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SOME RELEVANT STUDIES

The problem of indiscipline is of recent few decades. It has mainly been touched by the social scientists in the context of school organisation and administration. As such, little attention has been paid to tackle it with social and psychological point of view. Consequently, we are not able to find such studies that are directly related to our present study. However, there are studies which can be made use of for seeking some references to certain aspects of the factors under study. In the present chapter we have tried to enlist these studies presuming that they will support our hypotheses.

It has already been discussed in Chapter One (Pp. 4-5) that indiscipline in India includes class indiscipline, campus misbehaviour, vandalism, and juvenile delinquency; hence, studies pertaining to these forms of indiscipline have been referred to wherever needed. All such studies have been incorporated in this chapter under the sub-headings which relate to the respective factors.

EMOTIONAL MATURITY:

Burt (1923), while studying a group of young delinquents, found that there were 85% cases of emotional impairment among them. Healy and Bronner (1936) worked on 143 delinquents and found that 131 cases, i.e.,
91.6% gave substantial evidence of emotional malfunctioning.

Durea (1937), through "Interest-Attitude Tests" measured the emotional maturity of juvenile delinquents as compared with non-delinquents. The number of cases was 316 delinquent boys, confined in an institution for juvenile delinquents. The results show that the highest scoring 64 cases on the Interest-Attitude Tests had an emotional age of 10.5 years, whereas the lowest scoring 64 subjects rated 17.0 years. The median value for the lowest 64 subjects for the delinquency index was 121.4, the median value for the highest 64 cases being 180.9. It is evident that the juvenile delinquents show distinctive emotional retardation. Maud (1947), through his independent study, also comes to the same conclusion.

Worbois (1947), through the study of emotional development, asserts that the adolescents manifesting socially disapproved behaviour are emotionally immature.

Durea and Assum (1948) studied 276 delinquents and 151 nondelinquent girls of age-group from 13 to 17 years. The range of the scores of the tests was from 0 to 58. The highest score indicated the lowest maturity. The median score of the normal adolescents was 10 points. The results showed that 91% of the delinquents scored high. Over one third of the total population scored above 90th percentile for the normal. Thus, the delinquents were found to be immature.

Birkness and Johnson (1949) have done a comparative study of delinquent and nondelinquent adolescents. They have found out that the delinquents are abnormally sensitive to emotional tensions. Their results are as much unhappy and emotionally disturbed, 91%; irresponsible, 36%; without purpose, 40%; indifferent toward others, 44%; unimaginative, 48%; and emotionally unstable, 48%.

Lindemann and Grear (1949), through their study on emotional maturity, disclosed that a mature person is reasonably content and deeply con-
concerned with a cause to which he is devoted in teamwork with his fellowbeings.

Glueck and Glueck (1950) have studied the personality traits of delinquent and nondelinquent boys. Their results once again confirm the emotional immaturity of the delinquents as up to 75%.

Hathaway and Monachesi (1952) have determined the personality types of the juvenile delinquents through MMPI. They have established the fact that emotional instability is a characteristic of the personality of juvenile delinquents. Young (1959) studied the responses of the juvenile delinquents to TAT. His findings of emotional maturity is up to 82.4%.

Mohsin (1960) studied 109 cases for emotional maturity. The results showed that the subjects who were emotionally mature were relatively free from emotional involvement of the ego.

Saul and Pulver (1965) clinically studied the cases of adolescents and came to the conclusion that the individuals who had a balanced adjustment with their environment were emotionally mature as well.

Eberhard and Nilson (1966) studied a clinical group of 54 subjects with a control group of 43 subjects. They noticed that emotional immaturity was the cause of aggressive behaviour in many of the clinical group subjects.

Berne (1966) traced out through his clinical study that emotional immaturity was the cause of unevenness of behaviour and sometimes of pathological disturbances as by-products.

Kounin and Obradovic (1968) found out that emotionally disturbed students were the misbehaving and indisciplined ones.

Bloom (1971) worked on the greater emotional maturity development. His subjects were the college students (n=585). His pilot project indicated that emotional maturity had a highly significant influence on understanding the stresses acting on the students and their reactions to those stresses.

These studies help us in hypothesizing that emotional maturity
can be a determining factor in the personalities of disciplined and indisci- 
diplined students. The former are expected to be emotionally mature and the latter, in this relation, to be emotionally immature.

