A group which is formed on some irrational demands, its structure becomes ambiguous. The 'group-whips' ignore their personal tendencies and attend to the group tendencies which culminate role contradictions in their personalities (Berkowitz, 1956). When a leader who suits the wishes of a group comes forward, the non-ascendant and submissive members do not feel the need to lead. They simply like the things 'get going' and carry out suggestions made by the leader (Nemphill, 1961). In this situation the ascendants take an authoritarian position and the submissives regress to obedience and submission. On the contrary, the mature individuals, sensitive to the needs of the group and relatively free from personality disturbances, "try to achieve personal status as well as group-goals without consciously fostering regressive forces within the group for the satisfaction of the personal needs" (Schiedlinger, 1953).

The disciplined students have ample opportunities for the expression of their ascendance, viz., in studies, sports, extra-curricular activities, social work, etc., but the indisciplined ones, realizing their incompetency in these fields, resort to disruptive and destructive manifestations of their ascendance and forcefully compel the society to recognize their dominance. As they are emotionally and socially immature, their assertion generally betrays their anxiety, aggressiveness, and wishfulfilling fantasies.

SECURITY:

Our politicians and economists have frequently expressed the view that India is passing through a transitory phase; consequently, the existing generation is facing numerous insecurities which have disgruntled him with
the inconsistencies of the circumstances leading him to react in socially disapproved manners. This encouraged us to study the behavioral factor of security-insecurity in the disciplined and indisciplined students. The results of the present study show that the disciplined students feel more secure in comparison with the disciplined ones (Chap. V; Tables: XVI, XVII, and XVIII). The extent of feeling secure or insecure by the 1962 and 1974 disciplined groups is the same (Chap. V; Tables: XIX and XX). No significant difference has occurred between the two due to the lapse of time. Hence, in the light of these results it can be said that security is not merely a political or economic factor. It inculcates in the personality of an individual due to emotional maturity (Alexander, 1948; Lindgren, 1959), social maturity (Schneider, 1955), and as a whole, depends on the positive adjustment of an individual with his life situations (Goldfarb, 1944; Brody, 1956; Stewart, 1968).

In Chapter II, while defining and hypothesizing the factor of security-insecurity, we had proposed its four dimensions, viz., self-acceptance, self-actualization, self-control, and assurance of adequacy in future (pp. 42-43). Now the results of this study bring forward the fact that an indisciplined student, being emotionally and socially immature to present himself to the society as an acceptable member in his social milieu or some social setting. He is also incompetent to express his insecurity or protect himself against it in an approved manner. Parsons (1954) rightly says that "generalized insecurity is commonly associated with high levels of anxiety and aggression, both of which are to an important extent 'free-floating' in that they are not merely aroused in appropriate form and intensity by fear or anger-provoking situations but may be displaced onto situations or symbols only remotely connected with their original sources". This 'free-floating' has significantly been noted in the indisciplined students as mostly their reaction to the situa-
tions are hostile and aggressive.

In the case of self-actualization, the indisciplined student does not succeed in actualizing his self or realizing its potentialities. He is unable to feel secure and safe in the world that exists round him. The disciplined student, contrarily, possesses an integrated personality exhibiting a balance of psychic forces, a unifying outlook of life, emphasizing aspects of integration, and resistance to stress (Wechsler et al., 1970). These criteria make him feel secure in the surrounding circumstances.

The indisciplined student suffers from the fear of social disapproval or punishment for his conduct which does not enable him to restrain himself in frustrating situations as he is also emotionally and socially immature. He does not bother to conform to the norms and values of the social institutions, but reacts without a sense of proportion. Consequently, he proves to be highly impulsive and throws himself open to the dangers of insecurity. It is a fact that conformity in general saves the individual from numerous incongruities like fear and insecurities taking the form of displaced aggression against powerless groups (Aronson, 1972). A disciplined student avoids inconsistent manifestations of personality and endeavours to maintain its continuity or unity.

