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REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Different educationists, psychologists and philosophers defined 'Ethnocentrism' in different ways. Different meanings were also given. With the varied meanings and interpretations the following studies were taken up for the purpose of review. A number of theoretical and practical studies were carried out on ethnocentrism and its related issues by different psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists and educationists. The following related studies were identified and reviewed with a fervent effort to maintain the true spirit of review of related literature.

In the article entitled 'Ethnocentrism' in his book, "Folkways" W. Graham Sumner (1906) presented:

i) A definition of ethnocentrism, first of its kind;

ii) A depiction of the nature of ethnocentric behaviour of a group towards the ingroup and outgroups;

iii) A depiction of ethnocentric behaviour of a group vis-à-vis folkways of the ingroup and outgroups;

iv) A depiction of other concomitant ethnocentric behaviours like ascription of derisive epithets to outgroups as well as exaggeration and intensification of folkways for strengthening it;

v) A remarkable illustrations of ethnocentrism; and

vi) An advocacy of ethnocentrism to be one of the strongest elements of patriotism and falsity of ethnocentric judgment – "we are good and others are bad"

In an article entitled ‘Ethnocentrism’ in Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences\(^2\) edited by C.R.A. Seligman, the credit of developing the term ‘Ethnocentrism’ was given to W.G. Sumner by G.P. Murdock (1931) and the same was defined with the help of the definition given by Sumner. Emotional state and innate basis of ethnocentrism were also not neglected to express when he advocated the emergence of ethnocentrism as a cultural factor.

Solidification of folkways to be adequate in satisfying needs for group existence, security, loyalty, cohesion, discipline, and morale; adherence to folkways as a natural and a prosperity policy for the group; and deviation as an unnatural, painful or disastrous and wrong deed; ingroup superiority attitude and outgroup inferiority attitude or positive trait attribution to ingroup and negative to outgroups; nationalism, patriotism, chauvinism, religious intolerance and race prejudice as diverse and developed forms of ethnocentrism; fluctuation of ethnocentrism with degree of contact and cultural divergence of groups; ethnocentrism not only on racial differences but on cultural differences; universality of ethnocentrism; prevalence of ethnocentrism as well as measures for mitigation are different aspects discussed in the article.

Daniel J. Levinson (1949) in his paper entitled 'An Approach to the Theory and Measurement of Ethnocentric Ideology' in the Journal of Psychology, the construction of California E-Scale was made public in March 1949. It was a research carried out jointly by the University of California Public Opinion Study and the Institute of Social Research which had been outlined in a two-day conference conducted by the American Jewish Committee in May 1944. In a sense it was the conference where the first scientific study of ethnocentrism was conceived and which produced the work of Levinson as an embryo which attained the present full-grown form.

---

The most remarkable thing of his work was that of the construction of an Ethnocentrism scale popularly known as California E Scale. As done by the researchers Levinson also did a theoretical framework of ethnocentrism which was attempted to measure by the scale. His theoretical description and explanation of ethnocentrism was also not the least important rather it was at par with that of Sumner and Murdock.

On the basis of his theoretical framework and data collected tentative conclusions and hypotheses were made regarding the structure, construct, and dynamic sources of ethnocentric ideology. Certain of its characteristics – particularly its generality, its inherent contradictions and destructiveness, and the psychological aspects of its content like moral stereotypy, authoritarianism, fear of moral contamination, cynicism, concern with power-weakness, etcetera pointed to deeper lying personality traits which helped to organize and stabilize one’s social views. Data from other phases of the total research programme gave a substantial support to these hypotheses.

Milton Rokeach (1948) in his paper entitled ‘Generalized mental rigidity as a factor in ethnocentrism’⁴ reported his attempt to investigate differences in thinking between individuals scoring high and low in ethnocentrism. The main hypothesis was that rigidity inherent in the ethnocentric person’s solution of social

problems was not an isolated phenomenon but was rather an aspect of a general rigidity factor which would manifest itself in solving any problem, social or non-social in nature. A second hypothesis was that the mode of thought of ethnocentric person in solving problems was more concrete than that of the non-ethnocentric person, whereas the mode of thought of the non-ethnocentric person was more abstract in nature.

Ethnocentric and low-ethnocentric adults and children were selected as subjects with the help of California E Scale. Rigidity of the subjects was determined with the help of a series of experiments with an arithmetical technique. The problems solvable by only one complicated method on the one hand and problems solvable both by a complicated and by a simple method on the other were given successively. The main hypothesis was confirmed by the results obtained within each experiment and in repeated independent experiments with adults and children. The data for the measure of concreteness of thinking also clearly indicated that those high in ethnocentrism were more concrete in their mode of thought than were those low in ethnocentrism. Thus the second hypothesis was also confirmed.

T.W. Adorno et al's researches carried out under the guidance and support of Department of Scientific Research, American Jewish Committee were reported in the 990 paged
volume of the Authoritarian Personality published first in 1950. It was a book accredited to be the first treatise on the scientific studies of ethnocentrism and other related concepts. It also could be called the bible of studies on Ethnocentrism. The researches reported in the book were based upon a combination of research techniques and they had either a direct or indirect bearing on the present research. The bulk of this volume was concerned not with individuals as such but with variables and their relationship. They demonstrated that there was a close correlation between a number of deep-rooted personality traits, and overt prejudice. The most remarkable thing in the book which had a direct bearing on the present research was the work on the construction of the Ethnocentrism Scale which was treated separately.

R. Nevitt Sandford (1950) in his paper on “The Contrasting Ideologies of Two College Men: A Preliminary View” reported in the 2nd Chapter; and also Daniel J. Levinson’s two works – “The Study of Anti-Semitic Ideology” and “The Study of Ethnocentric Ideology” reported in the 3rd and 4th chapters published in the ‘Authoritarian Personality’ dealt with nature and characteristic of ethnocentric ideology. Three other works reported in the book had a direct bearing on the present study.

