CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION
Students’ behaviour, in the present times, has become synonymous to destruction, subversion, hostility, unruliness, and many such acts. It is generally believed that students never behave in a constructive and positive manner. Although this sweeping remark has some grain of truth in it but not the whole truth. Students are a social group in the sense that they collect together in the boundaries of educational institutions, where they behave in the manner they are educated and trained. But when they violate the norms and standards laid down by the education system their behaviour becomes alarming and is noticed with concern by the teachers, educationists, and responsible persons of the society and nation.

This behaviour, which worries the elders, is commonly labelled as the indisciplined behaviour. If we pay serious attention to this — indisciplined — behaviour we find that there are some factors which are intrinsic in the personalities of the misbehaving or indisciplined students. Along with these personality factors are some other factors which have social significance, contributing to indisciplined behaviour.

As such any study which is carried out to trace the root causes of indisciplined behaviour should give equal importance to its social and psychological aspects. Both of which are independent and complementary to each other. It is, therefore, appreciable to enunciate the behaviour, i.e.,
indiscipline, as well as the personality and social factors that have their significance for the present study.

**IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY:**

With the transition in the system of education in India the student community, through its behaviour, is presenting a formidable problem before the educationists, namely, the problem of indiscipline which has gradually become insurmountable. The opening of a school, college, or a university for a new academic session means the opening of a 'Pandora's Casket', letting out strikes, demonstrations, vandalism, assaults, arsons, gheraos, and other evils. Cases of such misdemeanours are so frequent that, during the academic sessions, the newspapers report such instances almost everyday. The responsible citizen of India becomes extremely perturbed with this state of affairs, and earnestly wants to know what has gone wrong with our education and where actually lies the source of disturbance? Is it inherent in the system of education, or is an expression of students' personality? There is a suspicion regarding either of these possibilities but our hitherto approach to this problem has been purely subjective and speculative.

The evils of indiscipline and its repercussions have been realised by every citizen of the country, i.e., educationists, statesmen, leaders, and men at the helm of affairs who have repeatedly expressed their fear and apprehensions. Within a couple of years after independence, Nehru (Statesman, New Delhi, January 30, 1949) felt that this turmoil might have serious repercussions in the future. He said that indisciplined students were committing the greatest act of treason to the country. Radhakrishnan (1949) felt that the indiscipline was shattering the peace of universities and the ever widening gulf between students and teachers had become frightening. He thought that the situation was fast deteriorating the morale of the students.
Mudaliar (1933), in the Report of the Secondary Education Commission, said that the student indiscipline had taken the worst shape in this country. It was increasing day by day, and demoralising students. The Secondary Education Reorganisation Committee of Uttar Pradesh (1953) also could not avoid taking notice of this grave situation.

This spreading fire of turbulence and rebellion became uncontrolable and rapidly enveloped the whole country which compelled the Central Government to take a countrywide notice of the problem. The then Education Minister, Kabir (1958), thought that student unrest "was at least partly due to the vacuum caused by the decay of old values and the failure to substitute new ones in their place". But, "at least among a section of the youth of India, the restlessness had gone beyond the stage of mere disequilibrium and was tending to become a case of indiscipline and maladjustment".

Nehru (1958), commenting on student indiscipline, thought that unrest and turbulence was a "subject of great importance to the country", because "often the violence of the outburst is out of all proportion to its alleged cause". This disproportionate turbulence was recurrently felt by all the leaders educationists, such as Amad (1954), Deshmukh (1959), Cormack (1961), Shrimali (1961), and Narayan (1962).

The journalists also paid attention to this problem, and a number of articles were published in nearly all the important papers of India. 'Statesman' gave special importance to it and Sarkar (1960), on behalf of the said paper, surveyed the situation of unrest in various universities of India. 'Seminar' (1963) issued a special number for it. They both emphasised the same thing which was repeatedly stressed by Nehru and other leaders and educationists. When a "Survey of Living Conditions of University Students" was done by the Ministry of Education, Government Of India (1961), again the severity of turmoil was felt and was duly mentioned. Kothari Report (1966) and a debate in the Parliament (Hindustan Times, November 25, 1966)
show their concern about this situation.

