CHAPTER - 10

GENERAL DISCUSSION

10.1 Results On The D-I Inventory

A reference to the combined distribution of scores on the D-I Inventory given in Table 8.2 (P.147) reveals that the frequencies are clustering on the minus side of the distribution. This indicates, on the whole, a trend towards endorsing more statements pointing to indiscipline. This is obvious from the larger number of indisciplined than of disciplined students in the population studied. As reported in Section 9.2 (P.221) of the preceding chapter, 400 students were identified as indisciplined and 300 as disciplined on the basis of the D-I Inventory, with 150 as doubtful cases. When we take into consideration the scores of indisciplined and disciplined students separately as given in Tables 8.3 and 8.4 respectively (PP 150-51) we find that indisciplined students have endorsed more of such statements as indicate indiscipline, while disciplined students prefer less of those statements pointing to discipline. The range of indisciplined students' scores, -62 to -9, is greater than that of their counterpart, which is +8 to +49. Of the two mean values, one in the case of indisciplined students is numerically higher. Moreover, within their respective groups students identified as indisciplined achieve numerically higher scores than the disciplined group, (Tables 8.3 and 8.4, PP 150-51). This amounts to saying that
the two groups — disciplined and indisciplined — behave differently on the D-I Inventory as revealed by the size of scores in the respective distributions of scores of the two groups. Diagrammatic representation of scores in Fig. 8.3 (p 152) shows that scores of indisciplined students move higher on the indiscipline side of the scale, while disciplined students' scores do not go that high on the discipline side of the scale. In other words, it suggests that indisciplined students are as a group more indisciplined whereas disciplined students are on the average less disciplined. Results of CR test applied to find out the significance of difference between the mean scores of the two groups on the Inventory reveal that the patterns of responses of disciplined and indisciplined students to items in the D-I Inventory are significantly different from each other; the difference between the mean scores of disciplined and indisciplined students is statistically significant beyond one per cent level. This leaves us in no doubt that the D-I Inventory does discriminate between disciplined and indisciplined students and the two groups respond to items in the Inventory in a different manner. The probability of this difference having arisen by chance is even less than one per cent. This strengthens our faith in the diagnostic value of the instrument designed for identifying the two types of students. Besides, the Inventory possesses requisite reliability and validity, as discussed in Chapter 5. It may be recalled here that the D-I Inventory is the first-ever attempt in the direction of measuring indiscipline objectively. There is no other test available for
the purpose so far.

10.2 Comparison Of The Self-Concepts Of Indisciplined And Disciplined Students

We now proceed to make a step-by-step comparison of the self-concepts of indisciplined and disciplined students in the light of the results obtained in chapter 8 and interpreted in chapter 9.

10.2.1 Comparison Of Indisciplined And Disciplined Students On W-scores Of Personality Word List

Indisciplined students endorse larger number of words as self-descriptive than do the disciplined students. Tables 8.8 and 8.9 (PP. 160-161) point out that the mean W-score of indisciplined students on Personality Word List is 61.8, whereas corresponding score for disciplined students is 58.3. Difference between the two mean scores is significant at about .02 level. This high degree of confidence strengthens our faith that disciplined and indisciplined students differ in the pattern of checking adjectives in the Personality Word List. Indisciplined students use larger number of adjectives to describe themselves, which points to the more expressive nature of these students. This is the first indication of the difference between the self-concepts of the two groups.

10.2.2 Comparison Of The Self-Concepts Of Disciplined And Indisciplined Students In Terms Of Adjectives Preferred.

Table 8.12 (PP. 173-177) shows that in all 90
adjectives discriminate significantly at .01, .02, .05 and .10 levels between the self-concepts of disciplined and indisciplined students. Out of these, 75 adjectives have been endorsed more often by indisciplined students and only 15 by disciplined students. But a careful scrutiny of Table 8.12 and 8.11 (PP. 164-177) will reveal that some of the adjectives, though yielding significant percentage difference, have been endorsed by relatively small number of students in both the groups. The reason why so small percentage frequencies yielded significant difference may be the large number of subjects tested. In this connection it may also be observed that the same difference between percentage frequencies at different locations at the normal curve is different in significance. For example, a difference between 0 and 10 per cent at the extreme may be significant even at .01 level, a difference between 10 and 20 per cent at .05 level, and a difference between 40 and 50 per cent or 50 and 60 per cent may not be significant at all. Size of sample, of course, contributes to it. CR test, however, assumes normality of distribution.

