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The main findings of the present research are:
(i) high self-disclosure subjects are less prejudiced than low self-disclosure subjects; (ii) adjusted subjects are less prejudiced as compared to maladjusted subjects; (iii) Muslims are more prejudiced than Hindus; (iv) there is an interactional effect of self-disclosure and adjustment on the degree of prejudice; (v) there is an interactional effect of self-disclosure and religion on the degree of prejudice; (vi) there is an interactional effect of adjustment and religion on the degree of prejudice; (vii) there is an interactional effect of self-disclosure, adjustment and religion on the degree of prejudice; (viii) no relationship is found between self-disclosure and adjustment i.e., high and low self-disclosure subjects do not differ with respect to adjustment; (ix) Hindu subjects reveal significantly more information to others than Muslim subjects i.e. Hindu subjects are significantly higher in self-disclosure than Muslim subjects and (x) Hindu subjects are significantly better adjusted than Muslim subjects.

The first finding of the present study i.e. high self-disclosure subjects are less prejudiced than low self-disclosure subjects, is consistent with the findings obtained by Srole (1956) who found a positive correlation between
anomie (the sense of isolation from others) and prejudice. Thus a person who remains isolated from others is more likely to develop prejudiced attitude as compared to one who makes frequent social interactions with others. It may be argued that a person who makes frequent social interactions is likely to communicate his feelings, desires, urges, love, hate and ideas to another person and consequently there are bright chances that his psychic energy will be manifested in constructive and creative deals. A person, on the other hand, who remains isolated from others or who is deficient in the skill of communicating with others i.e. in the ability to transmit his thoughts and feelings, is likely to develop psychologically sick personality (Ruesch and Baleson, 1951; Breaton and Breaton, 1958; Altman and Frankfurt, 1968; Halverson and Shore, 1969; and Sinha, 1973). A number of studies demonstrated that prejudiced persons are significantly high in anxiety, depression, aggression, frustration, neuroticism and hostility and a person who shows high anxiety, depression, aggression, hostility, neuroticism is considered a psychologically sick person (Horney, 1936; Altus and Tefejian, 1953; Siegel, 1954; Rokeach, 1960; Chatterjee et al., 1972; Hassan, 1975, 1978; Sinha and Hassan, 1975; Enayatullah, 1980; and Singh, 1980). Moreover, Bruer and Freud (1893) pointed out that when one discharges his/her emotions before others, he/she feels relieved of mental tension and anxiety and, therefore, regains his/her normal
The finding of the present research is not only in agreement with this view and provides empirical support to very old concept of catharsis (Freud, 1900) but also demonstrates beyond doubt that disclosing information, like feelings, ideas, desires, reduces anxiety, frustration, aggression etc. which in turn reduces the possibility of being prejudiced.

The first finding of the present investigation may also be explained in the light of the results obtained by numerous investigators who demonstrated a positive relationship between self-disclosure and inter-personal attraction; between self-disclosure and liking; and between self-disclosure and the development of interpersonal relationship (Lefkowitz, 1970; Jourard, 1971; Altman and Taylor, 1973; Rubin, 1974; Wortman, Anderson, Herman and Greenberg, 1976). In short these investigators have demonstrated that high self-disclosure subjects are more liked by others, are able to develop cordial interpersonal relations with the members of the groups than the low self-disclosure subjects. Moreover, as commented by Jourard (1959), the amount of personal information that one person is willing to disclose to another person is an index of the closeness of the relationship and of the affection, love and trust that prevails between the two. Since prejudice is a pattern of hostility in interpersonal relations which is directed against the entire group or against its individual member, it is, therefore, reasonable to assume that high self-disclosure subjects should be much less prejudiced than their
counterparts i.e. low self-disclosure subjects. The first finding of the present study provides empirical support to this assumption. The self-disclosure subjects by virtue of disclosing personal informations to others become close to the members of the out-group and consequently their misunderstanding, misgiving and irrational fears about the members of the out-group are removed which in turn help them to develop positive attitudes towards members of the out-group. As commented by Cozby (1973): "The individual who never discloses may be unable to establish close relationship with others. A large portion of his self may be seen as threatening and is repressed (there is evidence that repressers talk less than Sensitizers-Kaplan, 1967; Axtell and Cole, 1971)".

Somewhat recently Saxena (1982) has found that high self-disclosure subjects are significantly less hostile than low self-disclosure subjects. These results were interpreted on the assumption that expression of frustration releases tension and Catharsis reduces hostility. The findings of our research are also consonant with these findings obtained by Saxena (1982). We also argue that expression of various type of information including frustration reduces tension and hostility which in turn minimises the possibility of prejudiced attitudes or reduces the intensity of already existing prejudices.