Lastly, finding himself not adjusted with the surrounding social antecedents, develops a feeling of insecurity in him because he starts brooding over the dark future of his life. His disapproval in the campus and society, and incompetency with superior students further accelerate the fear of bleak future. He evaluates himself as academically misfit and socially inadequate (Morris, 1958; Bredmeier and Toby, 1960). As a matter of fact, "the need for a feeling of adequacy...is the need to feel able to live upto the normative standards of the expectation system, to conform in that sense" (Parsons, 1951). But, through the present study, we have found out that the
indisciplined student does not have any expectations from the normative standards. He manifests his feeling of insecurity by the tendencies to dominance or submission, aggressiveness or compulsive independence (Parsons, 1951).

We realize that the feeling of security is brought up by various factors, not confined to only one or a few spheres of life. These factors may come up from number of life-situations and make the individual feel secure or insecure. In this study, we find that if once the student becomes susceptible to insecurity he is vulnerable to deviance from general conformities to society and its institutions.

AGGRESSION:

It is generally believed that "society itself is torn by conflict, and the individual is presented with models of behaviour which are rewarded at one time and condemned at another, or approved by some groups and criticized by others. Thus, the boy learns that he should be tough and able to 'stand up for his rights' and at the same time that he should be orderly, considerate, and respectful" (Horton and Hunt, 1968). But when this homeostasis is not maintained the youth deviates from the approved norms of social behaviour.

We found out through our study that the indisciplined students both in 1962 and 1974 were significantly aggressive, but in comparison with them the disciplined students were not so (Chap. V; Tables: XXI, XXII, and XXIII). The disciplined and indisciplined students of 1962 did not differ with their counterparts in 1974 in their aggressive behaviour (Chap. V; Tables: XXIV and XXV). These results bring certain facts to light, viz., violence is not merely an act of rowdiness and lack of the sense of responsibility, but it has a close affinity with aggression intrinsic in the personality structure of the indisciplined student.

We must bear in mind that aggression is not the consequence of unme antecedent, but could be aroused by frustration, failure, and deprivation.
(Dollard, et al, 1939; Parsons, 1954; Berkowitz, 1968). But it could also be
learned in certain situations (Bandura et al, 1961, and 1963). Some persons
nourish it in them with the need for aggression manifested through their
fantasies which they wish to see in material forms (Feshback, 1955; Atkinson,
1964; Kahn, 1966). Often in the case of hostile young people, it is the 'need
for status equilibration' (Short and Strodbeck, 1963) which motivates them to
behave violently. Furthermore, some 'failures' in their goal achievements use
this expression just for the sake of 'attracting attention' (Aronson, 1973).
However, the indisciplined student, according to the present study is by
disposition aggressive. Such persons seek to justify their violence by exag­
gerating the evil in the object of their attack (Aronson, 1972). He is aggr­
essive not because of biological strength but more out of his weakness and
handicap (Parsons, 1954).

If, on the one hand, the frustrating objects or model displays of
aggressive behaviour patterns are responsible for the indisciplined behaviour,
on the other hand, emotional and social immaturities, dominance, insecurities,
and academic failures also aggravate such behaviour and deviate him from the
normal student life.

The conditions in which our country is developing, progressing, and
advancing towards a stable politico-economic position and status, many things
are not happening in the way they are expected to. The most powerful stimulus
for the arousal of aggression is the ugly indiscipline in other walks of our
life. The present author considers emasculation, smuggling, favouritism, nepo­
tism, impropriety, exploitation of power and status, indifference to obligat­
ions and duties, adultrations, waste of national resources, insincerity with
national interests, dishonest and selfish politicians and authorities, preju­
dices, hatred, violences and hostilities, brutalities and massacres, and
many such evils in our society as the acts of indiscipline common in our eve­
ryday life. We never hesitate to justify our men, our people and blame others.
This dynamics has become so popular that now we have started accommodating these evils as the inevitable course of life. Young generation, though knows the disadvantages of these practices, adopts them as a compensatory device for many of its incompatibilities and failures; hence, resorting to aggression and violence in the age of maturity. Emotionality and sentimentality pay them more than the reason could do — reason is also not made use of even by the responsible elders.

**EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT:**

It is generally noticed that the level of achievement of anti-social children is mostly low. Their schooling is either severely retarded as a result of their persistent truancy, lack of effort, and failures or is interrupted by dropouts, expulsion for disciplinary problems, or removal to a correctional institution (Robins et al, 1969). Among the indisciplined students a number of such characteristics have been enumerated by many of the educators and statesmen (See Chap. I). As such, this factor was selected for the present project and studied. The results confirm that the disciplined students have higher educational attainments than the indisciplined ones both in 1962 and in 1974 (Chap. V, Table: XXVI). This consistency in results has not demanded any further statistical analysis.

