

## MANAGEMENT ---- AND THE GUJARS' SOCIAL UNRESTS IN INDIA

Dr. M .A . Rahman Khan\*

### Abstracts:

Daniels (1972) established relevance of the equity theory of Adams (1965) in access to health care system. This was supported by Aday et.al. (1980) in their studies of access to health care systems in the USA. Further Walster et. al (1978) found equity theory useful in understanding intimate as well as various non-intimate/social relations. According to the theory, when a party or an individual involved in certain business/exchange or social interaction/transaction, is/are concerned that the terms of their relationships remain along the principles of justice, Just & fair. And that, a felt injustice is manifested by the concerned parties, in behaviour & satisfaction based on their overall 'comparative perceptions' of the process. Based along these assumptions, undergraduate students randomly selected from science and arts faculty of the Delhi University were studied .

Analyses reveal that at the initial stage of colleges the Arts-boys are perhaps more satisfied at the beginning of their college-days while the science-boys show more satisfaction at their higher levels of education, & in general girls show more academic satisfaction than boys in the said community. At the initial stage they seem to perceive that the justice exists with them in terms of academic-inputs/output-ratios they perceived. But as they move up to the higher levels of formal education, their this feeling appear to be fading however and they seem to be rather prone to perceive, that a little more justice is required for them in their comparative input-ratios perceptions for their money, time, efforts, etc, invested in it ----& quite a few percentage of them perhaps feel, that they are rather, 'under-benefited 'compared to their other partners, in terms of their educational-outputs in society, compared to the rest others' input/output ratios in academic affairs. The study explores some new& interesting socio-psychological aspects of social- comparisons in issues of distributive-justice in academics too, which can be extended to any other social condition, social management, movement, or unrest at large.

\* Deptt. Of Applied Sciences & Humanities, F/O Engineering & Technology, JMI, New Delhi :110025, INDIA.

**Key words:** social management, distributive-justice, social-comparison, comparing input/output-ratios, fair deal & satisfaction.

### **INTRODUCTION:**

After over the sixty years of independence most common question often being asked by our social scientists has been, as to has our socio-political system gone along the demands of said social or distributive-justice? Has it been by the norms and propositions of equity and justice? May be, the system has attempted hard for it, in terms of various special and protective socio-economic or political policies for the different marginalized groups (or sub-groups) of our society over the six decades. However, have the benefits of such special measures percolated down successfully to the actually cornered and marginalized people of India over the sixty years of independence? Have these measures been succeeded?-- if yes; there should not have been the cases of emergence of the new uprisings or social 'movements' in the society, like the ones in Haryana/Rajasthan or elsewhere, amongst the Gujar-communities and others, often being reported to be going 'aggressive' by every passing day. On the other, almost for the similar issue, the reveling-reports of the Govt.'s Sacher's committee(2007) about the educational and socio-economic structure and conditions at present,(after the over six decades of independence) of some specific and predominant social sub-group(s) of our society in population, is again an eye-opener at large, in addition to the said social uprisings. Given this, let us look at these from an equity angel and along the assumptions and theories of equity and distributive justice.

Like any other social unrest/or movement, the recent Gujars' social unrests too, reported in India in the recent years (2007 onwards), has shown loss of public properties, loss of several innocent & precious lives, through a large scale social violence, most often paralyzing public lives at so many times over the years. These incidences may be visualized through the perspective of socio-psychological theories of social comparisons of input/output ratios and distributive justice in rewards distributions. Equity theories focus on predominantly on the access of opportunities and rewards as the central point of concerns of the groups and individuals within a system of management of rewards' distributions along dimensions of the justice and equity. Adams'(1965) holds that the possibilities of rewards distribution in any system (for any social or personal exchange), is perceived through a comparison of 'ratios' of their relative inputs and outputs. And that there are three possibilities of perception (of rewards' distribution, to be perceived) by the

concerned individuals: (a) one being over benefitted, (b) one being under benefitted, and (c): rewards being given to him/them is equitable and just. The theory holds that perception of 'inequity' generates tension to 'equalize' the "ratios" of comparison. Validity and relevance of these assumptions and individuals' behavior have been reported & found by various other social psychologists too. For instance, Aday et.al. (1980), Daniels (1972), and Daniels (1982-e).