**SOCIAL MATURITY:**

Studies on social maturity, having direct relationship with our problem, are very few. However, psychologists have studied various aspects of social maturity. These studies are likely to help in clarifying the concept of social maturity and its correlates. So they have some indirect signifi-
cance for our study, are quoted below in brief.

Broadway (1937-38) and Lurie et al (1941) have studied the relation-
ship between intelligence and social maturity and arrived at positive results.

Patterson (1943) found out a correlation between social maturity and psychological adjustment. Wietsman's (1943) study establishes a relation-
ship between social maturity and social acceptability. Banham (1952) and Finley (1955) have also studied the same factor. Garrison (1956) has found out a positive relationship between various behaviour activities and social maturity.

The studies of Deutsch (1949) and McCandless (1961) have traced positive relationship between social maturity and cooperation, and sympathy in group process.

Barker and Wright (1949), Barker et al (1950), Barker and Wright (1951), Bronfenbrenner and Deverex (1952), Lehner and Kube (1955), and Fey (1957) studied the phenomenon of the sense of responsibility and found out significant relationship between it and social maturity.

Jersild (1957) established positive relationship between social maturity and emotional maturity.

Sullivan et al (1957) studied the interpersonal maturity of del-
inquents. He found that they were obviously socially immature. Smith and Phillips (1959) studied a group of 61 adolescents and found out a relationship between social maturity and social adequacy.

Ball (1962) made a cross-sectional multigroup comparison of environmental and personality factors with various types of deviant behaviours among adolescents. The tool used was that of MMPI. One of his results reveal that social deviation is significantly related with social immaturity.

Dell (1963) studied 492 police cases appearing in the Belfast Juvenile Court over a period of 12 months. These cases showed significant social immaturity in them. Rao (1964) and Gibbs (1965) have found out a relationship between social maturity and academic career.

Myers and Gates (1968) in their study have come to the conclusion that the subjects who were high achievers were also socially mature. Lindgren (1969) on the basis of a study on college students concludes that socially mature persons have a regard for interpersonal relations and social obligations.

Greenberger and Sorensen (1971), while working on a potential maturity scale, studied school students and as a result emphasized that effective individual functioning requires information necessary for the individual to grow and maintain himself in the average expectable environment and work-related skills and motives necessary for the same end.

These studies establish that there is a close relationship between social maturity and the adjusted, adequate and approved behaviour. It justifies the formulation of our hypothesis that social maturity may probably be a factor in the personality of the indisciplined students. And that is what our hypothesis brings under probe.

ASCENDANCE-SUBMISSION

Allport (1937) through his test of Ascendence-Submission determ-
ined that in the circumstances where an individual is able to find such an individual who conforms with his way of thinking; he immediately joins hands with him. This becomes a determining stage for these individuals to decide who will lead and who will be led.

Allport and Allport (1939), through their study, found out that the submissive person is not inferior to ascendant one. They may have all the other traits common in them except that of ascendance-submission.

Schiedlinger (1953) psychoanalytically studied the individuals who had constructive ascendance and those who had domineering ascendance. In the case of domineering ascendants he found that when such individuals are constrained to feel threatened and helpless they return to the childish longings for the comfort and protection of the omnipotent parental figure. In this situation the individuals who have an ascendant personality take an authoritarian position and the submissive personalities regress to obedience and submission. On the contrary, the mature individuals who are sensitive to the needs of the group and relatively free from personality disturbances will try to achieve personal status as well as group goals without consciously fostering regressive forces within the group for the satisfaction of their personal needs.

Tannenbaum and Massarik (1957), through their study, came to the conclusion that the discontentment or dissatisfaction with the society provokes the hostiles to violation and ugly aggressive behaviour, whereas the reasonable ascendants try to find out a healthy and constructive way to meet the situation.

Berkowitz (1957), through his study found out that when a leader who suits the wishes of a group comes forward, and the submissive members of the group do not feel a need to lead. They simply like the things 'get going' and carry out suggestions made by the leader.
Mann (1959) on the basis of his study proves that the individuals who had the personality dispositions of dominance, masculinity and liberalism proved to be ascendant. Couch (1960) affirms the results of Mann through his study.

Gruen (1960) through his study found out that dependent individuals change more in the non-self evaluation than the self evaluation.

Evans (1960) did the analysis of appointed-follower activity of subjects who were observed while performing in 4-person groups. His results depict that the submissive followers were significantly less active than ascendant followers, regardless of the type of leader.