In the latter half of 1966 this problem took a serious turn. Indiscipline spread throughout the country and did not confine itself to the problems related to students only. It took a communal and factional colour at many places. The students indulged not only in burning and destroying public property, manhandling and intimidating citizens, pulling people out of cars, etc., but they also damaged the religious shrines. (Hindustan Times, November 11, 1966). It all showed that indiscipline, instead of being in control, was on the increase, and to a really terrifying extent indeed. At this stage all the responsible persons in the government (President, Prime Minister, Home Minister, and Education Minister) were condemning all forms of indiscipline, vandalism, violence, and outright lawlessness. At this time the Education Commission Report (1966) also came out with similar opinions and conclusions about indiscipline. But inspite of their grave concern, no solution was found out for the problem of indiscipline.

The Institute of Constitutional and Parliamentary Studies (1966) forwarded a set of theories and views about the student unrest. The turmoil, in place of coming to rest, fermented day by day and a number of eminent social scientists gave special attention towards it. Altbach (1968), Gupta (1968), Ross (1969), and the Vishwa Yuwak Kendra (1973) put forward their theses about the indisciplined behaviour. This serious concern shows that the trouble had not died down, rather increased with greater seriousness, since this study was first made.

Indiscipline in India is typical in nature. It is not confined to class-rooms or to the campus walls alone, but it leaps out from schools and colleges and spreads into the political, administrative, industrial, communal, and sectarian fields; whereas, in the West, indiscipline is mainly a concern of the class-room (Bagley, 1914; Pringle, 1931). There, the undesi-
rable activities outside the class and within the campus are called mis-
behaviour (Wren, 1912). Miscreancies of the students or juveniles outside
the campus are classified as delinquencies and vandalism (Kvaracceus, 1945).
Indiscipline to them is absenteeism, whispering, truancy, etc. (Mullen,
1950). The acts which count to aimless destruction or the avengeful activi-
ties against the elders and the authorities are not considered there to be
a revolt or indiscipline (Altbach, 1970). Contrary to it, indiscipline in
India includes all these deviations of behaviour or maladjustments, law
breaking, and destructive behaviour. Hence, it demands two different pers­
pectives to study it in India and in the West. As such, we confine our
attention to the Indian situation alone and accomodate the perspective
relating to student behaviour in our country.

CAUSES OF INDISCIPLINED BEHAVIOUR AS VIEWED BY
THE EDUCATIONISTS, LEADERS, AND JOURNALISTS:

Politicians, educationists, and journalists have enumerated the
causes of indisciplined behaviour in India in the light of the literature
available from outside the country. They seem to emphasize only the external
factors responsible for indiscipline, i.e., those which are concurrent with
the social, economic, and political conditions. They have not made any eff­
ort for an intensive probing into the problem. For instance, Mudaliar (1960)
emphasizes the lack of autonomy in the universities. He considers that men
in power outside the universities have such a strong hold on the administ­
ration of the institutions that it makes the university authorities help­
less in solving many of the problems which come up before them. Saiyidain
(1958) mentions the factors of inadequate livelihood, and indulgence in
politics as causes of student indiscipline. These two factors have been
repeatedly emphasized by Deshmukh (1959), Kabir (1959), Mukerji (1960), and
Shrimali (1961).
Mukerji (1960) has enumerated several factors contributing to indiscipline, such as family influence, faulty school administration, lack of religious and moral values, lack of economic security, and insecurity as well as uncertainty about the future. Besides, he also lays stress upon the critical situations in the national and the international political life, etc. His main emphasis, however, is on the laxity of school and college administration, loss of leadership by teachers, tremendous rise in the number of students without a proportionate increase in the staff, lack of accommodation and equipment. Apart from these, he believes that the want of proper facilities for keeping the students engaged in healthy activities outside the class-room, unsatisfactory constitutions and working of students unions, lack of proper counselling, and defective educational system creating a sense of frustration due to unemployment among students which further aggravated the problem.

Secondary Education Reorganization Committee of Uttar Pradesh (1953) gives primary importance to social and economic conditions of the teachers, the taught, and the guardians. It stresses that "the teacher in the present times, wrongly or rightly, has been reduced to a mere wage earner, ready only to pay in terms of knowledge to the extent he is paid in terms of money. To the student, knowledge is only a collection of information devoid of all reverence for it and thereby for its giver --- the teacher. The guardian has nothing to do with either". Another important cause, according to this committee, is the use of students' organizations for political purposes by political parties. Party factions in the management are also mentioned as one of the causes. Lack of coordination between the educational and the economic plan of the state is also considered as an important cause of indiscipline which, in view of the committee, leads to dissatisfaction and frustration among teachers and students.
Apart from this, when the committee starts making recommendations some other causes are indirectly referred to. But these causes are solely related to school administration and organisation.