Daniels (1972) established relevance of the equity theory of Adams (1965) in access to health care system. Similar conclusions were arrived by Aday et.al. (1980) in their studies of access to health care systems in the USA. Further, in another study Daniels (1982-e) found the theory's interpretations pertinent to the health care opportunities and access. This keeping in the background, can the recent social movement in Haryana/ Rajasthan or elsewhere in India, by the Gujars' community in particular, being reported time and again be visualized and addressed through the social comparison theory of equity & distributive justice of Adams (1965)?

The theory holds that there are three possibilities of rewards distribution in a system in any matter of social or personal exchange or interaction, along an 'input/output-ratios-comparison' for the rewards the individuals get, as participants to the deal/s,--- (in the system). This comparison can take place at any level,--perceptual, physical, abstract, on a factual or only on the mental level within the people (the participants). Studies have reported the relevance of equity theory and these assumptions across the walks of human life and behavior in the various intimate and non-intimate social as well as personal relations, Adams(1965), Daniels(1972),Walster et.al.(1978),Hatefield et.al(1979), Daniels(1980-e),Daniels(1982),Khan(2007),and Khan(2008).

The effects of such comparisons (whether it is a real or merely a psychological); have shown significant impacts on human behavior, and has equal potentials to be operative on the individuals behavior, involved in the system. If so, the assumptions appear to be relevant even for a socio-political management point of view.

The problem of a fair deal or justice in access to several opportunities in fact, is much more pertinent to India in particular and to the third world countries in general, wherein despite the commitment to the democratic ideals and the universal opportunities inequalities and social deprivations of different kinds continue to exist in the social systems & sub-systems

( SACHER committee- reports on Muslim minority, Govt. of India ,2007, The ST/SCs present social conditions in the society, the recent Gujars' protests in Rajasthan & elsewhere in India\*\*

may be cited as for examples in India too,) . In the context of Educational opportunities in particular, Naik (1975 b) observes that a bulk of Indian children from poor families do not complete even the elementary education. The problem rather seems to be manifold.

Does the elementary education itself meet the demands of justice? Or does it ensure a just and fair access to all?---are some other relevant questions to be examined. Naik (1975a) has rightly pointed out that what is irony, that even the few who have access to a reasonable opportunity to education appear to differ qualitatively. In a social order & society like India wherein people live with several sub-group identities in a broader & a holistic social group; and India being the second country in the World having the maximum number of people on its land ---appears to need , to address the issues of people’s perceptions for demands of justice—as they perceive to be, with regard to their input/output-ratios in the social systems & sub-systems. A question to this effect, therefore, is as to how far does the system meet the demands of distributive justice---confronting the day today life of the people at large? Philosophers and social scientists both seem to agree that social comparison processes are indelibly linked with perceptions of “fairness”, “justice,” or “equity”,(e g:Frankena,1962; Boulding,1962;).

The basic thesis of the social scientists in equity theory has been that the perception of inequity produces a negative emotional state in both victims (anger) and harm doers (guilt),which, in turn, motivates them to restore equity to their relationship. It is hardly surprising that victims should want to restore equity by making their “exploiters” pay for their “crimes.” According to Adams(1965) ,comparison is not restricted to attitudes and abilities but also includes an individual’s ‘inputs’(efforts, qualifications, etc.) and “outcomes”(pay, rewards, gains, etc.). Specifically the theory holds that two (or more) individuals compare the ratios of their inputs and outcomes (the output-ratios), from a similar situation to determine whether they have been treated “fairly”, or justly. Inequity results when these ratios are perceived as unequal:

$$\frac{\text{Outcome A}}{\text{Input A}} \neq \frac{\text{Outcome B}}{\text{Input B}}$$

Adams holds that perception of inequity generates tensions, which promotes either behaviour change to equalize the ratios or a Scission of comparison. According to equity theory, a relationship is equitable when the ratio of a person's outcomes to (his) inputs is equal to the corresponding input/output-ratio of other persons who is/are chosen as a basis for comparison. 'Inputs' are defined as those contributions a person makes to a relationship, for which he anticipates a "Fair" return. A participant's 'Inputs' can either be assets (which entitle him to rewards) or liabilities (which warrant punishment). "Outcomes" are the net reward (value) a person derives from a relationship. An individual's "outcomes" are thus the sum total of the rewards he/she obtains from the relationship/ deal, or exchange, minus the cost he/she incurs. Adams (1965) presented this conceptual definition of an equitable relationship between the two "Actors" as under:

$$\frac{\text{Outcomes of Person A}}{\text{Inputs of Person B}} = \frac{\text{Outcomes of Person B}}{\text{Inputs of Person B}}$$

Though Adams's this formula has been criticized on certain "psychological grounds" that he ignored some negative psychological aspects in this equation but still, however, researchers continue to use the Adams, formula because of its heuristic applied value.