Our investigation provides indirect support to the findings obtained by Nakamura and Masahiko (1984) who found
positive correlation between self-disclosure and interpersonal attraction. More specifically, these investigators observed that high self-disclosure subjects were liked more than low self-disclosure subjects. Since increased disclosure leads to attraction; it should not lead to the development of prejudiced attitudes which are not only undesirable but also antagonistic to attraction. Thus the finding of the present research that high self-disclosees are less prejudiced than low self-disclosees is in consonance with the findings obtained by Nakamura and Masahiko (1984).

The first finding of the present investigation also provides indirect support to the findings obtained recently by Joshi and Joshi (1986) who have demonstrated that high self-disclosees are significantly more creative than low self-disclosees. As mentioned elsewhere the cognitive components of prejudiced individuals are faulty. They have inflexible or rigid perception, believes, pre-judgement or stereotypes about the target group. Moreover, a number of investigators have shown a positive correlation between prejudice and authoritarianism (Allport and Kramer, 1946; Gough, 1951; Kaufman, 1957; McClosky, 1958; Roberts and Rokeach, 1956; Smith and Rosen, 1958) and others have demonstrated a positive correlation between authoritarianism and rigidity. In short it has been established beyond doubt that prejudiced persons are cognitively rigid persons. In view of these facts it may be asserted that prejudiced persons should be less creative
than non-prejudiced persons. Our finding that high self-disclosees are less prejudiced than low self-disclosees provide indirect empirical support to the findings obtained by Joshi & Joshi (1986) in the sense that high self-disclosure subjects are less prejudiced and therefore, they should be more creative.

The second finding of the present investigation i.e., adjusted subjects are less prejudiced than maladjusted subjects, may be explained in the light of the criteria of good adjustment proposed by Tyson (1951). Tyson (1951) prepared a detailed criteria of good adjustment. Among these, some important criteria, according to Tyson, are (i) Capacity for affection i.e. ability to love others and to accept love and support from others; (ii) relative freedom from fear, anxiety and tension; (iii) Confidential or intimate relationship with some persons; (iv) Co-operation i.e., Balance between enjoyment of working alone and working co-operatively; (v) tolerance of frustration and (vi) acceptance of reality. In short an adjusted person is one who is free from fear, anxiety and tension, has good inter-personal relationship with others, extends co-operation to others and loves and is being loved by others. These characteristics of adjusted persons minimize the possibility of the development of prejudiced attitudes (Horney, 1936; Siegel, 1954; Altus and Tefejian, 1953; Rokeach, 1960; Lefkowitz, 1970; Jourard, 1971; Chatterjee et al., 1972; Altman and Taylor, 1973;
Rubin, 1974; Hassan, 1975, 1978; Singh and Hassan, 1976; Wortman, Anderson, Herman and Greenberg, 1976; Enayatullah, 1980; and Singh, 1980). It has been observed by Lowenthal and Harven (1968); Jacobs (1971) and others that intimacy is extremely important for good adjustment. In other words adjusted person is one who develops intimacy with others. Since intimacy is defined as a strong attachment characterised by trust and familiarity between two individuals, it is reasonable to assume that adjusted persons should be less prejudiced than maladjusted persons. Our findings provide empirical support to this assumption.