Gerard (1961) studied a group of adults and found that persons who were generally more dependent upon and sensitive to the opinions of others changed their self-evaluations to a greater extent than those who were less dependent.

Hemphill (1961) revealed through his study that the submissive individuals become less critical of their leaders and follow them as required. Guzikow (1961) administered Guilford-Zimmerman "A" Scale on a group of subjects and had significant results revealing that the 'keymen' are more ascendant than the 'endmen'.

Elkin, et al (1962) studied a student mob of 20 individuals. He observed fraternity pledges in two situations leading to mob action. Out of 20, the 6 leaders in an episode at a football game. Given a Gordon Personal profile, mob leaders scored higher than followers on ascendency and lower on emotional stability.

A study conducted by Emline and Messack (1968) on 34 male college students, categorized as to dominance or dependency in their control orientations towards others. The results indicate that the submissive subjects
were dependent on others while the dominant ones were more independent in their acceptance of reinforcements from others.

Prakash (1970) did an experiment on 22 ascendants and 22 submissives selected on the basis of their scores on Allport's A-S Reaction Study. Autokinesis was used to exert the desired pressure on the subjects and then to study the effect of such pressure. Results indicate that both ascendants and submissives were affected by the informational social influences; and compared to ascendants, submissives were more influenced by group pressure.

Dyson et al (1972) administered the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and the Dominance Scale of the CPI to 56 male and 35 female undergraduates. Subjects were assigned to 22 groups designed to reflect heterogeneity on the personality traits. Results reveal that the nonconformity environment encouraged the participation of different types of personalities in the leadership role. The conformity environment tended to favour the emergence of high dominant personalities as group leaders.

These studies are of various types. On the one hand, they help us in understanding the phenomenon of ascendance-submission in its various aspects. On the other hand, they tend to differentiate two types of ascendants: one aggressive and the other constructive. This fact may be useful in the interpretation and discussion of results regarding the relationship with the personality factor of disciplined and indisciplined students.

SECURITY:

Studies on security-insecurity are directly related to our problem. Psychologists and sociologists have studied various aspects of security, which might be of help to us in clarifying the concepts of security and its correlates. Following studies seem to be relevant in this area.

Andrus and Horovitz (1938) studied a group of young children. His results revealed that the children who had the insecurity syndrome gave many
socially undesirable responses.

Hovland and Sears (1940) through their study on lynchings by economically suffered individuals found that economic uncertainty leads to insecurity which in turn leads to aggressive behaviour. Frenkel-Brunswik and Sandford (1943) studied a group of minority community, viz., Jews and came to the same conclusion for their aggression.

Armenian (1943) studied a group of young children in an insecure situation and found out the internal cohesion of the family, wholesome parent-child relations, adequate discipline, and the security of a well-integrated society have immense influence on the development of ego-security.

Rose (1944) studied a sample of adolescent girls and found out that the girls who were insecure showed symptoms of hostility, aggressiveness, exclusiveness, or, what is worse, an almost pathological superiority.

Through an interesting study, Spitz (1945) came to the conclusion that the children who had been insecure in their early childhood showed retardation in emotional maturity. Alexander (1948) has also affirmed this finding through his study. He asserts that persons who attempt to adjust with their social and physical environment prove to be more than others.

McIntyre (1952) through his study found out that there is a positive relationship between the feeling of security and a person's evaluation of himself and of others. The secure individual likes himself as well as others. Crandall and Bellugi (1954) on the basis of their study on personal-social adjustment and Fey (1955) through his study on 58 medical students further support the findings of McIntyre.

Steffire (1959) served his Vocational Values Inventory on 113 High School students and found out that there is a positive relationship between self-realisation, achievement, and security.

Grapko (1960) studied three classes of Grade IV children and found
that there was a significant relationship between security and achievement.

Borel (1964) through his study on human motivation found a positive relationship between security and emotional maturity.

Daugherty and Waters (1969) studied a sample of 30 leaders and 30 non-leaders from students and came to the conclusion that the former were more field independent than the latter ones.

Siddiqi and Akhtar (1969) have demonstrated through their study that disciplined and indisciplined students significantly differ with each other at 1% level with respect to n-Affiliation. The indisciplined students on the average have much higher n-Affiliation as compared with the disciplined students.

On the basis of his study, Kureshi (1975) has found out that there is a significant difference in the personalities of secure and insecure adolescents. This difference is also significantly noticeable in sex, religion, and socio-economic status.