India has, according to 1971 census, only 29.34% literacy; the rest 70.66% are the "educational untouchables" deprived of not only political and social rights, but also of their right to learn and know (Ramachandran, 1975). They are out of the scope of this study. It is only those boys who use the "cushioning mechanisms" for "making the grade" (Parsons, 1970). They are sent to the colleges and universities with low achieving standards where they find that the "line between ability levels is rigorously drawn" (Parsons, 1970). But, irrespective of this licence, increased competition generates a strong fear of failure in them amounting to lessening of their motivation to achieve
(Atkinson and Feather, 1966). Low educational attainment also means less opportunities for future achievements "which turns the child against the school and forces him to seek satisfaction from behaviour antithetical to that taught by the School" (McDonald, 1969). They start realizing that they have no further use of school, so they become a nuisance and potentially delinquents from frustration and boredom (Herford, 1969; Riesman, 1961; Merton, 1968).

In our country the situation is something more serious. It is not the failures who have a fear of the future opportunities, but it is the high achievers who are academically, economically, and socially sabotaged by the 'privileged people' in the society. This practice has intensively lessened the achievement motivation and deviated-deviated the promising students either to escape (brain drain) or to traumatic aggressive responses. This is a pitiable situation for the young generation of developing India which needs immediate attention.

**SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS:**

A number of theoretical works and empirical studies have since long been stressing that socio-economic status is positively correlated with academic achievement and conformity with the social norms and values (Thrasher, 1927; Cohen, 1955; McDonald, 1969). In such studies it was emphasized that there is a "deferred gratification Pattern" (Popenee, 1974) in our educational institutions, and, as such, "the middle-class child is encouraged to communicate freely and to formulate his thoughts in conversation. The lower-class child is not encouraged to do so" (Popenee, 1974). This attitude is reflected in the way the lower-class child is assessed on middle-class standards, and declared as less intelligent than the middle-class child (Halsey et al, 1963; Yates, 1966).

Our educational system is dominantly built on 'life chances' (Weber, 1946), 'degree of command over existing benefits and resources' (Nadel, 1957), 'social class' dominance (Hollingshead and Redlich, 1958; Boruda, 1961), or
'opportunity structure' (Gladwin, 1963; Merton, 1968). Here the lower-class child has to face a conflict between middle-class and lower-class standards (Cohen, 1955; Miller, 1958; Miller, 1959), which often becomes frustrating and drifting to anti-social behaviour (Robins et al, 1969).

These contentions inspired us to include this factor in our study. The results to which we have come do not verify these views. They indicate that the disciplined students mostly belong to lower and middle socio-economic status groups, while the indisciplined ones belong to upper and middle socio-economic groups. These results were consistent in 1962 and 1974 (Chap. V; Table: XXVII).

We should not ignore the fact that in India the overwhelming majority (70.66%) of its population is kept outside the educational portals, which, obviously, comes from the lower-class. The rest, who get the opportunity to be called literate, do not go beyond junior or High School standards. There is a very negligible minority of lower-class boys who get access into colleges and universities. There, they have to readjust themselves with the middle-class culture, consequently, disowning their own lot and living up to the normative standards of expectations system, and conforming in that sense (McDonald, 1969; Parsons, 1970). Thus, they do not any further remain the members of lower-class. The truth about our student community is that they really come from the lower-middle, middle-middle, upper-middle class strata; in a sense, making the higher educational institutions as exclusively middle-class institutions.