To arrive at the self-concepts of the two groups on the basis of adjectives significantly discriminating a 4-way analysis of the 90 adjectives given in Table 8.12 (P. 173) was made. All the 90 adjectives were classified in 4 categories in the following manner:

Category I This included adjectives with percentage frequencies of 49 and less indicating that majority of the students did not endorse these adjectives as describing them.
Category II This covered adjectives which were preferred by 50% or more of the indisciplined students but less than 50% of the disciplined students.

Category III Adjectives picked up by 50% or more from the disciplined group and less than 50% from the indisciplined group.

Category IV Adjectives giving 50% frequency for both the groups indicating that majority of the students from both the groups endorsed these adjectives.

Table 8.12a (PP. 101-103) gives this classification along with the adjectives coming under each of the four categories. This table shows that maximum number of adjectives, i.e., 66 out of 90 come in category I indicating that most of the words significantly differentiating between disciplined and indisciplined students have not been picked up by majority of the students from both the groups. Out of these 66 adjectives 55 have been preferred more by indisciplined students and only 11 by the disciplined students. Category II in the table shows that 6 adjectives out of 90 have been endorsed by 50% or more of the indisciplined students, while category III shows that only one adjective was preferred by 50% or more of the disciplined students significantly more often. Category IV in Table 8.12a shows 17 adjectives preferred significantly more often by majority of the students from both the groups indicating that both the groups share these characteristics.

For inferring self-concept on the basis of adjectives given in category I of Table 8.12a an arbitrary criterion of 25% frequency was adopted, i.e., self-concept was inferred on
the basis of adjectives preferred by at least 25% of students from either of the two groups. In other words, before an adjective was considered to be descriptive of either the disciplined or indisciplined students it was essential that at least 25% of students must endorse it. Other adjectives were not taken into consideration, since they were preferred by a small minority of students and could not be taken as representing the group as a whole. Adjectives giving 25% frequency in Category I of Table 3.12a have been asterisked. There are 25 such adjectives and 21 of them have been preferred significantly more often by indisciplined students. Indisciplined students describe themselves as graceful and likable. It can be inferred from this that they hold social appeal and as far as their self-concept reveals they possess an amiable exterior. Indisciplined students also feel that they are enthusiastic, forceful and bold. This suggests that they possess enthusiasm and vigour. They also prefer such adjectives as talkative, straightforward, and humorous. These adjectives lend additional social appeal to their self-concepts. This points to their potentiality for cultivating healthy social contacts. Adjectives like carefree, expressive, optimistic suggest that they are free from inhibitions. Their self-concept, as couched in these adjectives, reveals that they are happy-go-lucky and have a bright outlook. Indisciplined students describe themselves as argumentative as well as suggestible. Not much can be inferred from this as it is usually recognised that a suggestible person cannot be argumentative at the same time. However, if we refer to the
actual frequencies we find that the word 'suggestible' has been preferred by greater number of indisciplined students as compared to the word 'argumentative'. Therefore, it may be stated that more students from the indisciplined group describe themselves as suggestible than argumentative. In this connection it may also be observed that indisciplined students consider themselves as nervous. Besides, they attribute to their self such adjectives as delicate and soft which have artistic appeal and point to aesthetic taste rather than any weakness. Or, may be that these adjectives were picked up mostly by female subjects in this group. Other adjectives from Category I picked up moreoften by indisciplined students are charitable, steady, and lenient. There are only two highly negatively toned words in this category, namely, hostile and aggressive, which indisci­plined students endorse significantly moreoften. Coupled with their bold and activistic nature, as outlined above, these two adjectives lend an anti-social bias to the self-concepts of these students. As it is, their self-concept reveals that they are prone to hostile and aggressive acts. It is already indicated that they are suggestible. This makes them an easy prey to 'extraneous' influence which impel them to indulge in violence and other types of socially deviant and undesirable acts. It is to be noted, however, that majority of the indisciplined students still abstain from checking these two adjectives, although some among them possess this teniency.

Disciplined students prefer four adjectives significantly moreoften from Category I in Table 8.12a.
These words are: shy, mature, relaxed, and well adjusted. The word 'shy' indicates that disciplined students are socially withdrawn, as revealed by their self-concept. It is, as if, they fight shy of social contacts. Their self-concept also indicates that they are free from tensions, as they say that they are relaxed. They also describe themselves as mature which indicates that they possess built-in wisdom. They also say that they are well adjusted which is natural to expect when one is free from tensions and has developed inner wisdom.