---

Again R.N. Sandford (1950) as reported in his research on ‘Ethnocentrism in relation to some religious attitudes and practices’ attempted to ascertain the relation between religious attitudes and practices on the one hand and ethnocentrism on the other by employing E scale and Anti-Semitic Scale with supplementary religious items as one of the areas of research conceived in May 1944 in a two-day conference organised by the American Jewish Committee.

He discovered that subjects who professed to some religious affiliation expressed more prejudice than those who did not. Subject’s frequency of church attendance was not also particularly revealing. However, those who never admitted church obtained lower E scores than those who attended. It was also concluded that people who rejected organised religion were less prejudiced than those who accepted it.

In his study it also appeared that ethnocentrism tends to be more pronounced in subjects whose parents presented a unified religious front than in cases where the religious influence from the parents was inconsistent, partial, or nonexistent. Interestingly there was an indication that agreement between the subject and his or her mother in the matter of religion tends to be associated with ethnocentrism, disagreement with its opposite. From these results it was inferred that acceptance of religion mainly as an expression of

---

submission to a clear pattern of parental authority was a condition favourable to ethnocentrism. In general it appeared that gross, objective factors – denomination and frequency of church attendance – were less significant for prejudice than were certain psychological trends reflected in the way the subject accepted or rejected religion and in the content of his religious ideology.

Daniel J. Levinson (1950) in his study – "Politico-Economic Ideology and group Memberships In Relation to Ethnocentrism" attempted to answer the question on the patterns of politico-economic ideology and its relevancy to ethnocentric and anti-ethnocentric "group – relations". However, the focus on the study was on the prevalent American politico-economic conservatism and liberalism vis-à-vis ethnocentrism and anti-ethnocentrism.

In the attempt to measure politico-economic ideology along a liberalism-conservatism dimension an opinion-attitude scale known as Politico-Economic Conservatism Scale was constructed. Extreme conservatives and extreme liberals were distinguished with the help of the scale i.e., high scores and low scores on the scale were categorised as extreme conservatives and extreme liberals respectively. Data pertaining to individuals’ relationship with and membership in various political and economic groupings were also taken. Ethnocentrism scale was also employed. The

---

8 Levinson, D.J: Politico-Economic ideology and group relationships in relates to ethnocentrism. Ibid pp 151 – 207.
result of the study showed appearance of an affinity between conservatism and ethnocentrism, liberalism and anti-ethnocentrism.

Daniel J. Levinson (1950) as reported in his paper “Ethnocentrism in relation to Intelligence and Education” attempted to investigate the relationship between ethnocentrism on the one hand and intelligence and education on the other. The analysis of ethnocentric ideology suggested that ethnocentrism was related to stereotypy, rigidity, concreteness in thinking, narrowness of the ego bounds, and affinity in grasping psychosocial explanation of social phenomena. In his study it was thus hypothesized that there was a relatively low but consistent negative correlation between ethnocentrism and intelligence.

It was generally agreed that values education aspired for were opposites of the contents of ethnocentric ideology. It was, therefore, hypothesized that relation between ethnocentrism and education was also likely to be negative. Scores of Intelligence Tests, already administered to four groups of subjects to whom his E Scale questionnaire was also administered, were used for comparison, corroboration, and hypotheses testing. The results indicated that ethnocentrism seemed to have had a low but statistically significant relation to both intelligence and education, the most educated and intelligent subjects being, on the average, the least ethnocentric. However, conscious of limitations of his

---

study, he suggested to take extended sampling and control of the operation of the other variables in similar studies for high quality results.

Patricia O’Connor (1952) in her study “Ethnocentrism, ‘Intolerance of Ambiguity’ and Abstract Reasoning Ability” tested five hypotheses – i) Ethnocentrism is positively related to ‘intolerance of ambiguity’; ii) Ethnocentrism is related to a poor ability to reason abstractly; iii) ‘Intolerance of ambiguity’ is related to a poor ability to reason abstractly; iv) Ethnocentrism is related to a tendency to be less successful in dealing with cognitive tasks that require an abstract orientation than with tasks requiring a more concrete orientation; and v) “Intolerance of ambiguity” is related to a tendency to be less successful in dealing with cognitive tasks that require an abstract orientation than with tasks requiring a more concrete orientation.

Her study accepted the first hypothesis because scores on California E Scale and scores on the measure of ‘intolerance of ambiguity’ show a positive correlation that was statistically significant ( r=.55; p< .05). t test indicated that Ss above the median in ethnocentrism were more ‘intolerant of ambiguity’ than those below the median (t=4.00; p<.05). The second hypothesis was also confirmed because the data showed a significant relationship between ethnocentrism and a poor ability to reason.

---

abstractly. While the third hypothesis was rejected as there was no indication from the data that 'intolerance of ambiguity' apart from ethnocentrism was associated with a poor ability to reason abstractly. According to the finding of her study the fourth and fifth hypotheses were rejected. But she herself considered the rejections of the hypotheses tentative as the results were too vague to allow definite conclusions.

E. Terry Prothro (1952) attempted to discover whether the strong anti-Negro feeling in the Deep South (in the Louisiana state of the USA) was attributable to the prevalence of generally anti-democratic, ethnocentric persons in that area in his work — Ethnocentrism and anti-Negro attitudes in the Deep South\textsuperscript{11}.

He employed already standardized scales. Questionnaires were administered to three hundred and eighty middle class Louisiana adults to measure attitude towards Negroes, attitudes towards Jews, and acceptance or rejection of fifteen specified ethnic and national groups. The relationship between attitudes toward the Negro on one hand and attitude toward Jews and other groups on the other, when plotted on a scatter diagram, was found to be 'triangular' in nature. That is, those persons who were favourable toward the Negro were generally favourable toward other groups, and those persons who had unfavourable attitudes toward Jews and other ethnic groups were generally anti-Negro. At

the same time, however, a large proportion of the sample subjects were low on general ethnocentrism but definitely anti-Negro. It was noted that the triangular relationship accounted for, and rendered of dubious value, the low product-movement correlations found in Southern populations between attitudes toward the Negro and attitudes toward other groups.