If we just collect the statistics of student violence and unrest, we will find that the dominant majority of such incidents has taken place in colleges and universities and not in the schools comprising a good number of lower-class children. Although, the question of physical and intellectual immaturity is one of the important factors of discipline at school level, yet the emotional and social immaturities at that stage would have played their role which
has not been the case. In the West, the majority of problematic and anti-social elements exist at school level and not mostly at college or university levels (Cohen, 1955; Wolfgang, 1961; Popencoe, 1974) because they cannot afford to meet the expenses of higher education as well as they cannot continue to be dependents on their parents for a long duration of life (Robins et al, 1969). Therefore, all frustrations, anxieties, and stresses (Parsons, 1954; Herford, 1969) confine to lower grade educational institutions. At higher level the violences have been named as the activisms which are deemed to be politically charged (Lipset and Wolin, 1965; Bourges, 1968; Martin, 1969; Buckman and Lehrer, 1970). In India, politics is very much charismatic (Desai, 1969) and exclusively controlled by the upper- and middle-class people. Lower-class people are still at the mercy of their old masters in their political life. Thus, again, if indiscipline is the expression of socio-economic discontentment, lower-class cannot exclusively be made responsible for it. Wood (1961) asserts that the “relation between poverty and crime is not straightforward”. Further, “to concentrate exclusively on....inequalities would, however, oversimplify contemporary problems in education, because the environment includes factors that cannot be directly related to economic situations” (Worsley, 1972). When the low status is ascribed to a class (as in the case of caste system in India) it becomes legitimised by community norms, and does not correlate highly with crime. But low status in achieved-status system (as in the West) does relate to frequency of crimes (Wood, 1961; Jessar et al, 1968; Parsons, 1970). The acts of indiscipline and violence in Indian colleges and universities are mostly middle-class discontentments and the representation of a youth culture emerging out of urban transitions and fantasy for vertical mobility. Lower-class is still afraid of such imagination, as there is still long impassable gap between them and the aspirated goal of the middle-class.

Amongst the lower-income group our sample for this study are also
those subjects who come from the rural folk which has its own social norms and values. Main differences between them and their counterparts in urban areas is the per capita income and its expenditure. A closer study will reveal that the rural lower per capita income groups are at par with the higher per capita income groups of urban areas. Hence, only income cannot be claimed as the reliable instrument of measurement. These comparatively low-income groups from villages can be placed equal to some urban-higher-income groups. It will again relate that the low-socio-economic group of this sample is not a true representative of the lower-class people, as our sample has the hierarchies of the middle-class only which overwhelmingly dominates our colleges and universities.

These arguments lead to conclude that our results rightly establish that, contrary to the Western findings, the indisciplined students in our country, come from the upper- and middle-classes, and it is their problems which get multiplied in higher educational institutions.

**RURAL AND URBAN INHABITANCE:**

Community studies generally stress that the rural people migrating to urban areas, are unable to adjust themselves adequately in the environment; and, as such, they face a number of problems which turn them into a problematic lot (Deshmukh, 1970; Sinha, 1970). This contention encouraged us to study this variable for analysing the student behaviour. Our results indicate that the disciplined students mostly come from rural areas and not from the urban settings. Findings of 1962 and 1974 invariably confirm the same fact (Chap. V; Table: XXVIII). Along with it, these results also reveal that the general contention about geographic belongingness is not very much true and it can not be upheld isolatedly. Socio-cultural factors make the two different from each other, both of which have different histories and traditions affecting the conformity and deviance therein (Reckless, 1967). Also, the expected trend of
deviances and defiances in one country cannot be consistent with other countries (Sutherland and Cressey, 1965). These facts stand true for this study.

Rural and urban communities have their own cultures which differ from each other in their values, attitudes, inter-relationships, and way of life (Vold, 1941). Rural people are more tradition directed (Reisman, 1961), conformist, and intolerant of the violation of values than the urban ones (Lonis and Beegle, 1957). Contrary to it, there is much of depersonalization (Fantani and Weinstein, 1973), Loneliness (Moustakas, 1961), anomie (Merton, 1968), and alienation (Marcson, 1970) in urban culture. Those who migrate from the rural areas to urban places have to go through a process of 'harmonization' (Fantani and Weinstein, 1973). They have to be acculturated for the new realities of life which are different to those in which they had been living. This process is mainly done by the educational institutions which stand for the articulation of 'urban middle-class culture' (Vorsley, 1972) into the 'new-comers' who have to "break into" already existing cliques and groups or into established urban secondary associations (Gutman, 1963). Now, it is also not necessary they will be smoothly accomodated in a society which claims itself to be superior to the one they had originally belonged. If they have difficulties in adjusting with the new society they are labelled as the deviants while it could have simply been called as the 'teething troubles' of acculturation to urban middle-class mainstream.

