

**Chapter - VI**  
**Summary and**  
**Conclusion**

## CHAPTER- VI

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Social influence plays a key role in many social behaviours. This is why it has been the subject of careful study by social psychologists. Among the important forms of social influences we may name conformity compliance and obedience. Conformity means pressure in one's group or society behave. It is a type of social influence in which individuals change their attitudes and behaviour in order to adhere to existing social norms. Compliance is efforts to get others say "Yes" to direct requests. It is a form of social influence involving direct request of persuasion from one person to another. Obedience is kind of social in which one person simply orders one or more others to do what he wants. Obedience is thus social behaviour in which persons obey direct orders from others to perform some actions. Obedience occurs in a situation where the person changes behaviour in response to the commands from other. Usually the person who issues such orders has some means of enforcing submission on person who exhibits obedience. Such persons are powerful for stimulating orders of influences. But if instead of obeying to the commands, a person reacts in an opposite direction or negative way of remains indifferent it is disobedience. People value their sense of freedom and like to project the image of self efficacy (Baer et. al., 1980). Consequently when social pressure

become so blatant that it threatens their sense of freedom, they often rebel. Thus resistance to obey is disobedience or defiance.

There is an increasing tendency in the youth to defy the authority. An elder who comes to command the youth is likely to serve as an authority. In home the parents serve as the effective authority figure. In the college and the university teachers and officials are accepted as authority. When the youth enters into some jobs, the immediate boss or other executives in the hierarchy are treated as authority. But one witnesses lack of adjustment in between the two tier relationship of the youth and the authority. The young generation is often found exhibiting disrespect, negativism, neglect, disregard, noncompliance etc. against the authority.

Requests from others are a part of our social life. Spouses, lovers and roommates have direct influence on the person's life through their requests but the moment one is treated as an authority he may be meted out with defiance or disobedience. In compliance of an order the legitimacy of the authority is of prime importance (Milgram, 1965, 1975). It has been found that with authority of lower status more than 80% of subjects fail to comply to their orders. Bushman (1984) found that the authority who possesses visible signs of his status and power is accepted for giving orders.

There are some reasons why the commands of an

authority is not accepted. For example, if the individuals think that they will be responsible for the outcome of their compliance and not the authority, there is sharp reduction in obedience (Hamilton, 1978). When obedience is accepted as inappropriate it becomes easier to disobey (Milgram, 1965; Powers and Green, 1972). Similarly if the source of the authority, their expertise and motives become questionable, there is an increase in disobedience.

However disobedience tendency among the youth may have some association with family environment. Family environment is influenced by several factors such as parental rearing behaviours, socio-economic status of the family, family type size of the family, birth order of the child, family occupations, parents' education etc. These factors which influence family environment may influence disobedience among college youth. Besides these some personal factors such as age, sex and education of the person may also influence disobedience tendency in him. The studies reviewed in this regard in chapter 3 have clearly revealed the effects of some of these factors.

The main purpose of this study was to see if these family environment factors and personal factors, in fact, do create some variations in disobedience tendency of college youth. In other words the study intended to know the extent of relationship of disobedience with these above mentioned factors.

For this a random sample of 200 male and 200 female college students of urban area were administered the following paper-pencil tests:

**(a) Personal Data Sheet** which taps informations regarding age, sex, education, birth-order, family type, family size, family occupation, mothers education, caste, religion, area of residence etc.

**(b) Socio-Economic Status Scale of Kuppuswamy ( 1962)** which Mesures SES of the subject's father with the help of three items relating to his father's education, occupation and income.

**(c) Parent Behaviour Inventory constructed by Ojha ( 1993)** which measures three dimensions of mother's and father's childrearing behaviours, viz. restrictive-permissive. rejecting-loving and neglecting-protecting, with 16 items in each dimension.

**(d) A Disobedience Scale constructed by Pramanick ( 1998)** which has s subscales viz, Disrespect to Elderly People (DEP), Disrespect to authoritative Figure (DAF), Disrespect to Parent and Teachers (DPT), Lack of Ethical Code (LEC), Conviction for Defiance (CFD) and Feeling for revolt (FFR), each consisting of 4 items. The scale is a five-point Likert type scalle having both positive and negative items.

On the basis of past studies and our daily life experiences, some hypotheses were formulated and tested. Following were

the hypothesis and related findings.