These studies facilitate us in hypothesizing that security is a probable personality factor of the disciplined students and insecurity is that of the indisciplined ones.

**AGGRESSION:**

Maller (1937) has found out through a study that individual adolescents participate in aggressive and antisocial behaviour more by group suggestion than through their own discretion.

Sears et al (1940) did an experiment on students who were kept awake all night, and further frustrated by the prohibition of smoking, disruption of conversations, and withholding promised food and entertainment. Their aggressive reactions included derogatory remarks about the experiment and psychologists.

Otis and McCandless (1955) have shown through their study that
when dominance and frustration combine together the individual becomes highly aggressive.

Dinviddie (1955) through his study exhibited that subjects with high scores on a measure of "social anxiety" (assumed to be the instigation for the inhibitory response) displayed more indirect aggression and responding to the Rosensweig R-F Study than the subjects who were low on this anxiety measure, with the strength of the hostile tendencies statistically held constant.

Bennett and Jordan (1958) have experimentally found out that the insecure among college students were more extrapunitive, i.e., they showed greater hostility or aggression against persons or against things than did the more secure group.

Bandura and Walters (1959) studied 52 adolescent boys; half of them had histories of difficulty with the law or school authorities due to their aggressive antisocial behaviour. They were matched with an appropriate control group of boys who were neither markedly aggressive nor markedly withdrawn. Results showed that inhibitions against aggression in the control-group boys arose to some extent from their belief that hostility was socially improper; in the aggressive boys; on the other hand, these restraints have been impelled largely by fear arising from expectations of punishment for aggression. Further analysis of the data showed that the aggressive adolescents were reliably more hostile to their teachers than the other group in all categories of aggressive behaviour.

Bandura (1960) took 30 highly aggressive elementary school boys, selected on the basis of behavioural observations rather than because of any trouble with authorities, and 30 inhibited but demographically comparable boys. The findings showed that the aggressive youngsters seemed to have both stronger tendencies toward aggression and considerably weaker
against normal behaviour.

Bandura et al (1961) have done an experiment on a group of nursery children. They were exposed to models exhibiting unusual forms of aggression towards a large rubber doll. After subjecting them to a mild frustration, these children became not only more aggressive than a control group, but also frequently imitated the model's unusual behaviour very precisely.

Sears (1961) did an experiment on two groups of children. One group comprised of subjects who were low in antisocial aggression and the other being high in antisocial aggression. The findings revealed that the low antisocial children voiced a stronger desire to employ hostility in socially approved ways — for example, in law enforcement and in inflicting punishment for rule breaking. Contrary to these, the high antisocial children did not care for socially approved ways of employing hostility. They also did not worry about breaking the rules.

Walters et al (1962) did an experiment on adults which revealed that disinhibited response was more aggressive than the inhibited one. This finding was further confirmed by Walters and Thomas (1963) through another experiment of the same kind.

Lieberman (1966) investigated the effects upon affective responses of students when a course examination was postponed twice. 44 students in a college English class were given the Multiple Affect Adjective Check List two days before the scheduled examination and were asked to fill it everyday for two weeks as a study of moods. Compared to students who did well on the examination, poor students were generally more hostile by the imminent examination, and remained more hostile on the day following the examination.

Siddiqi and Akhtar (1969) have found out through their study
that the indisciplined and disciplined students significantly differ with each other at 1% level in the case of n-Power. The indisciplined students have much higher n-Power in comparison with the disciplined students.

Through a longitudinal study on 982 children consistently displaying socially approved behaviour and 386 consistently displaying aggressive-disruptive behaviour in the classroom, Feldhusen et al (1970) came to the results that the subjects whose behaviour was aggressive and disruptive in the classroom achieved at significantly lower levels than their socially approved peers.

Kureshi (1975) through his research study, has traced out a significant correlation between n-Security and n-Aggression, as well as between n-Aggression and n-Achievement. Hence, he contends that one influences the others in positive or negative dimension whatsoever the case may be.

Above quoted studies, therefore, lead us to presume that aggression can significantly play an important role in the personalities of disciplined and indisciplined students.

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT:

Burgess (1956) studied engineering students in a college situation for the assessment of their personality factors in the context of their educational achievements. His findings revealed that over-achievers were less liable affectively, more constricted, more emotionally inhibited with respect to "pleasureable" situation, and more intellectually adaptive as well as controlled. Under-achievers were weaker in these characteristics.