### THE SOCIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE BEHIND:

Since there exist some financial, geographical, or socio-cultural barriers in almost every system /society preventing people from utilizing certain services or opportunities (the outcome or output),---the question of 'protections' or 'positive-discriminations' therefore, come up---in order to meet the demands of Social Justice in the "outcomes". Relevant to this context, Daniels(1981 e) reports that people in sub-group identities are differently at risk, to possess resentment for their inequitable "perceptions" of living conditions. And that, in such a situation the 'opportunity' requires both equity of access and also equity in distribution/ mechanisms. Daniels (1980 e) conforming to Walster et.al.(1978) holds that the people perceiving themselves "under-benefited " are resentful and the equitable treatment / deal or relationship is the most & the only viable relationship in the society or system. In another study Daniels (1982) asserts that



whatever we need or want we need a normal functioning----and it is a necessary condition for happiness in Life & society.

The situations of apparent injustice (unfairness) occurs when the party to the business /exchange or involvement for a return believes, that he or she is receiving a return (an outcome) disproportionate to the relative reward/investment(or input) ratio of others involved in the same trade or business . And that, a manifest dissatisfaction or similar other behaviour(s) are responses to actually 'Felt' injustice, rather than directly or relative deprivation. The theory has been found useful in understanding stable, intimate as well as non intimate relationships in particular (Berscheid et. al. 1973, Walster et. al 1978, Adey and Andersen 1980, Daniels 1982, & Radford and Larwood,1982).

The differential perceptions of distribution of rewards or outcomes (whether it is just a perceptual or a real) lead to different types of behaviour and psychology amongst the participants.(Walster et. al. 1978, and Hatefield et. al 1979). Assumptions of the equity theory assert that when individuals are involved in certain deal or business there are three possibilities of reward distribution (in that involvement) as under:

- 1: one may get more benefits in ratio to his/her (or their) input in the deal.
- 2: One may get far less than he/she (they) may have invested in .
- 3: The one(s) who get equitable , fair, or just rewards in proportion to his/her, their investment made to the involvement

These differential perceptions of distribution of rewards or benefits (whether it is just a perceptual or a real one) lead to different types of behaviour and psychology amongst the participants.(Walster et. al. 1978, and Hatefield et. al 1979).

The one(s) who get more than they actually deserve would feel uneasy, guilt and be less contented and happy compared to others (Hatefield et.al. 1979) ; and the people who get far less than they actually deserve in ratio to their in-puts in the process/exchange , social-exchange or dealings will feel depressed , resentful and be relatively less contented and happy (Walster et. al.1978). Relevant to the context , the socio- economic or educational deprivation of some social sub-groups in India , such as high-caste, low-caste, or the minorities as pointed out by the Sacher-Committee-reports,2007,(Govt. of India) ; may be mentioned as for examples, for highlighting

several socio- economic deprivations of such people , against their participations and inputs either in the freedom - struggles, or Nation- building or the work-force; in fabrics of the nation, it becomes relevant therefore, to address such issues. Addressing these issues against the framework and propositions of justice /equity theory may provide a better picture of the Indian social & political psychology and youths' Psyche at large,---which appear to be obviously different, for different social sub-groups in India (e.g. high-caste/low-caste, minority,/majority; St/Scs, OBCs, or Gujars/Meenas etc. etc.).

If the rationales of equity theorists are taken to be pertinent to the Indian context specially for the socially under privileged like ST/SC; minorities or other socially disadvantaged groups (of India); it may explain the people's group-behaviours or demands/special demand for the given issue(s),say---education; job-reservations, or protective policies at large. It may provide new insights into some critical problems of the protest-techniques, demand(s)–mechanisms or other similar social behaviour of these groups (often at loggerheads), for the distributive justice system in our society.