The Secondary Education Commission (1953) has also given an equal importance to the influence of political movements on students. The rest of the causes have been given lesser importance and are related to school administration and organisation, extra-curricular activities, and teacher-pupil relation.

Nehru (1958) has enumerated seven causes of indisciplined behaviour. They are: loss of leadership in teachers, party factions, political intrigues leading to fall in standards and the general deterioration in universities; loss of public esteem for teachers at different levels; undue importance given to the final examination; indifference towards self-discipline among students; underrating the value of social activities; minimising the importance of extra-curricular activities; and lack of moral or ethical values.

Kabir (1958) agreed with the above statement of Nehru. Later, he (1959) grouped all these causes into four major causes, i.e., loss of leadership by teachers, growth of economic difficulties, defects in the existing system of education, and general loss of idealism.

Bhide (1958) diagnosed the causes of indiscipline as: adverse teacher-pupil ratio, crops of coaching classes, lack of parks, and unhealthy attractions of cinema.

Patnaik has traced out fourteen causes of indiscipline (1958), most of which are related, in general, to the four groups mentioned by Kabir. Some of the causes described by Patnaik are such that have not been duly emphasized by other authors prior to him. These are: lack of understanding on the part of the educators; modern trends of education, lack of adaptation
to individual differences on the part of institutions; paucity of teachers of high mental and moral calibre; prevalence of vulgar novels, horror-comics and other pictures devoid of morale; and stern measures taken by authorities against students without probing into the real causes of indiscipline.

Potester (1959) emphasises the absence of missionary spirit among teachers as the cause of student indiscipline. They are: unsatisfactory training of children in the proper use of freedom; majority of the students unfit for higher education; large size of classes restricting the teacher to devote personal attention to his pupils; and the students not trained to face difficulties with courage and fortitude.

Da Cruz (1959) considers only three causes of indiscipline which are: conduct, training, and standards socially approved.

Sarkar (1960), after a survey of different universities at the height of turmoil in this country, tried to find out the causes through interviewing the students, staff members, and vice-chancellors. He also came to the same conclusions which have earlier been quoted. He admits that the facts about indiscipline are already known, sifted and put together by different commissions from 1941 to 1956. They are external or social causes, i.e., "the poor amenities in hostels, the pitiful lack of them for "decency" in students, the party politics in the universities, the blatantly unfair appointments, apathy of some, uselessness of the union, lack of funds, and etc."

In the case of non-resident students he thinks that they are forced to live in semi-slum conditions with no supervision or amenities. Besides, they get minimal instruction and poor equipment. Over all he criticizes the government for neglecting universities in comparison to big industries, new railway stations or dams. In addition to it he blames the political parties which "think it only fair and proper to make students their prey".

It is reported that 2,015 students of Kerala and Lucknow univer-
sities were approached by the members of Survey Scheme of the Living Condi-
tions of University Students (1961) for getting their opinion about the cau-
ses of indiscipline in their order of importance. Among students, 43% be-
lieved that the most important cause was 'the lack of personal relationship
between teacher and student'; for 22% it was 'the influence of political
parties and other outside elements'; for 7% 'non-availability of opportuni-
ties for spending extra time and energy' was the cause of indisciplined
behaviour; the cause for 6% was 'students considering themselves to be a
privileged class'. Among the remaining ones, i.e., less than 5% students,
there was no agreement on any factor. The next most important cause accord-
ing to 25% was 'the influence of political parties and other outside agen-
cies'; for 13% it was 'the lack of personal relationship'; for 12% 'the
students considering themselves as privileged class'; for another 12% 'the
influence of political disturbances on the students'; for 11% 'non-availabi-
ility of opportunities for students to spend extra time and energy'; for 10%
'meagre employment prospects after completing education'; for 6% 'attitude
of authorities'; and the remaining listed other causes. The third important
cause according to 15% was 'the influence of political disturbances on the
students'; for another 15% it was 'the students considering themselves as a
privileged class'; for 14% 'the influence of political parties and outside
agencies'; for 11% 'meagre employment prospects after completing education';
for 10% 'non-availability of opportunities for spending extra time and
energy'; for 9% 'lack of personal contact between teachers and students';
for 8% 'lack of laboratory facilities, equipment, etc.'; for 7% 'students
are irresponsible, they do not have to work their way to college education';
and the remaining have other reasons. It can obviously be noted that most of the
causes which have been ranked in the first, second and third order are only
the external ones, while the causes inherent in the personality have not
been given due importance.

