CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY
METHODOLOGY

As mentioned in the previous chapters, the present research was undertaken to study communal prejudice in relation to self-disclosure and adjustment. Thus the main objectives of the study were (i) to investigate the relationship between communal prejudice and self-disclosure i.e. to what extent self-disclosure facilitates or inhibits the development of communal prejudice; (ii) to investigate the relationship between communal prejudice and adjustment i.e. to what extent adjustment influences the development of communal prejudice and (iii) to investigate the relationship between communal prejudice and type of religion i.e. to what extent Hindus and Muslims differ in communal prejudice.

To be more specific, the study was designed to answer the following questions:

i) Do high and low self-disclosure subjects differ with respect to communal prejudice?

ii) Do adjusted and maladjusted subjects differ with respect to communal prejudice?

iii) Do Hindu and Muslim subjects differ with respect to communal prejudice?

iv) Is there an interactional effect of self-disclosure and adjustment on communal prejudice?
v) Is there an interactional effect of self-disclosure and religion on communal prejudice?

vi) Is there an interactional effect of adjustment and religion on communal prejudice?

vii) Is there an interactional effect of self-disclosure, adjustment and religion?

viii) Do high and low self-disclosure subjects differ with respect to adjustment?

ix) Do Hindu and Muslim subjects differ in self-disclosure?

x) Do Hindu and Muslim subjects differ with respect to adjustment?

**Design of the study:-**

In order to answer the above questions, a 2x2x2 factorial design in which two personality variables (i.e. self-disclosure and adjustment) and one sociological variable (i.e., religion), each varying in two ways, was used in the present study. The two personality variables, i.e. self-disclosure and adjustment were varied in two ways by selecting (a) high and (b) low disclosure; and (a) adjusted and (b) maladjusted subjects respectively. The two types of religion were (a) Hinduism and (b) Islam. Thus there were 8 groups of subjects namely, high self-disclosure - adjusted Hindu subjects, low self-disclosure - adjusted Hindu subjects, high self-disclosure - maladjusted Hindu subjects, low
self-disclosure - maladjusted Hindu subjects, high self-disclosure - adjusted Muslim subjects, low self-disclosure - adjusted Muslim subjects, high self-disclosure - maladjusted Muslim subjects and low self-disclosure - maladjusted Muslim subjects. Each group consisted of 50 subjects.

Sample: In order to form above mentioned eight groups of subjects, Sinha's (1973) Self-Disclosure Inventory was administered on 850 (425 Hindus and 425 Muslims) Undergraduate students of Abdul Islam Inter College and Kaushalya Inter College, Moradabad. They all belonged to upper-middle and lower-upper socio-economic status groups. The age of the subjects ranged from 15-18 years.

On the basis of their scores on self-disclosure Inventory, two extreme groups were formed, namely, high self-disclosure group and low self-disclosure group. The subjects whose scores on Self-Disclosure Inventory fell on or below 1st quartile were considered as high self-disclosure subjects while the subjects whose scores on Self-Disclosure Inventory fell on or above 3rd quartile were considered as low self-disclosure subjects. The first and 3rd quartiles were 399 and 683 respectively. There were 320 subjects in each group.

Aligarh Adjustment Inventory, developed by Dell and adapted by Umaruddin and Qadri (1964) was administered on these two groups (high self-disclosure and low self-disclosure).
On the basis of their scores on Aligarh Adjustment Inventory, each group was subdivided into two groups to form four groups of subjects namely, high self-disclosure - adjusted subjects, high self-disclosure - maladjusted subjects, low self-disclosure - adjusted subjects and low self-disclosure - maladjusted subjects. The subjects who obtained a total score of 21-27 were considered as adjusted subjects whereas the subjects who obtained a total score of 35-44 were considered as maladjusted (Norms of Aligarh Adjustment Inventory). The four groups so formed consisted of 540 subjects; 135 subjects in each group.