Miller (1959) in his investigation about Negroes found that low academic achievement, retardation, absenteeism, and over-ageness are found in significantly greater proportion among delinquents than among non-delinquents.

Shaw and Black (1960) selected 21 male achievers and 21 male non-
achievers each with an IQ of 113 or higher than it on the basis of Cook Hostility Scale. Their reactions were gathered through Rosenweig P-P Study. The results reveal that achievers tend to deny aggressive responsibility for their own inadequate behaviour, while under-achievers admit their guilt but claim that circumstances beyond their control were responsible for it.

Januar (1961) administered 2 intelligence and 2 personality tests to a group of college students. The results showed that the achievers had a better personality adjustment than the under-achievers. Home, emotional, and social adjustments were significantly high in the achievers in comparison with the under-achievers.

Tait and Hoggis (1962) studied 231 children out of 542, belonging to two different project schools of Washington run for the problem children. About two thirds of these students referred had academic difficulties. In their academic work 57% children were below grade placement for their years, whereas 31% of all 501 children in one of the two project schools had been retained in grade at least once, according to a study made by the principal of that project school.

Ball (1962) served the MMT on a group of deviant adolescents. His findings reveal that under-achievement was one of the significant causes of their personality maladjustments.

Dell (1963) studied 492 juvenile brought before the Belfast Juvenile Court by the police. He found that they had retardations in attainments. Jenkin et al (1964) through their study compared a group of emotionally disturbed boys with a control group of non-disturbed boys. Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC), Wechsler-Bellevue (WB), and California Achievement Test (CAT) were used. There was a significant difference between the normal and emotionally disturbed students (p .001). The latter were under-achievers as compared to the former.
Rao (1964a) through his study found that subjects who showed greater sense of responsibility and deeper sense of curiosity were over-achievers, whereas those lacked in these characteristics were under-achievers.

Rao (1964b) administered an abridged version of the Mooney Problem Checklist (in English) to approximately 300 undergraduate students in Madras State (now Tamil Nadu). The results showed that under-achieving students reported significantly more problems of adjustment than did over-achieving students.

Faherty and Rentzel (1965) studied 149 students of Mount Mercy College during Freshman Orientation Week. Significant differences at the level of .001 were found between the high- and low-achievers. The high achievers manifested better qualities of self acceptance, responsibility, achievement by conformity, intellectual efficiency, and flexibility than the low achievers.

Sinha (1966) studied 185 high-achievers and 190 low-achievers. His findings reveal that the high-achievers had better overall adjustment, and moderate anxiety level as compared with low-achievers.

Shoemar (1968), through his study, found that the students who were suspended from studies were far below in their high school achievement. Stewart (1968) studied 31 students on Grade Point Average (GPA) and Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) and found that there was positive correlation in educational attainment and the capacity for intimate contacts.

Siddiqi and Akhtar (1969) have revealed through their study that there is a significant difference at 5% level between the disciplined and indisciplined students. When they compared the means of achievement of the disciplined and indisciplined groups they found that the mean of the former group was 8.60 whereas the mean of the latter group was 3.90. Thus, on the
average, the disciplined group had a much higher n-Achievement than the
indisciplined one.

Hesser (1970) studied the stability of the cognitive disposition
of 65 boys to be impulsive or reflective over a 2½ year period. Meta-
correlations were modest but significant and ranged from .23 to .43. Subjects
who failed a grade were discovered to be significantly more impulsive than
their peers, but highly comparable in verbal intelligence.

On the basis of some studies, Lindgren (1973) asserts that "pe-
sons who score high on measures of n-Achievement enjoy exercising and test-
ing their competencies and hence are attracted to tasks that are moderately
difficult and that have some risk. They are, in effect, more attracted to
success than they are frightened by the possibility of failure. Tasks that
are too easy, with no chance of failure, are less attractive, because they
offer little challenge. On the other hand, very high-risk tasks, in which
the elements for success are largely beyond the individual's control, are
not attractive to them; the costs are much greater than the potential re-
wards".

In the light of the above studies, we can postulate that the fact-
or of educational attainment is expected to influence the personalities of
disciplined students in one way and that of the indisciplined ones in another.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS:

Reynolds (1942) studied a group of second grade students. His find-
ings brought to light the fact that children who come from more favorable
socioeconomic homes, where opportunities existed for healthy physical and
psychological development, made social adjustments better than did children
from poorer socioeconomic group. Studies of Neugarten (1943), MacDonald
(1949), and Carrison (1953) further support this result.