The first hypothesis was that permissive, loving and protective childrearing behaviours of parents would be negatively related with disobedience among college youth. In other words disobedient students would perceive their parents as restrictive (less permissive), rejecting (Less loving) and neglecting (less protective), while obedient students will perceive, their parents as permissive (less restrictive), loving (less rejecting), and protective (less neglecting).

The results revealed that loving and protective behaviours of parents were significantly and negatively related with youth disobedience and that High Disobedient (HD) students perceived their parents as rejecting and neglecting while Low Disobedient (LD) students perceived them as loving and protective. No significant relationship was witnessed in case of restrictive-permissive dimension. Parental love and protection thus restrained the rise of disobedience, while parental rejection and neglect accelerated disobedience among male and female college students. Hypothesis was, therefore, by and large confirmed.

The second hypothesis was that socio-economic status would create significant difference in disobedience scores of students and that there would be decrease in disobedience with increase in socio-economic status, The results, however, revealed that there was a curvilinear relationship between socio economic and status

and disobedience college youth. Lower class Ss were found to be most disobedient and middle class, the least disobedient while upper class Ss were in between. The Hypothesis was, therefore, partially confirmed.

The third hypothesis was that college students from joint family would be more disobedient than those from nuclear family.

The findings demonstrated that in both sexes Ss from joint family and obtained higher scores on Disobedience Scale compared to Ss from nuclear family. Hence the hypothesis was confirmed.

The fourth hypothesis was that size of the family would be linearly related with disobedience among college students i.e as the size of the family would increase, there would be rise in the disobedience scores of Ss.

The results revealed that Ss from large families were most disobedient while Ss from small families were least disobedient in both sexes. Thus the hypothesis was confirmed.

The fifth hypothesis was that birth-order would be significantly related with disobedience among college students and that later-born Ss would be more disobedient than first-born Ss.

The results, however, revealed that among male students the first-born Ss were least disobedience., while among girls the last-born Ss were least, disobedient. Disobedience was the highest among the last-born Ss in female sex, while disobedience was the highest among the middle-born Ss in female sex. Thus sex had a moderating effect on birth-order in the determination of disobedience among students. Thus the hypothesis was partially confirmed.

Our sixth hypothesis was that college students from families with entrepreneurial occupations would show greater disobedience than those from families with bureaucratic occupations.

Our results confirmed the hypothesis for both sexes. Boys and girl from families with entrepreneurial occupations clearly demonstrated higher level of disobedience than those from families with bureaucratic occupations.

The seventh hypothesis was that mother's education would be negatively related with disobedience among male and female college students i.e with increase in mother's education there would be decline in disobedience among boys and girls.

The results confirmed the hypothesis. It was found that Ss of mother's educated above graduation level displayed the least disobedience, while Ss of literate or Uneducated mothers had

the highest level of disobedience. The Ss from mothers educated above matriculation had the intermediate score. Thus the inverse relationship existed between mother's education and disobedience among college youth.

Our eighth hypothesis was that age of students would be linearly related with disobedience i.e with increase in age of youth, there would be rise in their disobedience.

However, the results presented different pictures for the two sexes. Among females the lowest disobedience was found in the age-range of 16-18 yrs but their disobedience increased in the age-range of 19-21 yrs. However, it declined again in the age-range of 22-24 yrs. Among males, however, disobedience went on increasing with increase in age. Thus the relationship among females was inverted U-shaped, while among males it was linear. Thus the hypothesis was confirmed for male sex only.

Our ninth hypothesis was that increase in educational level would be followed by decrease in disobedience among male and female students.

The results, however, did not confirm the hypothesis. It was found that intermediate students were least disobedient, while degree course and postgraduate student were disobedient.

Our tenth hypothesis was that caste status would be significantly associated with disobedience among students i.e as the caste status would be increase, there would be decline in disobedience.

The results confirmed the hypothesis. Forward caste students of both sexes were found to be least disobedient, while Scheduled caste students were found to be most disobedient, the backward caste students having intermediate level of disobedience.

Our eleventh hypothesis was that male Ss would be more disobedient than female Ss.

The results confirmed the hypothesis as male Ss demonstrated significantly higher disobedience scores than female Ss.

The results found in this research have been interpreted in the contest of previous findings and also on the basis of daily life observations:

\*\*\*\*\*