Donald T. Campbell and Boyd R. Mc. Candless (1951) as reported in his article "Ethnocentrism, Xenophobia and Personality" conducted a research to ascertain the relationship among three variables – Ethnocentrism, Xenophobia and Personality. The work could be considered as a minor cross-validation of the results of Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sandford's study on the variable in two ways:

a) By applying the scale to a new population, different in kind from any of the various populations originally studied with the 'California Questionnaire.'

b) By relating the results from the 'California Questionnaire' to results for an independently constructed and standardized scale specifically committed to the study of racial attitudes using complex and systematic combinations of questionnaires.

---

They administered three tests – Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sandford’s test; D.T. Campbell’s Scales of measuring attitudes toward minority; and Authoritarian Personality to non-minority subjects of 79 men and 80 women selected on stratified random sampling basis from the San Francisco State College students. The study obtained the following results:

a) Further evidence was provided of the existence of a general factor among most if not all attitudes toward other ethnic groups.

b) The F scale measure of authoritarian personality traits showed substantial relationship to all the wide variety of measures of attitudes toward minority groups which were employed.

R.E. Goodnow and R. Tagiuri (1952) as reported in their article “Religious Ethnocentrism and its recognition among adolescent boys” studied religious ethnocentrism and its recognition among adolescent Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish students. They employed a technique to obtain measures of ‘recognition’ and of ‘ethnocentrism’ simultaneously. The boys of these religious groups were asked to write on a card the names of the students whom each would choose as a roommate, and then the

names of those each guessed would choose him. Percentages of choices made by Protestants, Catholics, and Jews from their own groups were compared with the percentages of the students in each group. It was found that each group made a greater proportion of choices of each own members and a smaller proportion from other groups than the proportional group sizes. Thus, it was inferred that each of the three groups was found to be ethnocentric. Furthermore, although each group excluded others, the Protestant and Catholic students excluded the Jewish students significantly more than the Jewish students excluded them.

They logically contended that when guesses made by the groups were compared with the choices they received from other groups, it was possible to investigate the group's recognition of the biased choosing. In general there was evidence that groups had good insight concerning the social response they received from their own members of other groups. Protestant students closely estimated the response from members of their own group and that from the Catholic students, but they significantly underestimated the response from the Jewish students. Catholic students closely estimated the response from their own group members and that from the Protestant students, but they underestimated the response from the Jewish students. Jewish students closely estimated the response from their own group members and from the two other groups' students.
P.L. Sullivan and Joseph Adelson (1954) devised a Misanthropy Scale by revising items of Preliminary Ethnocentrism Scale in such a way that references were omitted by using terms “people”, “most people” or “human(s)” in lieu of specific group names. This was a study influenced by H.G. Gough’s considerations of misanthropy to be a variable underlying and confounding the measurement of ethnocentrism.

The Misanthropy and Ethnocentrism Scales were administered at the same session to 221 university students. The scores of the subjects on both the scales were significantly correlated. The product – moment correlation of the two sets of scores was .43. The correlated odd even reliabilities for E and M scales were .84 and .79 respectively. After correction for attenuation an $r$ of .53 was obtained. Both correlation coefficients were significant at the .01 level of confidence. Thus their hypothesis that assent to statements derogatory towards a specific group might reflect or express hostility toward people – or, that the designation of the particular group was not as important as was the imagery of hate and exclusion was reaffirmed.

In his work – “Ethnocentrism and Stimulus Generalization” Franklyn N. Arnhoff (1956) attempted to demonstrate, as the title

---

suggested, that degree of generalization was positively related to the subject's scores on a scale of ethnocentrism.

Ethnocentrism scale used to measure ethnocentrism of the subjects was that of Adorno et al. The apparatus, method and procedure used and followed was that of Dr. Judson S. Brown et al.\textsuperscript{16} Subjects of the study were 25 female nurses who were taking psychiatric training at the Nebraska Psychiatric Institute. The performance of the subjects on the stimulus-generalization task was correlated with their scores on the California E Scale yielding a significant $\gamma = .44$. Thus hypothesis of the study was confirmed.

Donald L. Mosher and Alvin Scodel (1960)\textsuperscript{17} attempted to investigate relationships between ethnocentrism in children and authoritarian rearing practices of their mothers in an endeavour to present supplementary evidence concerning two hypotheses which social scientists tended to adopt pertaining to the formation of ethnic attitudes in children. One hypothesis stressed the social climate, and particularly the home, in which the attitudes were learned. In general, this hypothesis placed the emphasis on deep-rooted personality factors in its review of the etiology of the ethnic prejudice. The other, more personality-centered hypothesis stressed


the invidious effects of authoritarian rearing practices that culminated in displaced hostility to ethnic minorities.

Seaman's social distance test modified from that of Hartley and based on the Bogardus test was administered to 400 children as the measure of ethnocentrism in children. A slightly modified form of the suggested final E Scale was used as a measure of the expressed ethnocentrism of the mothers. And a questionnaire composed of items included in the Gough, Harris, and Martin "Opinions on Child Training" questionnaire was also used to measure the rearing practices of the mothers. Secretly coded questionnaires were sent to the mothers with incentives to return them. 161 questionnaires were in useful form. The findings of the study unequivocally supported the conclusion that ethnic attitudes of mothers but not their attitudes toward authoritarian rearing practices were related to ethnic attitudes of children although there was a significant relationship between the first two variables.