On the other hand, adjectives which, though yielding statistically significant difference, have been endorsed by a small number of indisciplined students (less than 25%) in category I are:


It may be observed from these adjectives that within the indisciplined group there are some students who describe themselves as irresponsible, prejudiced, extremist, snobbish, intolerant, wicked, hostile and unscrupulous. But percent frequency in the case of these adjectives is low so that they cannot be considered as representing the group as a whole. Subjects in this small group of students also endorse such adjectives as self-pitying, pessimistic, unlikable, grudging. These traits reflect a high degree of maladjustment and are definitely obstacles to healthy social life. These students
seem to be disgruntled and frustrated. From the adjectives endorsed by them it is obvious that they are the real trouble mongers who indulge in anti-social activities. The data presented point to the fact that all the students who are indisciplined are not bad. It is only a small number of students who have asocial inclinations, who resort to boisterous and violent demonstrations and thus disrupt the normal functioning of educational institutions. But most of the students identified as indisciplined possess balanced self-concepts and have healthy social attitudes. However, it may be because of their susceptibility to outside pressures, as expressed in their suggestibility that they get involved in strikes and demonstrations and other boisterous acts.

Category I in Table 3.12a also gives 7 adjectives which give statistically significant difference and have been picked up by disciplined students more often to describe their self. But again they are not representative of the group, as preference value in the case of these adjectives is rather low. In brief, these adjectives are: Unkind, Confused, Absent minded, Unattractive, Inferior, Submissive, Womanly. These words reveal that there are some students at least in the disciplined group who admit that they are unkind – probably to themselves. These students also consider themselves to be unattractive and that may be the reason why they think that they are inferior. This small group of disciplined students also describe themselves as confused and absent minded. This is indicative of their pre-occupation with themselves and this also probably points to some sort of
conflict in them. In a nutshell, some of the disciplined students also betray signs of maladjustment with self, as is evident from the adjectives given above. These adjectives speak of their social inadequacy, their preoccupation with themselves and their generally withdrawn nature.

In Category II of Table 8.12a are given 6 adjectives which have been endorsed by majority of indisciplined students. These words are: Systematic, Attractive, Alert, Reasonable, Clever, Ambitious. This indicates that most of these students have social appeal on account of their attractiveness. This goes with the observation made above that indisciplined students have a pleasant exterior which can win them friends and admirers fairly easily. As their self-concept reveals, they are shrewd in their social dealings - as the word 'clever' indicates. Their ambitiousness goes with their optimism - a characteristic observed earlier in their self-concept. Majority of these students consider themselves alert. They also say that they are reasonable and systematic in their approach. From the disciplined group majority show preference for the word 'Patient' (Category III).

Category IV shows those 17 adjectives which majority of the students from both the groups have endorsed as applying to them. As such, these characteristics are shared by both the groups, although some adjectives have been picked up more often by one group than the other. The adjectives picked up significantly more often by indisciplined students in this list are: Cheerful, Intelligent, Sensitive, Noble, Religious, Affectionate, Frank, Responsible, Active, Honest, Strong, Punctual, Broadminded,
Smart. However, since these adjectives have been preferred by majority of disciplined students as well, they apply equally to the disciplined group, although comparatively they speak more about the indisciplined than the disciplined group. On the other hand, disciplined students speak more often through the following adjectives: Happy, Wise, Sympathetic. It is significant to note that majority of students from both the groups mark many highly desirable adjectives as describing them. As these adjectives reveal, both the groups display a cheerful self-concept free from any untoward sign. Besides, their self concepts reveal many cherished traits of character and personality.

10.2.2.1 Further Comparison Of The Self-concepts Of Disciplined And Indisciplined Students As Inferred From Adjectives Not Yielding Significant Percentage Difference.

It is also interesting to take into consideration those adjectives which did not yield statistically significant difference but which have been preferred by large majority of students from both the groups. At the same time adjectives preferred by a very small minority are significant in their own right and cannot be ignored. This may further throw light on the pattern of self-concept of disciplined and indisciplined students. These two categories of adjectives were studied along the following lines:

(1) Adjectives giving high preference value (50% +) showing that these adjectives have been used by a high percentage of students.
(ii) Adjectives giving extremely low preference value (percentage frequency less than 20%) indicating disinclination to attribute these qualities to their self.