Shrimali (1961) has enumerated four or five cases of student indiscipline, which he thinks are commonly known and frequently referred to. These causes are also exclusively related to external social conditions, e.g., economic, political, and educational.

Cormack (1961) has grouped the causes of indiscipline into three, viz., political-structural, professional, and socio-psychological. The first two groups deal with the external social causes. In the third group she has listed 12 causes, i.e., ambivalence of authorities and parents, lack of association between teacher and student, lack of communication among teachers and students through extra-curricular activities, inadequate living conditions in hostels, too much leisure time, absence of good "student governments", indignation against rules, totalitarian discipline, chronological as well as psychological immunity, emotional dissatisfaction, disparity between sex mores and sex interest, demand of freedom from authority, and lack of the modes of 'responsibility' and 'trust'. Though she has just listed these social psychological causes on the basis of journalistic and subjective opinions of the others, but it is the first instance that the psychological aspect, along with the sociological one, of the causes of indiscipline has been duly emphasized, otherwise only casual remarks or references had been made to it.

Singh (1962) gives the causes of indiscipline as: defective educational system, increase in the number of students, lack of individual attention, poor quality of teachers and their materialistic outlook, internal school circumstances, improper use of boys funds, non-association of children with administration of school laws, indifference to spiritual values, and political influences.

According to Kochhar (1964), the causes of indiscipline are:
Student unrest is a part of the wider unrest of the contemporary world; the system and policies of education are defective; the examination system is not rational, scientific, and objective; loss of leadership of the teachers; lack of teacher-parent cooperation; political parties and professional politicians are responsible for most of the troubles; wrong values have been given to certain things; dearth of leisure time activities; neglect of religious instruction is to a great extent responsible for lack of restraint among students; student unions are repugnant to the academic atmosphere of educational institutions, and destructive of their liberal corporate life; and the role of persons managing educational institutions causes discontentment among students.

Singh (1964) has given five reasons for the anti-social behaviour of the students. In his view, these are the "most important" ones. They are: feeling of insecurity, emotional difficulties, improper home and environmental influences, policies and methods of administration, and poor classroom atmosphere or teaching.

Taneja (1965) makes the following factors responsible for indisciplined behaviour: exploitation by political parties, absence of social philosophy, lack of healthy home, economic distress, non-functional and uninspirational education, lack of teacher's inspiration, and poor material and physical conditions.

Gaind and Sharma (1966) have mentioned the factors of indisciplined behaviour among the adolescents as: emotional and social maladjustments at home, school, and society; rapid industrialization and urbanization of the present society has produced multitude of problems leading to maladjustment and indiscipline; political conditions have caused great distraction in the study of students, disrupting the life of the institutions and its discipline.
Altbach (1968a) thinks that students' indiscipline is a result of immaturity or the ever present generational conflict. It is a function of the lack of direction and the organizational vacuum among students. Along with the above two factors, he (1968b) expresses that lack of proper academic atmosphere; absence of respect for authority — parental, educational, and governmental; ideological frustration; and political interference are the causes of indisciplined behaviour.

Shils (1968a) accepts political objectives, defective administration, low standard of education, and absence of appraisal for Indian students as the causes of indiscipline. In another article, he (1968b) claims that the causes are: absence of a great 'cause', larger section of students coming from rural areas and from families without a tradition of respect for education, "sexual vacuum" as a contributory factor to restlessness, and a deeper discomfort inherent in "India's movement from a primordial traditional condition into a modern large-scale civil order". The last one, he thinks, is the real cause.

Gusfield (1968) mentions politicalization of students as the main cause of student indiscipline.

DiBona (1968) states that the causes of student unrest are economic, psycho-social, and political. For the political cause, he says that "much of the current wave of student unrest was caused not by ideological politics, but by local grievances concerning college fees, examinations, faculty matters, and amenities".