### **THE OVERVIEW:**

The above social scientists in particular, have stressed that these issues of perceived justice--- (whether it is a real or just a Psychological) as problems and issues of perceived fairness& justice in different social orders . They hold that , individuals in non equitable relations differ in interests, kind of relationships ,and along contentment, happiness, guilt or resentments. Which are often manifested in their different kinds of individual as well as social behaviours. It is thus evident that the equity assumptions have been found to be relevant in social relations ---as it helps in understanding people's individual/social and group-behaviour in a given social context. Given this, attempt was made in the present study to focus the students' levels of perceived justice and satisfaction in a given educational set up & context. Is education perceived rewarding differently by them? placed in a given educational system & context ? ---particularly in relations to the factors like: the gender, levels of formal education, and the kind of discipline (or the subjects) they study ? Educational policies in India confront a series of questions viz: --does it meet the social needs and the expectations of the Indian youths? Why the gap in participation is so wide between rich and poor? –between males and females? It is theoretically relevant to verify ,

whether variations in perceived justice results in differential perceptions ; performance, satisfaction and participation in education? Are these concerns and questions pertinent today to the students in the present Indian social context? Though it is logical to expect that the variations in perceived justice levels are likely to breed variations in students' satisfaction level and academic behaviour ,participation or performance, there has been little researches addressing these issues,---hence the present study. It may provide with a broader spectrum to understand students' satisfaction, performance or academic participation at large, in a country like ours.

In the practical utility too, a study of this kind may provide with some insight also into the problems of students drop-outs, their continued and further learning-endeavors, involvements as well as some new parameters of their performance and satisfaction. These are likely to be more meaningful against the background of felt injustice/deprivation or disparities at the Psychological or actual level. It may provide an answer in the applied fields of employments or in the job markets as well as to the several sub-groups of society. Based on the above , focus of the present study was to ascertain if perceived justice was significant for students' performance and satisfaction? How does the group students' group feel about it? (the distributive justice with them),---at different levels of formal education and choice of the discipline or subjects they study?. Does the gender difference matter to these? Do they perceive themselves "under-benefited", 'equitably-rewarded', or 'over-benefited' in the present social order of education and distributive-justice-system?---if yes, they are likely to be ; according to the equity theory assumptions, differently resentful, contended and differently happy (e.g.: Walster et. al 1978).

### **OBJECTIVES:**

Basic objectives of the present study were to determine the extent of variations along academic profiles of the groups of students by gender (male/female); curriculum (science/arts); in the different of grades of formal education (1<sup>st</sup>.yer& the final year); ---and particularly to find out their percentage distributions among the three categories: perceiving (themselves) as "under-benefited", equitably rewarded, or 'over benefitted' in the ongoing educational system in the Indian social-context. Also, comparative satisfaction-levels of these comparative groups were studied predominantly amongst the Gujars community as students in Delhi.



**METHODOLOGY:**

A total of 200 under-graduate students, both boys and girls, 107 and 97 respectively, of 1<sup>st</sup>. year & the final year, particularly from the Gujars' community, were selected as sample of the study, at two stages from the science and arts faculty of the Delhi-university-colleges &(they)were finally selected randomly at the second stage,---by a 2 x2 x 2 factorial design, along the 'gender' 'faculty' & 'formal grade' of education level at two stages each.

In the first stage of sampling, Delhi University colleges having provisions of teaching Science and Arts; co-educational in nature, comparable in type and size, (in terms of enrolments), sex-ratios and nature of management etc. were identified from the "University Hand Book India" (1983-84).Colleges selected were by and large, similar in nature and directly controlled by the University of Delhi. Night shift or Trust-managed colleges were not selected. The colleges included in the final selection, (at the 2<sup>nd</sup> stage of sampling) were: S S Nand college from east Delhi, Hansraj college from North Delhi, Venkateswara college from south, and Shivaji college from west Delhi. Only the general category of students, (leaving St/Scs, minorities, OBCs, & other weaker-sections aside), were selected.

**SAMPLE DESIGN:**

	1 <sup>st</sup> . yr		Final yr.	
	Boys:	Girls:	Boys:	Girls:
Science:	21	22	41	30
Arts:	21	21	20	24
Total :	N= 200			

**TOOLS AND DATA:**

A questionnaire developed for this purpose was used as main technique for the data with its odd-even items reliability test ( $r = .84$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Validity of this (perceived-justice-scale) was determined by 'independent criterion method' and Robin and Peplau's (1975) 'Belief in Just world' scale was used for this purpose, and coefficient of correlation between these two scales on ( $N=43$ ), were found to be statistically significant & positive ( $r = .45$ ,  $p > .01$ ).