These two categories of adjectives were taken from Table 8.11 (PP. 164-172) and have been presented separately in Tables 8.13 and 8.14 (PP. 184-187).

As Table 8.13 (Page 134) points out, both disciplined and indisciplined students endorse the adjectives given in the table fairly highly. In other words, both the groups share these characteristics. Table shows that both disciplined and indisciplined students describe themselves as kind, unselfish, polite, fair minded and open minded. The fact that these adjectives have been preferred by a vast majority of students from both the groups points out that neither of the two groups can be described as prejudiced, selfish, rude or dishonest. A remarkable feature observed in Table 8.13 is that equal number of students from both the groups describe themselves as disciplined, percentage preference in both cases being 68%. This reveals that a vast majority of indisciplined students do not like to be called indisciplined. Besides, 68 to 68% of students describe themselves as obedient. This goes against the popular belief that indisciplined students are usually defiant. They may be defiant sometimes but mostly they are obedient. Both disciplined and indisciplined students describe themselves as 'thoughtful' with equal frequency. However, disciplined students consider themselves to be more serious than their counterpart which goes with their introvertive bent of mind, an observation
Disciplined students also describe themselves as quiet more often. Another noteworthy observation is that more than 80% of students from both the groups endorse the word 'Friendly' and more than 70% describe themselves as co-operative. This particularly favours the indisciplined students who are generally considered hostile and whose capacity to pull on well with their colleagues is always questioned. More indisciplined than disciplined students describe themselves as self-controlled, relevant frequency being 66% as compared to 63% in the case of disciplined students. From both the groups 60% of students describe themselves as tolerant indicating that both disciplined and indisciplined students are equally tolerant. Equal number of students, i.e., 50% from both the groups say that they are anxious. But at the same time it should be borne in mind that 39% of indisciplined students describe themselves as carefree whereas only 23% of disciplined students prefer to be called as carefree. From this it is obvious that although equal number of students from both the groups call themselves as anxious, yet disciplined students are on the whole more anxious than their counterpart. Indisciplined students are more confident of themselves than the disciplined, corresponding percentages being 68% for the indisciplined group and 62% for the disciplined. 72 to 76% students from both the groups say that they are sincere.

Referring to Table 3.1A (PP 135-137) showing adjectives giving extremely low preference value we find that the following adjectives were endorsed by 5% or even less number of students.
from both the groups: Unreliable, Unsympathetic, Impractical, Inhuman, Unreasonable, Wavering, Impractical. As such, these negative adjectives cannot be descriptive of either of the two groups. However, the two most conspicuous adjectives in the list of adjectives given in Table 8.14 (pp. 135-87) are 'Indisciplined' and 'Maladjusted'. It is interesting to note from the Table that 8% students from both the groups describe themselves as indisciplined, while just 3% say that they are maladjusted. In this connection it is to be recalled that 64% students from the two groups describe themselves as disciplined. On the other hand, 38% students from the disciplined group and 32% from the indisciplined group say that they are well adjusted. These figures indicate that a large majority of students from both the groups consider themselves to be disciplined. Comparative-ly fewer students describe themselves as well adjusted, particularly from the indisciplined group, although they would not like to be called maladjusted as well.

Adjectives like lethargic, inactive, and unenthusiastic also show extremely low preference, i.e., 5% or less. But it is to be borne in mind that whereas disciplined students do not generally associate themselves with enthusiasm and activity such adjectives are predominantly present in the self-concept of indisciplined students. It is also worthwhile to note that only a negligible percentage of students from both the groups like to be called as foolish, unsystematic and dull. Other adjectives preferred by 8% or less from both the groups are: Quarrelsome, Bossy, Bluffer, Defiant, Inhibited, Unexcitable,
Unemotional. It is significant to observe that both disciplined as well as indisciplined students refrain from describing themselves as quarrelsome or defiant. This goes against the prevalent notion that indisciplined students are generally fault finding and rebellious.