Rollingshead (1949), on the basis of his study, finds out that the
personality pattern is already formed by the time the child reaches the period designated as adolescence in the context of his social class.

Steffire (1959) studied a group of 112 high school seniors. He found that middle class background was associated with concern for altruism and self-realization while lower class background was associated with concern for security and money.

Kothukar (1962) studied 338 Brahmins, 65 Marathas (mostly agricultural people), 35 Depressed Class boys and girls in Grades 8, 9, and 10 of Poona City High School. Tests employed were: intelligence (Bimet-type in Marathi language and nonverbal Passalong Tests) plus Marathi version of Terman-McNemar Mental Ability Scale, Bell Adjustment Inventory (in Marathi) and O'Connor Fingers Dexterity. A questionnaire concerning future career plans and parental discipline was added plus ratings by teachers and school marks. In general, children of socioeconomically advanced classes (Brahmins) did better on all verbal measures; the lower groups surpassed the Brahmins on the O'Connor. High percentages of poor adjustment were disclosed on the Bell. Equally striking were results when analyzed in terms of high and low income groups. Particularly, impressive was the high level of aspiration shown by the depressed class sample.

Haller (1963) served the Cattell’s 16 PF test and California Test of Personality on a group of 17 year old boys in school in a culturally homogeneous county of Michigan for finding out the correlations between personality factors and socioeconomic status (SES). His results showed significant correlations between SES and eight of the personality factors, vis., Emotional Stability versus Dissatisfied Emotionality: .11, Dominance or Ascendence versus Submission: .06, Emotional Sensitivity versus Tough Maturity: .04, Anxious Insecurity versus Placid Self-Confidence: -.05.

Badami (1962) studied two matched groups of delinquent school
children. He found that the delinquent school children had more acute socioeconomic problems than the non-delinquent children.

Robins (1962) studied a group of antisocial children in the lower classes. He found that their high rate of deviant behaviour was to a greater extent due to their antisocial fathers who belonged to a low occupational status.

Ball (1962) served MMPI Profiles on those 9th grade public children who had been convicted for their delinquency. He found out significant relationship between deviant personality tendencies and socioeconomic status.

Dell (1963) made an analysis of the educational and social factors associated with 492 delinquent children who were brought before the Belfast Juvenile Court. He found that a low level of socioeconomic status had a significant relationship with delinquency.

Mehta (1968) studied 290 students of five experimental schools with two control schools. His results indicate that the low socioeconomic status group showed greater gain in achievement, compared with the middle socioeconomic status boys.

Warren (1970), in the context of his study, maintains that it is not the status group which is responsible for inconsistencies, rather, it is the individual whose reward structure is out of line with his investment. Wechsler et al (1970) further support this finding on the basis of their study by demonstrating that “high educational aspirations indicate an identification with norms of the larger social order concerning legitimate means, and hence they operate to restrain involvement in delinquency, despite blocked opportunities in the form of poor educational adjustment”. They also do not ascribe this adjustment to a particular socioeconomic class, but to the students who have high aspirations or ambitions.

Pepenne (1974) on the basis of a few studies asserts that the stu-
dents who involve themselves in protests, demonstrations, and "non-negotiable" demands are in majority from the high status socioeconomic backgrounds.

These studies, as such, lead to infer that socioeconomic status can be an important factor in determining the student behaviour relating to indiscipline.

RURAL AND URBAN INHABITANCE:

Smith (1937) studied the cases of delinquents in rural and urban areas of Kansas. He found that there was a regular increase in delinquency rates from the most rural to most urban counties.

Monahan (1937) did an analysis of the conviction rates in Iowa for the period 1865-1923 and traced out that the rate had been constantly lower than the urban rates and had not shown any significant tendency to approach the urban rate.

Lottier (1938) made a survey of criminal offences in metropolitan regions. His findings reveal that in the zone of 45-55 miles of the city hall crimes decreased from 1.87% to .07% and in the zone nearer to it the rate increased to .44%. Thus crimes decreased with the distance of zones from urban areas.

Wiers (1939) studied juvenile delinquency in rural Michigan. He found that the most urban county had the highest delinquency rate but that the sparsely settled logging counties had higher rates than the southern agricultural counties.