Donald T. Campbell and Robert A. Le Vine (1969)\(^{18}\) conducted a cross-cultural research with an aim to obtain comparable data from a large number of interdependent cultures on intergroup relationships; stereotypes of own and other groups; and possible correlates of ethnocentrism which were worthwhile for testing the details of the general theory of ethnocentrism widely

shared throughout the social sciences and usable for other approaches to the problem area of intergroup relations.

Interview schedules intended to extract data pertaining to survey of out-groups; survey of traditional relationship with each out-group; open ended imagery survey for each out-group; hostility and power ranking; willingness to ascribe traits as typical of whole groups; free-response of group names; child-rearing practices; authority patterns in the family and local community; and adult beliefs were formulated. Over and above the data collected through the interviews they collected geographical information; demographic and economic information; court and police records of rate of litigation, homicide rates, and suicide rates; and physical difference, lingua cultural difference, and difference in power ranking of the groups were also taken into consideration.

55 groups were examined on the basis of interview and extra-interview data and 35 of them were judged to be ethnocentric. Very interestingly an exceptional case, case of Lepcha was found. This Sub-Himalayan people had been found to have a fundamental acceptance of other groups as equals who had customs which differ, customs which would be unacceptable to Lepchas. Nonetheless, these differences were found to be a frequent topic of conversation to the Lepchas though they were noted with both amusement and disgust.
Marc J. Swartz (1961)\textsuperscript{19} portrayed the presence of a phenomenon what he called “Negative Ethnocentrism” in the Trukese people of Romanum Island with the help of evidences collected from the field study conducted in the island. He suggested a revision or refinement of the concept of ethnocentrism by citing some examples of exception to its general concept.

He pleaded that ethnocentric judgement of the Trukese people happened to result in negative judgement of themselves rather than positive judgement though the negative estimation they made of themselves was based on their own standards. But there was no reasons, according to him, to view their behaviour as other than ethnocentric. He wrote, “The fact that at least one group applies what must be considered ethnocentric standards to another group and from this application there results a judgment favourable to other group calls for a refinement in our understanding of the concept ‘ethnocentrism’.”\textsuperscript{19(a)} Here it can be mentioned that G. Gover’s accounts of Lepchas of Sikkim (1938) and Swartz’s present work were corroborative to each other.

In their study – Ethnocentrism and the acceptance of Negro support in a group pressure situation, Milton Malof and Albert J. Lott (1962)\textsuperscript{20} attempted to determine whether or not a highly prejudiced white man would accept the support of a Negro in a

\textsuperscript{19} Swartz, Marc J: Negative ethnocentrism. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 1961, 5(i), 75 – 81.
\textsuperscript{19(a)} Ibid. Page 80.
group pressure situation that produced conflict and self-doubt. Three specific hypotheses based on the personality oriented Adorno et al.'s approach to ethnocentrism were formulated. California E Scale was to be used for measuring ethnocentrism and discriminating subjects high and low in prejudice. Use was to be made of Asch, S. line judging procedure which was interpreted as setting up contradictory pressures between an individual's perceptual experience and social consensus. Sixty white males from classes in introductory psychology at the University of Kentucky served as critical subjects. Forty-one white males from the same classes and six Negro males from other classes voluntarily aided the investigators by participating in the groups as confederates.

In the study the greater amount of conformity in the group pressure situation which was found true of high ethnocentric as compared with low ethnocentric subjects supported their first hypothesis and the basic notion that the ethnocentric person would obey ingroup "requirements" and submit to ingroup standard. That he appeared to perceive even contrived ingroup as superior in judgement ability and worthy of following was an indication of the extent to which he would idealize and be influenced by ingroup pressure generally. The low prejudiced subjects as the investigators expected behaved both in conforming less than high prejudiced subjects initially when faced with an incorrect unanimous majority, and then in reducing this conformity when joined by either a white
or Negro partner. Thus this finding supported their second hypothesis. It was discovered that highly prejudiced subjects also accepted the support of both Negro and White thereby their third hypothesis was contradicted.

This study supported the phenomenon that prediction of behaviour from elicited verbal attitudes would not be successful without some consideration of the situation in which the behaviour would take place. It was also indicated by the study that known prejudicial attitudes do not provide adequate ground for making accurate behavioural predictions in certain interracial situations.

Jr. William R. Catton and Sung Chick Hong (1962)\textsuperscript{21} attempted to investigate the relation of apparent minority ethnocentrism to majority antipathy. Their hypothesis was that majority hostility toward a number of minorities varies in proportion to their respective degree of ethnocentrism. They advocated that if N different specimens of handwriting could be scaled by m judges on a continuum of neatness, there was nothing in principle to preclude the use of routine scaling procedures to place N minority groups on a continuum of apparent ethnocentrism, using the ratings of m judges.

557 students of the University of Washington were made judges. Descriptions of a highly ethnocentric fictitious minority,

Ethnians were given to the judges. On the basis of responses to purposive questions on the descriptions “un-prejudiced” student-judges were selected. Later on in the questionnaire judges were asked to rate on a ten-point numerical scale how ethnocentric they thought each of the given 18 minorities in compare with the description of the Ethnians. A social distance scale of 7 questions was given to the judges. And finally, the questionnaire included an anti-Semitism scale to be filled out by the judges and used as an additional screening device for selecting a sub-set of “pure” (unprejudiced) judges.

Their operations did not confirm the hypothesis with which they started. That was to be modified because of serendipitous discovery. It was thus concluded that majority antipathy and apparent minority ethnocentrism turned out to be curvilinearly related. The curvilinearity of the relationship pointed to the “marking” effect of a third variable, “Social Dominance G”. After its effects were taken into account, residual majority antipathy was related to apparent minority ethnocentrism in such a way as to support the conclusion that to appear ethnocentric entailed measurable costs for the group in intergroup relations.

Erdman B. Palmore (1962)\textsuperscript{22} perceived a universality of ethnophaulisms and their close connection with ethnocentrism. From the analysis of data available from the United States he

attempted to discover patterns of generalizations that would make the sources and functions of ethnophaulisms understandable.