Following adjectives were endorsed by 5 to 10% of students from both the groups: Fussy, Obstinate, Rude, Superficial, Irritable, Impulsive, Hateful, Unhappy, Narrow minded, Pretending, Dishonest, Critical, Inefficient, Coward. These adjectives have been preferred with almost equal frequency, however low, from both the groups. Table 8.14 (PP 105-117) also reveals that 25% of indisciplined students also describe themselves as mischievous as compared to 20% from the disciplined group. This difference, though insignificant statistically, shows that more indisciplined than disciplined students describe themselves as mischievous. However, the fact that 20% disciplined students also describe themselves as mischievous is equally noteworthy. Other adjectives which have been preferred almost equally by both the groups, though with slightly higher frequency, are impatient, jealous, contented, inventive, persevering, conscientious.

10.2.3 Dimensionwise Analysis Of The Self-Concepts Of Disciplined And Indisciplined Students

Table 8.27 (P.206) shows the result of the analysis in terms of dimensions of the self-concept of the two groups. It brings out those areas of self-concept where disciplined and indisciplined students resemble as well as differ most. Table
No. 8.27 reveals that the two groups generally differ from each other on emotional and social adjustment aspects of self-concept, besides on the neutral dimension. Performance of both the groups on adjectives covered by various dimensions in terms of frequencies of endorsement can be observed from Table 8.11 (pp. 164-72). In the discussion given below comparison of the two groups on each of these dimensions is made.

10.2.3.1 Intelligence Dimension

Both the groups endorse almost equal number of adjectives on this dimension, as revealed by their mean scores given in Tables 8.15 and 8.16 (pp. 175-89). Fig. 8.7 (p. 190) shows that the pattern of endorsing adjectives by the two groups on this dimension is similar, implying that hardly any difference can be observed in the two groups so far as the pattern of endorsement of adjectives is concerned. In terms of adjectives preferred more often by either of the two groups we find that majority of indisciplined students describe themselves as intelligent, systematic and argumentative whereas disciplined students describe themselves more often only through one adjective, i.e., wise. Other adjectives from the dimension have been preferred with such a small frequency that they cannot be regarded as characteristic of either of the two groups. From the adjectives given, it is apparent that indisciplined students rate themselves reasonably high on this dimension, while disciplined students almost abstain from endorsing adjectives under this dimension except that they describe themselves as wise.
Mean score of almost 6 yielded by both the groups (Tables 8.15 and 8.16 PP183-39) points out that both the groups check small number of adjectives from this dimension.

10.2.3.2 Emotional Adjustment Dimension

As Table 8.27 (P<.06) indicates, disciplined and indisciplined students differ in the pattern of endorsing adjectives on this dimension. Mean score of indisciplined students on this dimension being larger (Table 8.17, P<.191) it is concluded that they endorse more words as self-descriptive than do the disciplined students. In terms of adjectives preferred, indisciplined students attribute the following adjectives more often to their self: Cheerful, Sensitive, Nervous, Affectionate, Expressive, Carefree and Alert. Equal number of adjectives have been picked up significantly more often by disciplined students from this dimension. These adjectives are: Happy, Shy, Mature, Relaxed, Patient, Well adjusted, Sympathetic. The adjectives preferred by the disciplined students point to somewhat better adjustment and maturity on their part than the indisciplined students who describe themselves as nervous and sensitive. However, this does not mean that indisciplined students are maladjusted. Both the groups display a fair amount of adjustment, though the disciplined group has a slight edge over their counterpart. The disciplined students' marked preference for the adjective 'shy' points to their introverted and withdrawn nature, whereas indisciplined students as a group appear to be extroverts — as can be inferred from their
preference for adjectives, such as, carefree, aggressive and expressive. The two words preferred equally by majority of students from both the groups are 'Tolerant' and 'Anxious'. Disciplined students' preference for the word 'Anxious' goes with their introverted and withdrawn nature, but this is not the case with indisciplined students. This points to some sort of conflicts in the indisciplined students and suggests that they are comparatively less well adjusted, especially when anxiety is coupled with nervousness and sensitiveness. But indiscipline is especially relative to the social and cultural conditions, and these results are applicable more in the Indian setting. It is quite possible that in a different social and cultural background the results might differ from the one we have obtained.