The second finding of the present investigation may also be explained in the light of the results obtained by Traux & Carkhuff (1965); Taylor, Altman and Frankfurt (1968); Halversen and Shore (1969) and Certner (1973) who have demonstrated that high self-disclosure subjects are better adjusted than low self-disclosure subjects. The individual who reveals his feelings, ideas, emotions to others develops intimacy, trust and familiarity with other individuals which in turn lead to better adjustment. Self-disclosure not only increases trust and familiarity leading to good adjustment, it also reduces anxiety, frustration and aggression which in turn reduces the possibility of being prejudiced. Thus if the high self-disclosure subjects are better adjusted, they are also likely to be less prejudiced (Qamar Jahan, 1986).
The second finding of the present research also provides indirect support to the findings obtained by Mukherjee & Upadhyay (1980) and those obtained by Alam and Shrivastava (1983). Mukherjee and Upadhyay (1980) found that maladjusted subjects were significantly more anxious than adjusted subjects. Similarly Alam and Shrivastava (1983) found that poor adjustment and high anxiety resulted into a feeling of inadequacy, inferiority, insecurity, unnecessary apprehension and self de-evaluation of the individual leading to adverse impact on one's self-perception. In short these investigators have observed that maladjusted individuals are anxious, develop feeling of inadequacy, inferiority, insecurity, apprehension and self-de-evaluation. As a matter of fact any individual who has these personality characteristics is highly unlikely to react adequately to social realities, situations and relations. Moreover, he is unlikely to respect the rights of other person, to learn to get along with them, to develop friendship, to participate in social activities and to learn to respect the values and integrity of social customs and traditions. To hide or to justify these weaknesses, the person is likely to develop certain defense mechanism. He may project all his incapacibilities on others and consequently may develop prejudiced attitudes towards certain group or community. Thus, we may draw a logical conclusion that maladjusted individuals are more prejudiced than adjusted individuals because (i) they are more anxious, (ii) they develop feeling of adequacy, inferiority and insecurity and
(iii) they develop unnecessary apprehension and self-devaluation which in turn adversely affect their self-perception. It is also interesting to note that even one personality correlate of maladjusted person i.e., anxiety, is sufficient to explain why maladjusted persons are more prejudiced than adjusted persons, for it has been established by a number of researchers that there is a positive correlation between anxiety and prejudice (e.g., Rokeach, 1960; Chatterjee et al., 1972; Hassan, 1975 and 1978; Enayatullah, 1980; and Singh, 1980).

The third finding of the present study i.e., Muslims are more prejudiced than Hindus, requires deep analysis. Such finding cannot be explained in terms of religiosity or in terms of the stronger positive attitudes of the Muslims towards religion because (i) the sample of the present study was drawn randomly from Muslim and Hindu population and (ii) there is still conflicting results about the relationship between religiosity and prejudice. For instance, Jeeves (1957); Kelley, Person and Holtzman (1958) and Allport & Rose (1967) have demonstrated a positive correlation between the pro-religious attitudes and prejudices, while other investigators such as Rosenblum (1958); Shinert and Fort (1958); Allen (1965) and Stormmen (1961) have found negative correlation between the degree of religiosity and prejudice. Moreover, since Islam is a religion that teaches brotherhood, honesty, equality and respect to all other religions, a 'true Muslim'
is unlikely to develop prejudices toward any religion, caste and creed. However, it is unfortunate to note that a great majority of the Muslims are not adhering to the noble ideals of Islam rather they have politicized their religious ideology. Allport (1954), while studying the role of religion in prejudice, observed that the role of religion is paradoxical. 'It makes prejudice and it unmakes prejudice'. Allport recognized two type of religious outlook namely, 'Institutionalised' and 'Interiorized'. According to him persons with institutionalised religious outlook are influenced more by political and social aspects of religiosity. They adhere to religion because it is a safe, powerful and superior in group. Such type of religiosity tends to be associated with prejudice. Persons with interiorised religious outlook, on the other hand, are personally absorbed in their religion. They adhere to religion because its basic creed of brotherhood expresses the ideals one sincerely believes in. Persons with such religious outlook tend to be more tolerant and less prejudiced. These observations of Allport, though not made about Muslim, may be used to interpret the present finding. It appears that Muslims of the day do not adhere to religion because they sincerely believe in the noble ideals (such as brotherhood, equality, respect for all other religions etc.) of Islam rather they adhere to religion in order to gain some immediate practical advantages. They have developed what Allport has called institutionalised religious outlook.
and therefore they are more influenced by political and social aspects of religiosity and consequently they have developed prejudiced attitudes.

The present finding though provides support to several investigators (Allport, 1961; Bettelheim and Janowitz, 1950; Rosenblum, 1958; Rokeach, 1960; Triandis and Triandis, 1960; Khan and Singh, 1975; and Hassan, 1981), may also be explained in the light of the history of communalism in India. The dawn of independence witnessed horrifying scene of bloodshed. Specially in northern India innumerable Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs were killed in the severe communal riots that took place in different parts of the nation. All these communal riots were in reaction to the partition of the nation as well as in reaction to what was happening in Pakistan. The seed of hatred sowed by the British rulers grew to a large tree. Both communities (i.e. Hindus and Muslims) lost the feelings of oneness due to the British policy of 'divide and rule'. As a result of this policy as well as the creation of Pakistan, a large number of communal riots took place in different parts of the country. Almost in all these communal riots, Muslims were great sufferers. These tragic events induced deep frustration, demoralization and feelings of insecurity among Muslims. This created social and Psychological Chasm between the two communities which in turn might have provided the ground for the persistance and growth of communal prejudice among Muslims.
Another possible explanation of the higher degree of prejudice shown by the Muslim may be the fact that Muslims by and large are very sensitive about their religion and culture. As a result of contemporary social situation, Muslims developed the feelings of being submerged into Hindu culture and losing their religious and communal identity. The psychological effect of all these are that Muslims have become suspicious to Hindus. This suspicion might have provided a ground for the development of high degree of prejudice among them.