As a result of the study five generalizations were presented. They were:

1) All racial and ethnic groups used ethnophaulisms to refer to other groups.

2) There is a close association between the amount of prejudice against an outgroup and the number of ethnophaulisms for it.

3) When the outgroup is a different race, most ethnophaulisms express stereotyped physical differences.

4) When the outgroup is of the same general racial type, most ethnophaulisms express stereotypes of highly visible cultural differences.

5) The derivations of most ethnophaulisms express some unfavourable stereotype.

A.J. Lott and B.E. Lott (1963)\(^{23}\) examined influence of ethnocentrism on the American subjects in the making of judgements of space superiority between the U.S.A. and the

erstwhile U.S.S.R. on two different occasions (first cosmonaut and astronaut space flights) in order to test two hypotheses – i) Subjects choosing the United States in response to questions regarding space superiority following the cosmonaut flight were significantly higher in ethnocentrism than subjects choosing the U.S.S.R., ii) Among those who choose the U.S.S.R., those who switched to the U.S.A. following the astronaut flight were significantly higher in ethnocentrism than those who did not change.

Findings of their research proved the hypotheses positively and they concluded that knowledge of ethnocentrism, as measured by the California E Scale was useful in predicting opinion behaviour in the area which was attended to. They also concluded that some reliable relationship did exist between general ethnocentricity and judgements about the relative superiority of one’s own country as compared with another though the relationship varied with the nature of the subject on which opinions were elicited.

In a paper entitled “Origins and effect of groups ethnocentrism and nationalism”, Paul C. Rosenblatt (1964) gave the credit of coining the word “ethnocentrism” to W.G. Sumner and focused on the overlapping effects of ethnocentrism and nationalism on ingroup loyalty and antipathy toward outgroups. An inventory of propositions appeared in the related and widely

---

scattered literatures of ethnocentrism and nationalism had been presented. The inventory of propositions was divided into two sections, one concerning the origins of ethnocentrism and overlapping aspects of nationalism and another concerning the effects on the ingroup of ethnocentrism and nationalism.

A similarity between the two concepts was viewed although they don't overlap completely. Two-fold importance of both of them was advocated. First, they appear so often during the formation and continued existence of relatively stable social collectivities. Second, they were frequently cited as the cause of serious problems in the world and an examination of them may lead to an increase in the ability to cope with these problems.

Mark A. Chesler (1965)  developed an “Intergroup Relations Scale (IRS)” so as to measure an individual’s attitudes towards a variety of minority groups. A scale to measure attitudes toward disabled persons (ATDP) developed by H.E. Yuker, J.R. Block and W.J. Campbell was also used to measure the way individuals viewed persons who were physically disabled. This study was taken up with a view to test two hypotheses – i) Individuals who exhibit ethnocentric attitudes toward one particular minority will express similar attitudes toward a variety of similar outgroups – religious, racial, socio-economic, or nationality groups; ii) Individuals who express ethnocentric attitudes towards

---

various outgroups will express similar attitudes toward physically disabled persons. Here the author categorized disables as a minority social group.

IRS was designed in such a way that high scores on it indicated ethnocentrism. On the other hand low scores on the ATDP indicated rejection of disabled persons. Both the IRS and ATDP were administered to samples of 77 university and 243 high school students. The derived product-movement correlations between IRS and ATDP scores were in the hypothesized direction. The results of the study supported those authors and works who had suggested that ethnocentrism, or prejudice, was a general phenomenon expressed towards a variety of outgroups and was not narrowly focussed on one or another particular minority group.

Ralph Epstein and S.S. Komorita (1966)26 took a sample of 120 Negro boys and girls reading in the fifth degree in an elementary school in Detroit Michigan and investigated prejudice among them as related to parental ethnocentrism and punitiveness.

Parental Punitiveness Scale (PPS) developed by themselves was used to measure children’s perceptions of parental punitiveness toward aggression. Three supposedly independent variables were used: i) parental punitiveness toward aggression –

---

high, medium, and low as determined by scores on the (PPS); ii) race of target group – Negro versus White; and iii) socio-economic class of target group – working versus middle class. Slides depicting the “Piraneans”, a fictitious group as either middle or working class, and Negro or white were given to the subjects with instructions. And accordingly 7-item social distance scale with regard to Piraneans was to be completed by the subjects.

Children’s attitude ratings towards nonfictional groups – Chinese, German, French, Catholic, Italian, Mexican, Negro, Japanese, Jewish, and Russian were obtained after the experimental sessions to establish generalized social distance measure. A measure of the parents’ social distance attitudes, as perceived by the child, was obtained as well by asking the subjects, three weeks latter, to indicate how they thought their parents would rate these same groups on the social distance scales.

This study indicated three interesting results: i) strong self-rejecting attitudes among Negro children which probably mirrored the prevailing prejudices of the white majority; ii) correlations between social distance scores toward own and other racial groups suggesting a generalized predisposition or misanthropy; and iii) correlations between the children’s social distance score and his perceptions of his parents’ social distance suggesting that misanthropic attitudes are learned in the home.
In their work – "Ethnocentrism and Causal Attribution in a South Indian Context" Donald M. Taylor and Vaishna Jaggi (1974) asked 30 Hindu adult subjects to attribute the behaviour of ingroup (Hindu) and outgroup (Muslim) members performing socially desirable or undesirable acts in terms of internal and external causes for the behaviour. Trait Ratings and Attribution Items were used in the questionnaire. Trait ratings of Hindus and Muslims were analysed to assess whether the Hindu subjects evidenced the traditional patterns of ethnocentric attitudes. A separate correlated t-test was performed on the ratings of the two ethnic groups on each of twelve given traits. Significant differences emerged for nine of the twelve traits and in each case it was clear that Hindu Ss responded more favourably to their own group concept than that of the outgroup. These results confirmed the basic ethnocentric pattern found for most attitudinal reactions to ingroup and outgroup members.