10.2.3.3 Social Adjustment Dimension

Table 8.27 (P. 206) reveals that disciplined and indisciplined students significantly differ in the pattern of endorsing adjectives under social adjustment dimension. In the first instance this difference is noticeable in the much larger number of adjectives having been preferred by indisciplined students on this dimension. This difference is also observable from Fig. 8.9 (P. 196) where the polygons based on the scores of the two groups are different from each other. In order to understand the nature of this difference we have to examine the adjectives which have been picked up by majority of the students from the two groups. The words giving statistically significant
percentage difference in favour of the indisciplined group and picked up by more than 25% of indisciplined students are: Likable, Lenient, Talkative, Humorous, Smart. Disciplined students generally abstain from endorsing adjectives denoting social adjustment as the frequency of endorsement of these adjectives is not high enough to deserve consideration. This is a further indication of their introverted and withdrawn nature and points out that they are not well off from the social development point of view. Indisciplined students, on the other hand, have a sociable disposition and possess the knack and potential for cultivating healthy social contacts. They also describe themselves as polite, co-operative, friendly and social which are highly desirable traits from the point of view of social adjustment. On the other hand, though disciplined students describe themselves very often as social but at the same time they say that they are quiet which indicates that they are essentially aloof and are temperamentally not inclined to lead an active social life.

10.2.3.4 Character Dimension

Tables 8.21 and 8.22 (PP 197-90) giving scores of indisciplined and disciplined students respectively, on character dimension reveal that mean score of the two groups on this dimension is almost equal, i.e., 27.94 for the indisciplined and 27.38 for the disciplined group. In other words, both the groups on the average choose about 27-28 adjectives giving significant discrimination from Table 8.12 (PP 173-77) we find that almost all the adjectives which have
been preferred by 25% or more of the students come from the indisciplined group, as per Table 8.11 (PP 164-171) showing percentage frequencies. These adjectives are enthusiastic, forceful and bold, on the one hand, and noble, responsible, honest, broad minded, ambitious, optimistic, reasonable and steady, on the other. These adjectives bring out the zeal and tempo of indisciplined students and at the same time it points out that they are persons of sound character possessing many desirable traits. When we take into consideration those adjectives which give extremely high preference value, though not yielding statistically significant difference, (Table 8.12, P 184) we find that indisciplined students also show a marked preference for the following adjectives: Kind, Brave, Unselfish, Self-controlled, Confident, Fair minded, Human, Sincere, Disciplined, Careful, Obedient. Adjectives like self-controlled, sincere, disciplined and obedient are particularly noteworthy in view of the fact that indisciplined students are generally considered rash and defiant. Disciplined students also describe themselves as kind, unselfish, brave, fair minded, human, disciplined, and obedient. They share these characteristics with their counterpart. However, they describe themselves as serious and progressive more often than do the indisciplined students. The adjective 'serious' goes with the introverted nature of disciplined students. From the discussion given it is apparent that indisciplined students rate themselves very favourably on character dimension. This does not amount to saying that the disciplined students underrate themselves. This also suggests
that the reason for indisciplined behaviour need not be sought in the bad character traits of the indisciplined students as is generally thought. The indisciplined students, from the character point of view are as socially desirable as the disciplined students. They share many good qualities with their counterpart, though they appear to be lacking in vigour, energy and enthusiasm characteristic of indisciplined students.

10.2.3.5 Aesthetic Dimension

Mean scores of the two groups on this dimension, as given in Tables 8.23 and 8.24 (pp. 200-201) are almost equal, though the mean values are rather small. This should, however, be interpreted in view of the fact that there are only 10 adjectives under this dimension, consequently choice was also restricted. Figure 8.11 (P. 202) reveals a good deal of parallel between the two groups in the pattern of endorsing adjectives on this dimension. From the distributions of scores given in Table 8.23 and 8.24 (pp. 200-201) and from the shape of polygons in Fig. 8.11 (P. 202) hardly any differences are observable between disciplined and indisciplined students on aesthetic dimension of self. But differences appear on the breakdown of adjectives preferred by the two groups in terms of the content of these adjectives.

For example, indisciplined students show a high degree of preference for such adjectives in this dimension as graceful, attractive, delicate, and soft. These adjectives significantly discriminate between the self-concepts of indisciplined and disciplined students. They reveal that indisciplined students
attribute to themselves such qualities as convey personal charm which equip them favourably for effective social interaction.

Indiscliplined students' preference for the two adjectives 'delicate' and 'soft' is not easily understandable in view of the fact that they prefer equally strongly 'strong' and 'forceful' (other dimensions, mentioned here for comparison). This may, however, be understood in the light that the adjectives 'delicate' and 'soft' have an artistic appeal, and thereby the impression is gained that indiscliplined students have an artistic appeal. Disciplined students, on the other hand, refuse to entertain any adjectives conveying aesthetic appeal. The frequency with which they endorse adjectives under this dimension is not high enough so as to deserve consideration. It seems that they prefer to skip over these adjectives.