Further the construct validity of this (new) scale was determined by factor analysis, using the principal component method,—with an orthogonal rotation. The items having a loading of at least .30 and above only, were retained as to be valid and meaningful in the factor structure. The five emerged factors in the ‘perceived-justice-scale’ explained above sixty-one percent of the total variance.

Perceived justice was operationalized & focused in terms of their future prospects ; opportunities; results they have; and the job-chances ahead for them in view of their overall inputs in education,—as compared to their accompanying fellows ----specially for their economic well being as well as for the needs of the Indian society as they perceived it to be ; with regard to the present socio-economic health of the country in their perceptions.

#### **PROCEDURE AND THE METHOD:**

The minimum possible score on perceived-justice-scale was 30; and a maximum of 150,—as it had a set of 30-items to be rated on a five point continuum. And the score ranges were broken into three almost equal parts, with a gap of about a 40-score-range in each, as explained below, in order to mark the respondents into the three category of justice-perceivers as per the definitions of ‘three’ categorizations of Equity-theorists via: persons perceiving ‘over-benefited’, ‘equitably/fairly rewarded’, and ‘under-benefited’.

This was done on the basis of the total scores obtained by the respondents as under:

Scorers between the range of: 30 to 70, i.e.  $30 + 40 = 70$ , (that is, scorers up to 70,) were marked as persons perceiving themselves as : ‘under-benefited’; and scorers between the range of: 71 to 117 (i.e.  $71 + 40 = 117$ ), were considered as perceiving themselves as ‘fairly treated’; and those who scored in the top strata of the score-range, i.e. within the score range of 112 to 150, were marked as to be perceiving themselves as being : ‘over-benefited’. This was computed to mark the sample sub-groups into the three categories of justice perceivers as mentioned above, along the Adam’s (1965) conceptualization. In the present study, however, satisfaction-levels of the ‘under-benefited’, ‘over-benefited’, & ‘equitably-rewarded’ perceivers/groups (students) have been focused in particular. Deepak’s (1980) academic satisfaction scale was used to study students’ satisfaction level.

## ANALYSES, RESULTS/ IMPLICATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS:

Table no:-1:

Percentage distribution of sample sub-groups perceiving: 'under-benefited' & their rankings in the Sample sub-groups:

Names of the sample Sub-groups:	Percentage distribution of students perceiving themselves "under-benefited":	Rankings of the sample-sub-groups
1 <sup>st</sup> .yr. Boys, Science:	11 . 11	3 <sup>rd</sup> .
1 <sup>st</sup> .yr.Girls, Science:	5. 21	7 <sup>th</sup> .
1 <sup>st</sup> .yr. Boys, Arts:	00	8 <sup>th</sup>
1 <sup>st</sup> .yr. Girls, Arts:	9 . 52	5 <sup>th</sup>
Final year Boys, science:	7 . 31	6 <sup>th</sup>
Final year Girls, science :	10 . 00	4 <sup>th</sup>
Final year Boys, Arts:	15 . 00	1 <sup>st</sup> .
Final year Girls, Arts:	12 . 00	2 <sup>nd</sup> .

Results in the above table show that the percentage distribution of the students and their rankings in the sample sub-groups perceiving themselves as 'under- benefited' is found to be mixed & different. As is indicated from the above table (no: 1) that the final year Arts' students (boys) feeling under-benefited are at the top in ranking-order followed by Girls of the same final year-arts-group for their relative input/output-ratios in academics. Similarly, the boys in the 1<sup>st</sup>.yr. Science-group, and girls of the final year in science faculty are in the third & fourth rank respectively, and are perhaps perceiving themselves as 'under-benefited' in terms of their input/output-ratios' comparisons in education, for an overall justice,---in terms of the out-put factors like: job chances, opportunities, images, recognition, prestige and future prospects etc. It may be noted, however, that the present study focused the general category of students only. A

study of students from the minorities' groups like: Dalits, St/Scs, OBCs, or other similar under-privileged sections of the Indian society may reflect altogether quite a different picture however, for the justice they perceive, and may have in academics---or in society at large for their inputs like: costs, parental supports, time & money spent, and their overall inputs in education.