Examination of the Ss judgements of the in-group (Hindu) actors in the four prescribed situations provided evidence for the operation of ethnocentrism in causal attribution. The interpretation of an ethnocentric pattern of causal attribution was further supported by Ss judgements of the outgroup (Muslim) actors in each of the four situations. Although the situations were identical, Ss completely reversed their internal causes attributions for the Muslim actors. The sharp reversal in the pattern of internal causes

---

attributions made for in-group as compared to out-group actors clearly exposed the operation of an ethnocentric form of causal attribution. This study was, to the best of the researcher’s knowledge, the first of its kind on ethnocentrism in India.

Edward C. Chang and Edward H. Ritter (1967)\textsuperscript{28} attempted to discover ethnocentrism in black college students with the help of a scale developed by them which was later known as Black Ethnocentrism Scale. Perceived inconsistency of results across contemporary studies dealing with the group relation between the whites and the blacks of America; a zeal to alleviate this measurement problem by developing a more reliable scale; and an intention to smash the non-availability of scale for measuring pro-black attitudes despite having many scales for measuring anti-Negro attitudes were the stimulants for the construction of the scale.

On the basis of two considerations or assumptions that blacks were becoming increasingly ethnocentric and that black ethnocentrism involved both pro-black and anti-white components seven predictions were formulated. They were: 1. Pro-black scores will be positively correlated with ethnocentrism, 2. Anti-white scores will be positively correlated with ethnocentrism, 3. Pro-black scores will be positively correlated with authoritarianism, 4. Anti-white scores will be positively correlated with

attributions made for in-group as compared to out-group actors clearly exposed the operation of an ethnocentric form of causal attribution. This study was, to the best of the researcher’s knowledge, the first of its kind on ethnocentrism in India.

Edward C. Chang and Edward H. Ritter (1967)\textsuperscript{28} attempted to discover ethnocentrism in black college students with the help of a scale developed by them which was later known as Black Ethnocentrism Scale. Perceived inconsistency of results across contemporary studies dealing with the group relation between the whites and the blacks of America; a zeal to alleviate this measurement problem by developing a more reliable scale; and an intention to smash the non-availability of scale for measuring pro-black attitudes despite having many scales for measuring anti-Negro attitudes were the stimulants for the construction of the scale.

On the basis of two considerations or assumptions that blacks were becoming increasingly ethnocentric and that black ethnocentrism involved both pro-black and anti-white components seven predictions were formulated. They were: 1. Pro-black scores will be positively correlated with ethnocentrism, 2. Anti-white scores will be positively correlated with ethnocentrism, 3. Pro-black scores will be positively correlated with authoritarianism, 4. Anti-white scores will be positively correlated with

authoritarianism, 5. Pro-black attitudes will be positively correlated with anti-white attitudes, 6. Black students are currently less anti-black, 7. Black students are currently more anti-white.

Authoritarianism scale, California E Scale, Steckler’s Anti-White Scale and Steckler’s Anti-Negro Scales were administered to 92 black college students enrolled in the general psychology classes for testing the predictions. All the predictions were reaffirmed by the data collected from the sampling. The reaffirmation was corroborated not only by the data collected by the researchers themselves but also by the scores on the Anti-White, Anti-Negro and F scales of black students sampled 21 years back.

In the study – “Whites Ethnocentrism and their attributions for the behaviour of blacks: A motivational bias,” Jeff Greenberg and Rosenfield (1979)\textsuperscript{29} used three measures – Ethnocentrism Measure, Discrimination Measure, and ESP (Extra Sensory Percept) ability Measure. In their endeavour selection of a task which required an ability about which there was no stereotypic belief that blacks were inferior to whites; and obtaining attributions from subjects with different levels of ethnocentrism were considered important by the researchers to demonstrate that ethnocentrism was responsible for derogatory attributions for the behaviour of blacks. For ascertaining the first one an ESP task was

\textsuperscript{29}Greenberg, J and Rosenfield, D: Whites Ethnocentrism and their attributions for the behaviour of blacks; Journal of Personality, 1979, 47, 643 – 657.
chosen because it was very unlikely that cultural stereotype pictured blacks as having less ESP ability than whites. They applied their own newly developed ethnocentrism measure in partial disguise so as to ensure non-bias response from the subjects.

In their findings correlation between the ethnocentrism and discrimination measures was high and significant, $r = .54; P<.01$. Regarding relationship between ethnocentrism and attributions, it was found that high ethnocentric subjects made more derogatory attributions for black (as compared to whites) than low ethnocentric subjects did. High ethnocentric subjects attributed black success (as compared to white success) more to luck and loss to ability than low ethnocentric subjects did, and attributed black failure (as compared to white failure) more to the lack of ability less to bad luck than low ethnocentric subjects did. Thus, ethnocentrism appeared to be strongly related to the tendency to derogate the outgroup in their study.

Adams et al. (1982)\textsuperscript{30} in their work – “Ethnocentrism as a Multidimensional Paradigm: Prejudice and Homophily” sought to test the hypothesis that multi-dimensional model of ethnocentrism was a better predictor of communicative behaviours than a single dimensional model. They based their findings on the following four theories in succession dealing with – 1. Congruence perceptions of the similar ingroup-outgroup beliefs, values, and

\textsuperscript{30} Adams, Ch. Et al: Ethnocentrism as a multidimensional paradigm: Prejudice and Homophily. Resources in Education, 1982,17(9), p 141.
culture; 2. Racial congruence; 3. Perceptions of differences to predict ethnocentric behaviour; and 4. stereotyping/trait attribution theory.