10.2.3.6 Neutral Dimension

Neutral dimension is the third dimension to yield statistically significant discrimination between disciplined and indiscliplined students in terms of mean difference in the scores of two groups. This dimension covers those adjectives left over from the other dimensions discussed earlier. As such, the adjectives placed in this dimension are general in nature without having any bearing towards a particular aspect of self. Indiscliplined students prefer the following three adjectives from this dimension significantly more often than disciplined students: Active, Clever, Strong. It has been discussed earlier under character dimension that indiscliplined students are enthusiastic and energetic. The adjectives 'active' and 'strong' can be
interpreted in the same strain as emphasizing further these qualities of indisciplined students. However, their preference for the word 'clever' possibly points to their skill in social relations. Disciplined students generally dissociate themselves from endorsing adjectives under this dimension.

10.2.4 Negative And Positive Aspects Of The Self-Concepts Of Disciplined And Indisciplined Students.

Table 8.29 (P.219) gives the mean negative score of selected group of indisciplined students as 19.08, while Table 8.30 (P.211) shows the mean negative score of disciplined students as 8.57. Difference between the mean negative scores of the two groups is statistically significant at .01 level (Table 8.33, P 216) meaning thereby that the performance of the two groups on negative - self scores is significantly different from each other. Mean negative score of the random group of indisciplined students is much higher than that of disciplined students i.e., 19.08 as compared to 8.57. This clearly indicates that indisciplined students on the average endorse much larger number of negative adjectives than do the disciplined students. The adjectives endorsed as self-descriptive significantly more often by at least 25% of the indisciplined students are as follows: Nervous, Hostile, Aggressive, Suggestible, and Talkative. The three first adjectives in this list are, no doubt, highly negatively toned and suggest that some of the indisciplined students do describe themselves as violent. They are nervous and gullible and are, therefore, an easy prey to
aggressive acts. But the fact that they have described themselves through these negative adjectives also point out that they are honest in their self assessment. In this connection a study conducted by Taylor and Combs (1962) may be cited in which these authors proved that the willingness to admit derogatory things about oneself is positively, not negatively, related to adjustment. The study also suggests that honesty about oneself, which may also be thought of as accuracy, may well be related to good adjustment. Study conducted by Chodorkoff (1954) also brings out that the men most accurate in self description recognised threatening words more quickly which is one aspect of good adjustment. Tendency of indisciplined students to endorse negative adjectives more often should be interpreted in the light of these studies. Disciplined students, on the other hand, describe themselves fairly highly through only two negative adjectives, i.e., shy and anxious. This points to their socially withdrawn nature which reflects unfavourably on their capacity to adjust well. Disciplined students generally dissociate from expressing themselves through negative adjectives as can be observed from their low mean score. May be that this is indicative of the inhibition of the disciplined group.

On positive self mean score of indisciplined students is 29.01 (Table 8.31, P313) and that of disciplined students 41.17 (Table 8.32, P314). This is particularly revealing when we compare these mean scores with the mean scores on negative self which were 19.08 and 8.57 for the indisciplined and disciplined groups respectively. This brings out the tendency
of both indisciplined and disciplined students to check more of positive than negative adjectives. Of particular interest in this regard is the sharp increase in the mean score of disciplined students on positive self in comparison to negative self. From the figures given it is clear that disciplined students endorse positive adjectives almost five times more than they check negative adjectives. This is not so in the case of indisciplined students in whose case the increase in mean positive self score is steady and not abrupt. The tendency of disciplined students to endorse a large number of positively toned adjectives and very small number of negatively toned adjectives can be interpreted as defensiveness on their part. In this connection it will be pertinent to refer to the study conducted by Chodorkoff (1954) which suggests that defensiveness is frequently defined as the tendency to blot out of one’s conscious mind, or deny, those things in the environment that are threatening. Disciplined students, by endorsing positively toned adjectives with far greater frequency and admitting negative adjectives to their self rather infrequently, give the impression that they are defensive and refuse to entertain negative adjectives in their self. Another possibility is that the acceptance of socially desirable characteristic is mere in the case of disciplined students. According to Chodorkoff (1954) this sort of defensiveness reflects badly on the accuracy of self-description.