Studies have reported Khan (2003), that the good performers in academics happen to be good not only in perceived-justice rather, he/she/they have a good academic satisfaction too, in terms of overall environment and academic conditions, learning-skills, academic knowledge/results etc. etc.\*

(TABLE No: 2):

**Levels of satisfaction in the three categories of justice-perceivers:** (viz: the "over-benefited", the "under-benefited"& the "equitably-rewarded" groups):

Sub-groups' name:	Mean Score	SD.	t-ratio
Over-benefited:	162.78	34.46	5.20**
Equitably-rewarded:	143.33	35.62	
Over-benefited:	162.78	34.46	3.71**
Under-benefited:	114.59	49.15	
Equitably-rewarded:	134.33	35.02	1.45
Under-benefited:	114.59	49.15	

**Note:** \*= significant at .05 level.; \*\*=significant at .01 level.

Results in the above table-2, indicate that the group who perceived themselves as ‘over-benefited’ and the ones who perceived themselves as ‘Equitably-rewarded’ differed from each other on satisfaction-level significantly; wherein students perceiving themselves as over-benefited showed remarkably a higher level of academic satisfaction as compared to their ‘equitably-rewarded’ counterpart. Similarly, the students who perceived themselves as ‘under-benefited’ differed significantly, (showing lesser amount of academic satisfaction) from the ‘over-benefited-’group. Contrary to the above, however, students’ perception of the facts, that they are ‘equitably-rewarded’ or ‘under-benefited’ in academics, does not seem to have an effect on satisfaction-level of students at the colleges. This suggests that, whether students are with the concept or idea of ‘over-benefited’ or ‘under-benefited’ from the educational input/outputs does not matter significantly to their satisfaction-level in education,---unless they have a feeling about others’ being ‘over-benefited’ or ‘under-benefited’ in it (education).

**Table No: 3:**  
**Grade wise comparison on academic satisfaction:**

Sub-groups' name:	Mean score:	SD	t-ratio:
1 <sup>st</sup> .yr. Boys, Arts:	151.82	30.98	t = 0.28
Final yr. Boys, Arts:	148.4	31.05	
1 <sup>st</sup> .yr. Girls, Arts:	165.00	36.19	t= 2.25*
Final yr. Girls, Arts:	138.12	42.35	
1 <sup>st</sup> .yr. Boys, Science:	122.39	43.37	t = 1.69***
Final yr. Boys, Science:	141.95	30.35	
1syr.Girls, Science:	151.26	46.34	



t = 1.31

Final yr. Girls, Science: 1333.9 48.18

Note: \*\*\*= significant at .10 level.

**Table No: 4:**  
**Subject wise comparison on Academic Satisfaction :**

Sub-groups' name; Mean score: SD: t-ratio:

1 <sup>st</sup> .yre.Boys,Arts:	151.82	30.98	
1 <sup>st</sup> .yr. Boys, Science:	122.39	47.37	t= 2.05*
1 <sup>st</sup> .yr. Girls Science:	152.26	46.34	
1 <sup>st</sup> . yr. Girls, Arts:	165.00	36.19	t= 0.94
Final yr, Girls, Science:	133.9	48.18	
Final yr. Girls, Arts:	138.13	42.25	t= 0.34

Note: \*= Significant at .05 level.

The above table nos. 3 &4 present the comparative picture of their satisfaction levels along the formal educational grades, and by the differences of the subjects they have been studying. The results have been supportive to the results in above two tables,--- table no.1 &2.

Thus the assumptions of equity-theory that the groups with a perception of 'equitably-rewarded' in a deal (or social exchange) show a better & the highest satisfaction (in the Deal) ---though get a partial support in the present investigation, this maybe because of the fact, that the gain in the 'educational' deal (along input/output comparisons) is neither an immediate one, nor in a tangible concrete shape or forms ---as it happens to be in the other forms of social exchange processes, (trades or input/output deals). Instead, it has a long term perspective & often futuristic in nature; -

- contrary to the outcomes of other forms of social exchanges in society—perhaps. Thus the findings may have some relevance & implications for the socio-political managers as well, apart from its relevance and implications for the pedagogues in educational policy and plannings.

---

---

## CONCLUSIONS:

In view of the said rationale of the equity theorists, the present social unrest by the Gujars' community which is often being reported, need to be addressed through the equity angel too.