Their analysis found a linkage among the four theories which consisted of two common elements: i) Homophily – heterophily defined as the degree to which pairs of individuals who interact are similar in certain attributes such as beliefs, values, education and social status; and ii) prejudice as an evaluative predisposition to respond to homophily judgements. It was thus that the conclusion was reached that ethnocentrism was a multi-dimensional construct. The study was conceived, as already mentioned to test the value of multi-dimensional model as a predictor of communicative behaviour.

In their study – “Ethnocentrism and Causal Attribution in South East Asia” Miles Hustone and Colleen Ward (198531) rediscovered Taylor and Jaggi’s hypothesis of ethnocentric attribution: Group members made internal attributions for the positive behaviour of other ingroup members, external attributions for their negative behaviour. For attributions to outgroup members a reversal was happened. They discussed the methodological shortcomings of Taylor and Jaggi’s work and the same were overcome in their study.

Their first experiment was done in Malaysia. 68 Malaysian subjects – 34 Chinese and 34 Malay students from the University Sains Malaysia were asked to ascribe internal or external causes of behaviour of ingroup and outgroup members performing socially desirable or undesirable acts. The findings of the study supported the hypothesis (Taylor and Jaggi’s hypothesis) in the case of Malay subjects only, whereas the Chinese subjects favoured the outgroup (Malays). These results were found consistent with a limited analysis of auto and heterostereotypes.

Their second experiment, an exact replication of the first experiment, was done in a different social context. 30 Malay and 30 Chinese Singaporean students from the National University of Singapore were the subjects and they were asked for causal attributions of behaviour of ingroup and outgroup. The results revealed ingroup favouritism for the Malay subjects, although the Chinese subjects no longer favoured the outgroup, Malay. Differences between the two experiments were discussed from socio-structural and cultural perspectives that indicated that ethnocentric attribution was not a universal tendency. Here the cases of Romunum people and Lepcha could be recalled.

P. Scheepers, A. Falling and J. Peters (1990)\textsuperscript{32} updated and tested a classic model derived from the theoretical notions of

prominent members of the Frankfurt School in an attempt to explain ethnocentrism in the Netherlands.

Operationalization of ethnocentrism was carried out according to the theoretical notions of Sumner, Adorno et al. and Levine and Campbell. A number of municipalities were selected with a view to give proportionate representation of the regional municipalities in the selection of sample subjects. People aged from 18 upto 69 were randomly chosen out of the registers of the selected municipalities. About 56% (N = 3003) of the approached respondents were willing to be interviewed. Out of which 1799 respondents were questioned on authoritarianism and ethnocentrism because they hypothesized that authoritarianism brought about ethnocentrism. They used Frankfurt Ethnocentrism Scale to test their hypothesis besides other studies.

They show in their study that standardized effects of authoritarianism on unfavourable attitudes towards outgroups and on favourable attitudes towards ingroup were .56 (regression coefficient) and .47 (regression coefficient) respectively. Their findings supported that their hypothesis was not falsified. Standardized effects of predictors related to the individual’s social condition on both components of ethnocentrism were found to be not insignificant though they were weak in compare with the effects of authoritarianism.
Robert A. Levine and D.T. Campbell's 310 paged book (1972) was a treatise on some theoretically crucial problems for comparative research on war and peace and ethnic relations. Discussion on the concept of ethnocentrism and ten theories on group relation along with a chapter on concord and discord among the theories made the book a worthwhile one in this area of study. In the attempt to expose a clarity of the concept of ethnocentrism the authors discussed in detail Sumner's early conceptualisation and 23 facets of ethnocentrism were milked out from Sumner's and other discussions. They were:

A] Attitudes and behaviours towards ingroup:

i) See selves as virtuous and superior.

ii) See own standards of value as universal, intrinsically true. See own customs as original, centrally human.

iii) See selves as strong.

iv) Sanctions against ingroup theft.

v) Sanctions against ingroup murder.

vi) Cooperative relation with ingroup members.

vii) Obedience to ingroup authorities.

viii) Willingness to remain an ingroup member.

ix) Willingness to fight and die for ingroup

B) Attributes and Behaviors toward outgroups:

i) See outgroups as contemptible, immoral and inferior.

ii) See outgroups as weak.

iii) Social distance.

iv) Outgroup hate.

v) Sanctions for outgroup theft or absence of sanctions against.

vi) Sanctions for outgroup murder or absence of sanctions against outgroup murder.

vii) Absence of cooperation with outgroup members.

viii) Absence of obedience to outgroup authorities.

ix) Absence of conversion to outgroup membership.

x) Absence of willingness to fight and die for outgroups.

xi) Virtue in killing outgroup members in warfare.
xii) Use of outgroups as bad examples in the training of children.

xiii) Blaming of outgroup for ingroup troubles.

xiv) Distrust and fear of the outgroup.

Covert and overt contradictions and agreements of the theories about ethnocentrism were exposed in their discussions. Cross-cultural variations in ethnocentric activities, institutions, ideologies and attitudes were focused in their examinations of the implications of social and physiological theories on group relations and group behaviours.

Ultimately agreements and disagreements of the theories were compared by highlighting contradictory propositions about the nature of future evidence. A field manual was also developed for ethnographic research on the propositions postulated.

In ethnocentrism and Intergroup attitudes East African Evidence\textsuperscript{34} (1976) M.B. Brewer and D.T. Campbell reported studies on Ethnocentrism of 30 ethnic groups of Eastern Africa. The data of the research were opinions collected from 1,500 respondents in 1965 with the help of Interview schedules.

The main focuses of the study were on assessing intergroup attraction; correlation of intergroup attraction; ingroup self-regard and ethnocentrism; intergroup attraction and percepts; and content of perceptions of outgroups. Thus an index of intergroup attraction was developed based on responses to survey questions regarding liking for, social distance toward, and familiarity with each outgroup. The index was nothing but a quantification of the relative distance at which each ingroup held various outgroups. Later correlates of the distance measure were also systematically examined. Various explorations of the content of intergroup perceptions – the trait characteristics ascribed to ingroups and outgroups by their survey respondents were also revealed.