Table 8.33 (P. 216) shows that the difference between the mean positive-self scores of disciplined and indisciplined
students is significant at .01 level. This lends further support to the contention that the pattern of endorsement of positively toned adjectives on the part of disciplined students is significantly different from that of indisciplined students. It also proves further that disciplined students check positive adjectives with far greater frequency than do the indisciplined students. The possibility of mean difference on positive self scores of the two groups having arisen by chance is ruled out.

The positive adjectives chosen significantly more often by indisciplined students to describe themselves are diverse and varied and cover all the areas of personal and social adjustment. In short, these adjectives speak of their personal charm and emotional and social well being. These adjectives also show that indisciplined students are energetic and bold, display a high sense of values and are forward looking. As such, positive qualities which they attribute to their self are far reaching and extend over a very wide range of behaviour. Positive words through which disciplined students express themselves convey a healthy emotional adjustment. These adjectives do not display energy and enthusiasm characteristic of indisciplined students. Nor do these adjectives express the capacity for an effective social interaction. In this sense positive adjectives endorsed by disciplined students are quite different from those endorsed by the indisciplined students. Nonetheless, disciplined students possess many desirable traits of character and they share with the indisciplined students such qualities as kindness, politeness, self-control, self-confidence, fair mindedness, sincerity,
tolerance etc. Table 8.13 (P.184) gives many such adjectives which, though not yielding statistically significant difference between the groups, have been preferred by a large majority of students from both the groups.

10.2.5 Comparison Of Disciplined And Indisciplined Students On Composite Self-Concept Scores

Composite self-concept score for a student was obtained by subtracting the number of negative adjectives endorsed by him from the number of positive adjectives endorsed. Distributions based on these scores have been presented in Tables 8.34 and 8.35 (PP.217-218). Self-concept has been studied in this manner by a number of authors. Studies of Lipsitt (1958), Mitchell (1959), Coopersmith (1959), Mussen and Porter (1959) can be cited in this connection. Table 8.36 (P.220) shows that the mean self-concept score of disciplined students is much higher than the corresponding mean score of indisciplined students and the difference between the two mean scores is statistically significant much beyond .01 level. Mean self-concept score of disciplined students is 31.91 and that of indisciplined students 10.06. The higher positive score of disciplined students can be attributed to the larger number of positive-self adjectives endorsed by them. This goes with the observation made earlier under section 10.2.4 where it was mentioned that disciplined students exhibit a tendency to endorse greater number of positive than negative adjectives. This was interpreted as defensiveness on the part of disciplined students in accordance with research findings in this direction. But when positive and
negative self scores are combined and a composite score is obtained it has to be interpreted in a different manner. Some research studies point out that there is a marked relationship between self-concept scores (positive-negative dimension) and self-ideal discrepancy scores. In his study Sharma (1967) proves that negative-self scores generally mean high self-ideal discrepancy, and vice versa. On this basis it is suggested that results obtained in self-ideal discrepancy studies can be obtained as clearly and simply by employing a measure of perceived self only, since "the amount of self-ideal discrepancy is a function more of positive-negative variation in the self-concept than of variation in the ideal self" (McCandless, 1962). Judged from this standpoint, disciplined students display an adequate self-concept accompanied by a feeling of satisfaction with self. In the light of studies conducted by Coopersmith (1959), Mitchell (1959) and others, a high self-concept score arrived at from positive-negative dimension of self indicates high self-regard or self esteem and is a pointer to better adjustment. Sharma (1967) has also suggested a linear relationship between self-score and adjustment as judged by the anxiety scale. Therefore it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that indisciplined students, because of their lower self-concept score, are more self-rejecting or disapproving of themselves. This observation, however, should be considered in view of the fact that most of the negative adjectives endorsed by indisciplined students yield low frequencies, as can be observed from Table 8.11 (PP 164-172). While combining the negative and positive scores we
cannot ignore the varying degrees of the social importance of negative adjectives as well as the frequency with which these negative adjectives have been preferred. It has been already mentioned under section 10.2.4 above that the capacity to admit negative words to the self is positively, not negatively, related to adjustment. Moreover the indisciplined students may not themselves be maladjusted. But on account of the fact that their social environments expect a certain socially desirable behaviour they might have accepted a low self-regard as they sometimes refuse to accept those standards as the disciplined students do.