Shaw (1968) considers that indiscipline is a symptom of discontentment among Indian students.

Singh (1968) relates that "student indiscipline is a by-product of the rapid expansion of education and the attempt to bring broader segments of the society within its orbits". And, because of this fact, increase
in the number of students, poverty of the university, lack of facilities, and favouritism among teachers become the causes of indiscipline.

Sarkar (1964), on the basis of his empirical study, traces out the causes of indiscipline as: "indisciplined" group of students have more contact with teacher-politicians who use them against their rivals; students mainly coming from nouveau riche families lack academic tradition and atmosphere; parents are not interested in the studies of their sons; the agitational leaders are generally bad students; and the student leaders have alignments with outside elements.

Cormack (1968), after a lapse of seven years, theorised that "the Indian student unrest and the wastes of academe reflect the global social unrest in general and the serious social disintegration taking place in India at this time in particular". She also demands for a rational approach to indiscipline by saying that "it is probable that the 'indiscipline' deplored by most Indian adult authorities relates to the absence of a modern concept of 'discipline'."

Srivastava (1974) has emphasized the political involvement of students and the interference of the communal political parties in students' affairs as the main cause of indisciplined behaviour.

In these points of views we find that the psychological aspect of indisciplined behaviour has been stressed along with the sociological one.

It is interesting to note that it was never considered that all the students were bad (Deshmukh, 1959; Shrinai, 1961; Sarkar, 1964; Cormack, 1968), but it was also never bothered about to find out why the bad ones overwhelm the good ones. It was felt that frustration (Narayan, 1962; Altbach, 1968b) and insecurity (Saiyidain, 1958; Singh, 1964) are accelerating dissatisfaction among youths, but the main sources of the unrest were not located. If anything was mentioned in this context, it was merely casual,
because the internal world of the youth involved in indisciplinary behaviour never received due attention.

It is now an admitted fact in the social and psychological literature that the external circumstances are meaningful for the individual only in the situation they influence him. However, when the individual is influenced by the external variables his self becomes a part of the total situation. He then participates in the total situation actively and purposefully. Hence, we cannot ignore the subjective aspect of the youths responsible for indisciplined behaviour. In spite of Cormack's suggestions (1961), the studies on this problem concentrated mainly on the external or sociological factors. Narayan (1962), Kapadia (1963), Bansood (1963), Sarkar (1964), Education Commission (1966), Altbach (1968a), DiBona (1968), Shaw (1968), Singh (1968), and Srivastava (1974) have given major importance to the external factors. It indicates that men of prominence in education and government are overwhelmingly preoccupied by the shortcomings of the system of education and administration, and the organization of educational institutions, but they have not been able to pay due attention to the individual and his personality. No doubt, certain educationists and statesmen have referred to certain causes of indiscipline which are related to personalities of students, but this reference is only casual and betrays that little attention has been paid to understand their role in students' turmoils.

In the past two decades, it has been repeatedly noted that different improvements have been made in the education system and efforts have been made to fulfill the legitimate demands of the students. Hence, the disturbance, instead of decreasing, has increased and spread all over the country. Furthermore, the student unrest has not confined itself to the campus of educational institutions, but it has entered the communal, political, regional, and other spheres as well. It has now become a very alarming situation.
The more the authorities yield to the student agitators the more they feel themselves victorious, and use their might to press for their unjustified demands. Every success in an agitation encourages them to go forward for the next one which turns out to be more destructive. But it is not always the entire student community which becomes unruly and floods out of the campus in the form of agitators. Actually, it is a minority which is emotionally unstable, socially unapproved, educationally incompetent, and socio-economically dissatisfaction. Besides, this minority has the ability to assert itself and dominate others, and tries to disturb the peaceful atmosphere of educational institutions. Deshmukh (1959) and Shrimali (1961) have rightly said that "all students are not bad". But why these bad students get the upper hand? Why the authorities are not able to single them out and try to check their deviant role and behaviour? The simple answer is that their personalities have not been fully understood.

One may say that all student agitations are not unjustified, and should not be measured with the same rod. But the issue before us is not merely the agitations; rather we want to know why the agitations end with the charred buildings, destruction of public property, and the wounded and dead bodies on the streets? Should we call them student agitations or naked atrocities? Are they patriotic actions or a blow to the progress of the nation? The main concern at present should be to locate those who indulge in miscreancy, and try to find out why they are so destructive. In other words, the student unrest demands from us a scientific study of the personalities of the indisciplined students and of those social factors which are responsible for the growth of such personalities.