Leavy (1940) studied the contrast in urban and rural family life. He found that socialization of the urban subjects was more regulated by the home than by the peer group, and they acquired most of their status in family rather than peer culture activities. Contrarily, the rural subjects were less exposed to rapid social changes and were able to relate to a more stable set of values.
Clinard (1942) studied the process of urbanization and criminal behavior in the context of culture conflicts. His results reveal that the excessive criminality of the city is due to the impersonality of city life in comparison with rural life.

Wiers (1944) while studying the economic factors in Michigan delinquency found that in West Virginia the mining communities had higher crime rates than the agricultural communities.

Munson (1959) administered the California Test of Personality to 500 seventh graders in Manhattan suburban and rural areas. The results revealed that the best adjusted children were from suburban, urban and rural areas, whereas the town children were least adjusted.

Hathaway (1959) administered the MMPI to 15,000 Minnesota ninth graders and noted their rural-urban differences. He found that the rural children, in general, expressed more feelings of shyness, self-depreciation, and suspicion to others. Urban children were more apt to express feelings of rebellion against authority, less self-critical, and less suspicious of the motives of the others.

El Kousey (1960) studied the characteristics of rural and urban adolescents in Egypt. He asked 800 pupils in Port Said, Cairo and in rural areas in North and South Egypt to write about their attitudes and values. He found that the rural more than the urban groups reflected in their productions the dominant culture of their social set up.

Burchinal and Jacobson (1963) through their study on the migrating rural families found out that adolescents of such families were more apt to adjust with the new urban life than their parents. They also adjusted satisfactorily in their urban schools.

Sutherland and Cressey (1965) on the basis of an analysis of crime records came to conclude that crimes in the city of Chicago in the years
1931 and 1932 were 59.6% whereas in the suburban area within 25 miles from
the centre of Chicago in the same period it were only 29.8%. In 1927-1932
crimes in Chicago were 57.9% and in the suburban area within hundred miles
of the city it were only 21.4%. The rate of crimes further decreased in
areas 75 to 100 miles away from the city, i.e., between 19.5% and 5.8%.

Coleman et al (1966), by their study known as American Coleman
Report, demonstrate that the average rural dweller has the same level of
educational attainment as the average suburbanite.

Jesser et al (1968) did a study of a tri-ethnic community through
which they found that "students who live in town were considered to have
more access to the situations, means, and materials for deviance than stud-
ents who live relatively isolated from each other in the rural surround".
Wechsler et al (1970) also demonstrated the same results by their study and
assert that the cities, in comparison with the rural areas, have more opp-
portunities for deviant behaviour.

Popesoe (1974) basing on some studies reveals that rebellion
against the parents, teachers, and the establishment is an integral part
of the adolescent stage of life more prominent in the urban groups than in
the rural ones.

Hence, these studies give us a clue to hypothesize that the beha-
vior of rural and urban students will manifest some noticeable difference
in itself.

THE OVER-ALL REMARK:

The studies cited in this chapter are not directly related with
our research problem, but they have some relevance for their reference.
They indirectly throw light on the hypotheses about the personality factors
and variables that are selected for the present research. They can be well
utilized for interpreting our results. To some extent they also clarify the
concepts of these factors. Most of the studies highlight misconduct, aggression, and maladjustment which eventually prove to be of some utility and relevance for our hypothesis.

REFERENCES


Allport, G.W.; Personality: A Psychological Interpretation; Constable & Co; London; 1937.

Allport, G.W., and P.H. Allport; The A-S Reaction Study; Manual of Directions, Scoring Values, and Norms; Houghton Mifflin; Boston; 1939.


Ball, J.C.; Social Deviancy and Adolescent Personality; Univ. Kentucky Press; Lexington, Ky.; 1962.

Bandura, A., and R.H. Walters; Adolescent Aggression; Ronald; New York; 1959.


Barker, R.G., H.F. Wright, J. Nall, and P. Schoggen; "There is no Class Bias in our School"; Progressive Educ.; 1950; 27, 106-110.


Burchinal, L.G., and P.H. Jacobson; "Migration and Adjustments of Farm and


Couch, A.S.: "Psychological Determinants of Interpersonal Behaviour";


Dimmiede, F.H.; An Application of the Principle of Response Generalization of Displacement of Aggressive Responses; Catholic Univ. of Amer. Press; Washington; 1955.