The issue may require a serious attention of the social scientists or the 'socio-political managers' at large for a stable and a peaceful solution of such an issue in India. Given the arguments by the equity theorists, (e.g. Adams 1965, Aday and Andersen 1980, Radford & Larwood 1982,) the present findings may imply that, subjects of the present study too, perceiving themselves as 'under-benefited' in their 'input/output-ratios' comparisons in rewards distributions may become prone to be resentful, unhappy, aggressive or even depressed, or less contended; by the present modes of distributive-justice & system and the management (in their opinion,) which makes them feel 'under-benefited' or deprived in the present social order & conditions in society they are in. Which may in turn, for its prolonged perpetuation, is likely to get accentuated, resulting in for a differential, compensatory or may be, even for a retaliatory violent behaviour; possibly, (maybe; by a violent mode too, either by damaging property or sabotage of the public properties,) with an intention to seek (and establish) 'justice for a fair deal' in the present social order & (the social) conditions---(either by force, or by a violent measure & technique). A managerial introspection from this angel too, may be a relevant attempt by the 'management' to address the issue in a right perspective. Findings of the present study as such, may have some practical as well as theoretical implications too,--for the policies and practices in the said socio-psychological and the 'managerial' condition.

---

---

**References:**

- 1: Adams, J S. Inequity in social exchange, (1965), in Berkowitz, L.(ed.) Advances in experimental social psychology: vol.2 .Academic press New York.
- 2:Aday,L.A. & Andersen,R. and Flaming G.C.(1980) : Health care in the USA: Equity for whom? Beverly Hills, Sage.
- 3: Bercheid,E. Walster. E. and Bohrnsted, G (1973): The Body Image Report, Psychology Today, pp:119-131.
- 4: Boulding,K. Social Justice (1962), in dynamics. In R . Brandt (Ed.),Social Justice. Englewood Cliffs, N. J. Prentice-Hall.
- 4:Daniels, N.(1981 e), What is the obligation of Medical Profession In the Distribution of Health Care? .Social Science and Medicine; Cited in : Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly ~Health and Society, 1982, vol. 60, no. 1, pp: 55-81. (p:17).
- 5 :Daniels. L: Equity of Access to Health Care (1982): Some Conceptual & Ethical Issues, Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, Health and society, vol. 60, No: 1, pp:51-81.
- 6:Deepak,A.(1980): Factors of content, context, and person in academic satisfaction & students performance. A study in Bombay College, Doctoral Thesis ,School of Social Sciences, Jawahar Lal Nehru University, New Delhi.
- 6:Frankena,W.K.(1962) The concept of social justice. InR>B>Brandt (Ed.).Social Justice.Englewood Cliffs,N J.: Prentice-Hall.
- 7: Hatefield .E; J. Traupmann and W. Walster (1979); Equity and Extramarital Sex ;pp: 309-321,in M .cook & G Wilson (Ed.), Love and Attraction: An International conference, Oxford, Premegon.
- 8:Khan, Aatur Rahman (2003); Students Performance Perceived Justice and Satisfaction Academic & non Academic Factors; Third Concept, An International Journal. of Ideas, pp: 49-52, Jan.
- 9:Khan. A. R.(2007),Managing Academic input/output “Ratios”and the Students’ satisfaction. Mangalmay **Journal of Management and Technology**; Vol. I, No. 3, july-Dec.,pp:26—38.

10: Khan. A. R.(2008), “Academic Performance and Perceived Justice amongst the college students”, Journal of Objective Studies, Vol.:19 & 20; No: 1 & 2; (2007)/ No:1& 2 (2008), Pp: 183—196.

11: Naik ,J. P .(1975,a,)-Equality Quality and Quantity; New Delhi, allied Publishers.

12:Naik. J.P.(1975,b.)Policy and Performance in Indian Education; 1947-74, New Delhi , Orient Longman.

13:Radford. M.L.and Larwood ,L (1982)---A field study of Conflict in Psychological Exchange, The California Tax Payers' Revolt; JL.of Applied Psychology,12, 1, pp:60 -69.

14: Sacher-Committee on Muslim Minorities, Govt. of India 2007.

15:Robin, Z. and Peplau,L.A; Who believes in a just World? (1975), Journal of Social issues, vol: 3 1 (3), pp:65-89.

14: University Hand Book India, 1983-84; Association of Indian Universities, Deen Dayal Upadheya Marg; New Delhi 110002.

17: Walster.. E; E.Berschied and G. W. Walster (1973); New Directions in Equity Research . ' JL. of Personallty & Social. Psychology, vol: 25, pp:151~176.

18: Walster. E; G. W. Walster And J. Traupmann: Equity and Premarital Sex.(1978), JL. Of Personality and Social Psychology, vol:3 6 (1), pp:82—98