Discontinuities between affective and evaluative dimensions of intergroup attitudes in the light of changing political and social conditions in East Africa at the time of survey were also discussed to account for their failure to find the expected convergence of facets of ethnocentrism and to speculate about what social environmental conditions would promote such convergence. Their findings had also been crossed-validated with data from other regional surveys and with materials from ethnographic fieldwork wherever possible.

Roy Preiswerk and Dominique Perrot’s 234-paged book\(^{35}\) (1978) having 18 chapters with an introduction of 11 pages had a

taste different from those of the other works reviewed. Ethnocentrism as one of the forms of sociocentrism was advocated in their book.

They examined 3 volumes of history in German language; 6 volumes in English; 11 volumes in French; 2 volumes in Portuguese; and 8 volumes in Russian. Method of secondary empiricism was followed and technique of content analysis was employed in the study of these histories. They studied critically the distorted history of non-European people written by the western people influenced by what they called western macro-ethnocentrism. Ethnocentric shades of mind were thus detected in the writing of history textbooks.

MEASUREMENT OF THE PHENOMENON:

Ethnocentrism conceptualized first by Sumner and magnified by Murdock later was attended to in the early 20th century. Till today the attention persists.

The first scientific measurement of the phenomenon was done by T.W. Adorno *et al* in general and by D.J. Levinson in particular. They developed a test popularly known as California Ethnocentrism Scale or California E-Scale.
Another popular scale designed to measure ethnocentrism was the Frankfurt Ethnocentrism Scale. P. Scheepers *et al* used the scale vide Chapter-III (Review of Literature) of the present thesis.

In another attempt to measure Black Ethnocentrism Edward C. Chang and Edward H. Ritter used an ethnocentrism scale which was later known as Black Ethnocentrism Scale.

Australian Ethnocentrism Scale of D.G. Beswick and M.D. Hills was also popular but this could not be included in the review since the same was not available to the researcher despite fervent effort.

Social distance scale was also used to measure ethnocentrism. For example, Seeman's Social Distance Test was used to measure ethnocentrism in children vide Chapter –III of the present thesis.

Measurement of ethnocentrism by trait attribution technique was also practiced. For example, Donald M. Taylor and Vaishna Jaggi carried out the same vide Chapter-III of the thesis.

Measurement of ethnocentrism on the basis of looking glass theory of the group (analogous with looking glass theory of self) was a new approach taken up by the present researcher. Here it could be reiterated that personality of an individual could be pictured by knowing how he or she assessed or rated himself or herself in relation to others. Similarly, ethnocentrism of a group
could be pictured by knowing how the group assessed or rated itself in relation to others. It was here that the present scale differs from California E-scale, Frankfurt E-scale and Black Ethnocentrism E-scale.

CAUSES OF THE PHENOMENON:

At the outset it could be said that gregarious instinct was the soil and poly-group situation was the seed to be fertilized by the demand of circumstances to germinate ethnocentrism.

Ethnocentrism was first given to birth at the time when a group came to know a different group or groups.

Tangible rewards were considered as the cause of ethnocentrism. P.C. Rosenblatt wrote, "Nationalism and ethnocentrism are greater the greater are the tangible rewards, perceived tangible rewards or expected tangible rewards associated with the ingroup and with loyalty to it and/or the less are the tangible rewards, perceived tangible rewards, or expected tangible rewards associated with outgroups, with friendliness to outgroups, or with other forms of social organisations."36

Leader's manipulation was considered as one of the causes of ethnocentrism. Again Rosenblatt said, "Sensing the advantage

of ethnocentrism or nationalism for themselves and for the group, militarily, administratively, and otherwise, group leaders frequently act to increase group ethnocentrism and nationalism, often through opportunistic exploitation of fear or hate of some outgroup.”

Motivational and cognitive factors aroused ethnocentrism. “Nationalism and ethnocentrism satisfy psychic needs. Nationalistic and ethnocentric needs are greater the greater are the perceived or expected psychic rewards of the ingroup and/or the less are the perceived or expected psychic rewards of the outgroup or of some alternative form of social organisation” Rosenblatt reiterated.

Ethnocentrism was viewed as a product of socialization and enculturation. Richard N. Adams wrote, “Ethnocentrism, on the other hand, arises from the combined factors of the process of socialization and enculturation, and the resulting perpetual reintegration of a culture pattern between and within individuals. It is a peculiarly cultural thing, with no demonstrable parallels in subhuman groups.”

Ethnocentrism was considered to be the manifestation of “Gregarious instinct”. “Many writers have viewed ethnocentrism as

---

37 ibid. P. 133.
38 ibid. p. 133.
the manifestation of herd instinct, since there seems to inhere in it a quality of primary certitude which betrays its essentially irrational and primitive character and since an analogous form of group egotism prevails widely among those animals which live in societies," 40 Murdock wrote.

Ethnocentrism became even more glaring if and when he and his counterpart or counterparts of the outgroup or outgroups were in keen contest at individual level as well as his ingroup and outgroup or outgroups are at loggerheads at group level. Sherif et al emphasized that threat and intergroup competition caused the exaggeration of ingroup virtues and the magnification of outgroup vices, that is, ethnocentrism.41

Psychologically it conceived in the mind of man as soon as he was identified with a group, primary or secondary and was aware of the bond or togetherness between himself and his ingroup and its members. It was intensified and prominent as he grew up and became conscious of the difference, concrete or abstract between members of his ingroup including himself and members of the outgroup or outgroups.

Cultural determinism was viewed as one of the causes of ethnocentrism. "The cultural relativist, like the sceptic, maintains that cultural determinism leads to ethnocentrism in value judgements but, strangely enough, need not lead to ethnocentrism in judgements of facts."42

---