Finley, C.B.; "The Social Opinions Inventory as a Measure of Social Maturity"; Child Develop.; 1955; 26, 81-90.


Garrison, K.C.; Psychology of Adolescence; Prentice-Hall; Englewood Cliffs; 1956.


Healy, W., and A.F. Bronner; New Light on Delinquency and its Treatment; Yale Univ. Press; New Heaven; 1936.


Hollingshead, A.B.; Bimtown's Youth; Jonh Wiley; New York; 1949.

Hovland, C.I., and R.R. Sears; "Correlation of Economic Indices with Lynchings"; J. Psychol.; 1940; 9, 301-310.


Jersild A.T.; "Emotional Development"; in C.B. Skinner; Educational Psychology; Staples; London; 1952; Pp. 52-117.


Kothurkar, V.V.; Psychosocial Survey; Univ. Poona; Poona; 1962.


Kureshi, A.; Adolescent Fantasy: A Study of Youth Motivation; Minerva; Calcutta; 1975.

1940; 5, 948-953.
Lehner, G.F.J., and B. Kube; The Dynamics of Personal Adjustment; Prentice-Hall; Englewood Cliffs; 1955.
Lieberman, L.R.; "Effects upon Anxiety, Depression, and Hostility of Postponement of Examination"; Perceptual & Motor Skills, 1966; 3; 2; 1051-1054.
Lindeman, E., and I.M. Greer; "Emotional Maturity"; J. Pastoral Care; 1949; 3, 1-11.
Lindgren, H.C.; Psychology of Personal and Social Adjustment; Amer. Book Co.; New York; 1953.
MacDonald, H. C. McMurtrie, and R.J. Havighurst; "Leisure Activities and the Socioeconomic Status of Children"; Amer. J. Sociol.; 1949; 54, 505-519.
Maud, A.M.; Problems of Child Delinquency; Houghton Mifflin; Boston; 1947.
McCandless, B.R.; Children and Adolescents; Holt, Rinehart and Winston;


Monahan, T.P.; "The Trend in Rural and Urban Crime"; 1937; (Cited in B.H. Sutherland and D.R. Cressey; Principles of Criminology; Times of India Press; Bombay, 1965).

Munson, B.B.; "Personality Differentials among Urban, Suburban, Town, and Rural Children"; Rural Sociol.; 1959; 24, 257-264.

Myers, R.L., and L.W. Gates; Personal Characteristics of Academically Talented College Freshmen seeking Training in Cognitive Listening: An Exploratory Study; Pauley; Indianapolis; 1968.

Neugarten, B.L.; "Social Class and Friendship among School Children"; Amer. J. Sociol.; 1946; 51, 305-313.


Patterson, C.H.; "The Vineland Social Maturity Scale and Some of its Correlates"; J. Genet. Psychol.; 1943; 62, 275-287.


Prakash, J.; "A Study of Group Convergence in Relation to Ascendancy and
Submission"; Manas; 1970; 17:2, 125-133.


Rose, A.A.; "Insecurity Feelings in Adolescent Girls"; New Child; 1944; 4, 46-59.


Schiedlinger, S.; "Freudian Concept of Group Relations"; in D. Cartwright and A. Zander (Eds.); Group Dynamics; Research and Theory; Row-Peterson; New York; 1953; P. 52-61.


Smith, R.; "Tier Cauties and Delinquency in Kansas, Rural Sociol.; 1937; 2, 310-322.


Sullivan, C., M. Grant, and G.J. Douglas; "The Development of Interpersonal Maturity: Application to Delinquency"; Psychiatry; 1957; 20, 373-386.

Sutherland, B.R., and D.R. Cressey; Principles of Criminology; Times of India Press; Bombay; 1965.

Tait Jr., C.D., and B.F. Hodges Jr.; Delinquents, their Families and the Community; Thomas; Springfield; 1962.

Tannenbaum, R., and F. Massarik; "Leadership: A Frame of Reference"; Management Science; 1957; 4:1, 1-19.


Wiers, P.; Economic Factors in Michigan Delinquency; Columbia Univ. Press; New York; 1944.

Wetzman, E.; "A Study of Social Maturity in Persons Sixteen through Twenty-four Years of Age"; J. Genet. Psychol.; 1944; 6, 37-66.


Young, F.M.; "Responses of Juvenile Delinquents to TAT"; J. Genet. Psychol.; 1956; 88, 251-259.