Since the trouble is always initiated by a few hostile and aggressive leaders it is necessary to study their individual dispositions. It is commonly accepted that all individuals do not respond to a situation in an
identical manner. Every individual has his own psychological pattern of response. Thus, the behaviour of individuals varies from person to person (Anastasi, 1958). In the light of this fact the external situation remains nearly the same for all the persons, but the differences in the personalities of the individuals manifest itself in distinctly divergent behaviours. Persons who are emotionally and socially mature, ascendant, secure, non-aggressive, unfrustrated, socio-economically contented, having good family relations, and high educational achievements will behave in a more restrained and rational manner than those who lack some or many of these qualities. And these are the persons who always guide and lead the disturbances. We cannot, therefore, ignore the fact that though the external causes of dissatisfaction are the same for all the individuals, the internal or subjective aspects of personality determine the reactions of the individuals.

In this study, therefore, we would be inclined to accept the view that the real causes of indiscipline be in the personality factors, and the social causes which have been repeatedly stressed by the political leaders, statesmen, journalists, etc., can be located in the external factors.

Once the personality factors get due importance in the eyes of the responsible educationists and guardians it will become easier to check the tide of student unrest, and it would be possible for us to take the preventive and remedial measures. It is easier to help the development of a normal personality from the very beginning of an individual's life than to check and correct it at a later stage. Also, if the root causes are not removed it will be futile to weed out only those causes which are off-shoots. If the personality factors become the centre of study for student indiscipline it will be very helpful to devise ways and means for the development of socially healthy attitudes among students. In the light of the above considerations we have taken up the study of student behaviour from both
social and psychological point of views.

AIMS OF THE PRESENT STUDY:

Having accepted the primary importance of personality factors, our study aims at determining the respective roles of different personality factors in causing indiscipline. But, since there can be innumerable factors constituting human personality it is neither possible nor profitable to study all of them, we have selected a limited number of factors for our study in order to find out their relative importance in causing the indisciplined behaviour. Some of these factors which we have selected for our study are strictly internal or subjective, such as: emotional maturity, social maturity, ascendance-submission, etc., but other factors such as: socio-economic status, educational attainment, and the factor of belonging to rural or urban conditions of life, seem to be more closely related to external situations. With regard to these factors too it may be argued that they are not purely external or, at least in our study, we have not treated them as purely external. Because they, in their turn, shape the attitudes or qualitative aspect of the personality. These factors have been included in this study strictly in accordance to this point of view.

In short, at the first instance in 1968, we intended to study the relation of the following factors with the indisciplined behaviour of students: emotional maturity, social maturity, ascendance-submission, aggression, and security from the psychological aspect and the impact of educational attainment, socio-economic status, and rural or urban inhabitance from sociological aspect. We have repeated this study after nearly 12 years in 1974 for ascertaining whether the previous findings had any relevance even after a lapse of time.

EMOTIONAL Maturity: A situation of turmoil and social upheaval often betrays the emotional condition of the individuals involved in it.
Those who have the capacity to withstand the hard realities of life are often found to make a constructive use of their emotions and do not indulge in acts which are harmful to themselves and others. They are restrained, calm, and emotionally mature. Consequently, they face the situation without getting emotionally upset and generally avoid and minimize the trouble. But, those who are emotionally immature become easily irritated, depressed, ill-tempered, and irrational which lead to hostility in a given situation. Hence, we can visualize that acts of indiscipline are likely to be committed by those who are emotionally immature.