Each of the four group was further subdivided into two groups on the basis of religion to form eight groups namely, high self-disclosure - adjusted Hindu subjects, high self-disclosure - maladjusted Hindu subjects, low self-disclosure - adjusted Hindu subjects, low self-disclosure - maladjusted Hindu subjects, high self-disclosure - adjusted Muslim subjects, high self-disclosure - maladjusted Muslim subjects, low self-disclosure - adjusted Muslim subjects and low self-disclosure - maladjusted Muslim subjects. There were 50 subjects in each group.

**Tools** - Following tools were used in the present study -

1) **Self-Disclosure Inventory (SSDI)**:

Self-Disclosure Inventory developed by Sinha (1973) was employed to assess the magnitude of self-disclosure of
the sample. This inventory measures the extent of self-disclosure of the Indian adolescents of both sexes of urban and rural population. The inventory is capable of measuring the trend and magnitude of self-disclosure of the adolescents in different areas of self and toward different target figures. The inventory consists of 8 areas of self and six target figures. The eight areas of self are (i) Money, (ii) Personality, (iii) Study, (iv) Body, (v) Interest, (vi) Feeling-ideas, (vii) vocation and (viii) sex. The six target figures to whom one may disclose about oneself are (i) Mother, (ii) Father, (iii) Brother, (iv) Sister, (v) Friend and (vi) Teacher.

The instructions of Self-Disclosure Inventory to be given to the testees are written in Simple Hindi on the cover page of the inventory. A few examples and some precautions to be taken are also given on the cover page of the inventory. The scoring of the inventory is based on a three point self-rating scale. The sum of the scores in all the areas of self toward all target figures gives the total magnitude of self-disclosure of the subject.

(2) Aligarh Adjustment Inventory:-

Aligarh Adjustment Inventory, developed by Bell and adapted by Umaruddin and Qadri (1964) was used to select the adjusted and maladjusted subjects. It provides five separate
measure of adjustment namely, home, health, family, emotional and economical. The inventory consists of 90 items with three alternative response categories such as 'yes', 'No' and 'Do Not know'. There are 20 items for each of the first four areas of adjustment (i.e. social, emotional, health, and home areas of adjustment) while 10 items deal with financial adjustment. Out of 90 items, 81 items are positively framed while 9 items are negatively framed. If a subject responds 'yes' to a positive item or responds 'No' to a negative item, he is assigned one point indicating maladjustment. Thus high score on the inventory indicates maladjustment while low score shows adjustment.

(3) Prejudice Scale:-

Prejudice Scale, recently developed by Qamar Jahan, Bhardwaj and Saeeduzzafar (1986), was used to assess the magnitude of communal prejudice of the subjects. The details about the construction of the scale is given in the M.Phil. dissertation of the present investigator. The scale consists of 32 items. Each item of the scale possesses five alternative answers and the subject has to tick (✓) on any one alternative out of five responses given for each item. More specifically, the subjects have to select one of the five possible responses to each item. These responses are: too much, much, normally, less and least and weights of five, four, three, two and one are assigned to the responses respectively. When an item is stated in such a way that a response
of 'too much' indicates least prejudiced attitudes, the order of weights are reversed. In other words, a prejudiced response always receives a higher weight and unprejudiced response always receives a lower weight. Thus the higher the score an individual obtains on the scale, highly prejudiced he would be. The total score for a subject is the sum of the weights he secures for each statement.

**Procedure:** Prejudice Scale, developed by Qamar Jahan, Bhardwaj and Saeeduzzafar (1986), was administered on all the eight groups of subjects. The test was administered groupwise with the following instructions:

"This scale consists of few statements. Each statement is followed by five alternative responses namely (i) too much (ii) much (iii) normally (iv) less and (v) least. You are required to read each statement carefully and mark a tick (✓) on one of the five responses with which you agree. It is important to note that you have to answer each statement in the context of other religious community - the community with which you do not belong. Since there is no time limit, therefore, you are requested to try to answer each statement. I assure you that your answers will be kept secret. Please read the instructions carefully, given on the cover page of the scale before starting the scale. Do you understand"?
As soon as the subjects finished their task, the test was collected from them and scoring was done. As mentioned elsewhere the total score for each subject, is the sum of the weights he secured for each statement.

The data, thus, obtained were tabulated groupwise and were statistically analysed to draw necessary inferences.