Besides these troubles, we cannot claim with confidence that rural people take lead in the urban turmoil for discontentments. They could be dissatisfied with the urban life and make protests, but they do so only when they have 'urbanized' themselves and accepted the urban problems as their own. We know that there is a difference in response from the rural and urban people to occasions of violence. Urban people mostly show a degree of non-chalance — a competent passive reaction — to the inconvenience caused by their own people
(Pantani and Weinstein, 1973). They are the 'other-men' to the suffering caused coldheartedly by their neighbours to their own neighbours. They are simultaneously the spectators and victims of the demonstrations, agitations, strikes, violences, etc. (Reston, 1965). In the world of urban people these tantrums are a daily practice. They become so much accustomed to these excitementsthat they develop a sort of immunity to them and are not very much worried about it, whereas the rural people have different types of expressions of resentments and reactions which are mostly simple and direct expressions. Now, if the rural people in the urban settings feel constrained to express their discontentment they have to give the lead in the hands of the urban people which is frequently noticed in all sorts of agitations and demonstrations.

According to Pantani and Weinstein (1973), "a city dweller has less opportunity to ignore social realities. He is exposed to them whether he wants to be or not. He is close to crime, riots, poverty, muggings, alcoholics—they are constantly making themselves felt—and he cannot remain totally impervious to them. So it is with children in the urban school. The urban school has attempted to shy away from things going on in the real world which are part of an urban child's experience. Thus, there is a dichotomy and tension between the child's urban curriculum and the school's more antiseptic curriculum—a dichotomy usually leads the urban child to label the school's curriculum as phony". This dichotomy does not exist in rural areas to such a great extent not these people are so much exposed to social and legal deviances as the urban people are. It can be verified with the rate of crimes in urban and rural areas (Bloch, 1949; Barnes and Teeters, 1959), wherein, simply geographic factor is not the sole reason, but "favourable conditions of population density and urbanization" (Wiers, 1944) exist much too in the cities than in the villages. Therefore, obviously, urban students have more chances to become indisciplined than the rural ones.
Furthemore, student indiscipline is an urban problem and an expression of discontentment with 'phony' education system — more so against the values and conformities not existing in the people in day to day life. This contradiction in idea and practice is not very often manifested by the rural people. They are contaminated in urban surroundings in the course of their 'articulation'. Hence, they share in indisciplinary behaviour and participate with such students who never surrender the leadership to the 'new-comers'.

These discussions may support our findings by providing a genuine rationale for the new direction they are expected to give to future studies.

IN INTEGRATED APPROACH:

In this chapter we have discussed the results of the present study in a manner that the significance and importance of social and psychological factors have become evident, but by doing so we do not mean that every factor has an independent entity and it can contribute to discipline or indiscipline independently or isolatedly. Our closer observations have revealed that nearly all the factors, whether social or psychological, interact with each other and when there is a cluster of a majority of these factors then only the students behave in a particular way — disciplined or indisciplined.

It is also not necessary that all the factors should cluster together; only a majority of them is quite sufficient to give a direction to a student's behaviour. Often it is not only the psychological factors — the vice versa is also true — that are responsible for indisciplined behaviour but social factors too play their role. Even in this condition some psychological factors start taking shape and come to coordinate with the social factors. As far as psychological factors are concerned, we hold that they are the exclusive product of social milieu, and, as such, they always become effective only with the contribution of social factors.

Often it is also noted that a student possesses some psychological
factors in normal form; social factors are also not very much unfavourable to him, but he beats the path to indiscipline. A close analysis of social psychological factors, especially in the case of the depth study of security and aggression, brings us to the fact that a few of these factors become so prominent in him or in his social set up that he is swayed away by the indisciplined lot. Such cases are always a few.

However, on the basis of the findings of this study we can say that the indisciplined students are not solely the creation of those factors which lie outside them. Some personality factors, and some of those factors that have an impact on the pattern of a personality, interact with each other and determine the course of an individual's way of responding to the realities of life. If we want to check student indiscipline, we will have to cure the individuals, along with controlling the contextual factors, in a manner that they become properly adjusted with their academic and social environment; and, not that we suppress it by pressure and power. It is not simply administrative, organizational, political or economic disturbance; it involves the individual and also his social environment which have deeper impacts on the young citizen. He needs a careful and serious treatment rather than deterrence.
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