**SOCIAL MATURITY:** Indiscipline is a social problem which is very often a consequence of the lack of social sense in the individual. Social maturity or immaturity seems to be intimately related to discipline or indiscipline. Emotional maturity and social maturity tend to play a vital role in our interpersonal relationships also. Though they are inextricably interwoven in human personality, the two are not wholly identical, because in different individuals the manifestations of the two traits may differ in degree and extent. In some individuals one may be more prominent while in others the other aspect may be comparatively significant. It is also true that emotional immaturity in many cases may lead to social immaturity in varying degrees. However, social maturity is by itself an important trait which represents the development of social sense and recognition of social obligations in an individual. Socially immature individual is unable to adjust with the society because he does not recognize any obligations to the society or because he resents the social restrictions on his freedom. He often develops great grudge and antagonism against society which often leads him to anti-social behaviour. On the other hand, socially mature persons have the ability to adjust themselves to various situations and norms of the society. Their participation in social life tends to be generally rational and often constructive.
ASCENDANCE-SUBMISSION: The present nature of indisciplined behaviour demands special attention to the phenomenon of unruly demonstrations and agitations by students. In all such situations a peculiar type of leadership emerges for the purposes of offence or attack. In many cases of student indiscipline it has been found that the whole trouble is initiated by the dissatisfied leaders of the student community who, on account of their quality of leadership and dominance become the office-bearers of their unions or unofficial representatives of the student community. The majority of the students, because of their submissive nature, follow the lead given by them. When they gather together they make the whole situation explosive. For this phenomenon the personality factor of ascendance-submission will be studied since it seems to be the root of dominance and leadership.

SECURITY: Some individuals who feel insecure in life remain constantly dissatisfied and frustrated. They often develop special sensitivity to even the smallest injustices and threats to their prospects. They entertain a grudge against society and jealousy against all those who are more secure than themselves. Under normal conditions they are unable to compete with others but in the situation of an agitation or a strike they get an opportunity to feel fat with their grudge against the society and to gain some degree of superiority for them. Thus, they may be easily involved in disciplinary activities. The feeling of insecurity may relate to any aspect of the personality. An individual may be insecure physically, emotionally, financially and socially. In every case it may lead to maladjusted and disciplinary behaviour by way of compensation for an safeguard against the feeling of insecurity. Sometimes educational backwardness makes the students uncertain about their future. And this uncertainty gives rise to the feeling of insecurity which turns them into 'hostiles' against the society.

AGGRESSION: Indiscipline often involves violence, chaos, and
destruction which is obviously an aggression let loose. So, the study of this trait of personality, i.e., aggression, may throw important light on the problem of indiscipline. If our study helps us in establishing high correlation between aggression and indiscipline it will enable us to predict the phenomenon of indiscipline when we find the presence of aggressive tendencies in a certain group of students. Moreover, it will draw the attention of the educators to their duty for removing the causes of frustration among students which according to many modern psychologists directly lead to aggression and thereby contribute to indiscipline.

**EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT:** Students who have poor educational career, frequent failures, seldom punishments, fines and sent-downs or rustications loose their interest in education. They develop a feeling of humility in them when they mix with their classmates. They feel insecure in the relationship with people in general. They clearly visualize that they are lagging behind the bright students. Therefore, they choose another field where they can defeat them and take leadership in their hands. And, this field is only of the might and not of the right. Thus, they turn hostiles, and disobey the social laws, and take law in their hands to make the whole system idle.

**SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS:** It is sometimes supposed that majority of the indisciplined students come from the lower socio-economic status because they are more insecure, more frustrated, and harbour greater aggression within themselves. To test this hypothesis we have included this factor in our study in order to see if there is any significant correlation, either positive or negative, between socio-economic status and indiscipline.

**RURAL AND URBAN INHABITANCE:** India has two markedly distinct communities, viz., rural and urban. Although individuals belonging to these communities tend to influence each other, yet their norms, mores, values, customs and traditions are to some extent at variance from each other. Previously the
student population belonged largely to urban areas, but now a sizeable population of students comes from rural areas to study in the urban institutions. Some people are tempted to connect this factor with the growing indiscipline among students. There might be a grain of truth in this view. Apparently the rural population is culturally and socially more traditional than the urban one. Hence, when youngsters come to the urban areas for their academic pursuits they face problems of adjustment and very often they have difficulties which seem to lead them to the acts of indiscipline. In the case of urban population, it is generally noticed that it has become sufficiently politically conscious. Therefore, dissatisfaction instigates it to react with political ferment, causing much of indisciplinary behaviour. We, therefore, consider it worthwhile to test this hypothesis and find out if there are significant differences between students coming from these two different backgrounds, viz., the rural and urban.

The above factors represent the significant and important aspects of social-psychological set of student behaviour which is generally manifested in the shape of student indiscipline. As such, the present study is expected to bring us to certain fruitful conclusions.
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