The final possible explanation of the higher degree of prejudice shown by the Muslims may be traced to the fact that their loyalties towards the nation are frequently doubted, though on imaginary and meaningless grounds, by the members of the majority community. In other words Muslims are themselves the victims of prejudiced. There are numerous studies to indicate that victims of prejudice inflict on others what has been inflicted on them (Allport and Kramer, 1946; Gray and Thompson, 1953).

Turning our attention to other findings of the present research, we find that all the interactional effect, i.e., interaction between self-disclosure and adjustment, between self-disclosure and religion, between adjustment and religion and interaction among self-disclosure, adjustment and religion are significant.
The first interactional effect, i.e., interactional effect of self-disclosure and adjustment, suggests that the prejudice scores of high and low self-disclosure subjects are not independent of their degree of adjustment rather the prejudice scores of the subjects are the product of self-disclosure and adjustment. In other words, neither self-disclosure nor adjustment alone contribute in the development of prejudiced attitudes i.e., both self-disclosure and adjustment play equally important role in the development of prejudiced attitudes.

Like the first interactional effect, the remaining interactional effects may also be explained. Taking all types of interactional effects into consideration, it may be concluded that the development of prejudiced attitudes is a function of self-disclosure, adjustment and religion. In short it may be suggested that all these three variables i.e., self-disclosure, adjustment and religion play equally important role in the development of prejudiced attitudes.

Apart from the main findings of the present research, the other findings of the study require deep analysis. These findings, as mentioned earlier are, (i) no relationship is found between self-disclosure and adjustment i.e. high and low self-disclosure subjects do not differ with respect to adjustment; (ii) Hindu subjects are significantly higher in self-disclosure than Muslim subjects and (iii) Hindu subjects are significantly better adjusted than Muslim subjects.
The finding that high and low self-disclosure subjects do not differ with respect to adjustment is contrary to our expectations. It was expected that high self-disclosure subjects, by virtue of revealing their ideas, feelings, hate and love, should develop intimacy with others and, therefore, should be better adjusted than low self-disclosure subjects. The reasons why we failed to obtain a positive relationship between self-disclosure and adjustment might be due to defective techniques of communication used by the high self-disclosure subjects of the present study. As pointed out by Calhoun and Acocella (1978) gradual self-disclosure, encouraged by reciprocity, is not only the easiest way; it is also the most successful way. But if one reveals too much, too soon, he may find the other person edging away with an embarrassed smile rather than reciprocating. Too quick disclosure generally puts people off. In the first place, his behaviour is simply too unconventional to encourage trust in most people. Second, other people reason, quite logically, that he is unlikely to keep their secrets if he is so indiscriminate in revealing his own (Luft, 1969). Moreover, even in the relationship that is already intimate, there are times when self-disclosure is excessive or out of place. One should not turn one's friend or any other person into one's Psychiatrists or confessor. By doing so, he forces that other person always to be strong so that he can always be weak and cry on his shoulder. It is too great a burden, and eventually it will become irksome.
In addition, there are times when it is simply inappropriate to reveal something to another person, no matter how close your relationship is. For instance, when your wife is depressed, this is not the time for you to make a sincere, honest, open, spontaneous disclosure of the fact that you think she is less attractive since she gained weight. In other words, a good deal of selfishness can slip past under the cloak of self-disclosure. If one abuses self-disclosure in this way, it will cease to be effective.

Thus it is possible that high self-disclosure subjects of the present study might have abused self-disclosure in the above mentioned ways and consequently self-disclosure became ineffective to affect adjustment.

The finding that Hindu subjects are significantly higher in self-disclosure than Muslim subjects may be explained in the light of historical perspective of independence of India as well as in the light of social set up. As a matter of fact, during the struggle for independence the loyalties of Muslims community toward the freedom movement were doubted and even after independence, that was achieved at the cost of the partition of the nation, the bonaides of the Muslims were doubted and suspected by a sizeable number in Hindu community and by a significant section of the national leadership. There was a demand that they should pay homage to Hindu saints and savior. This created a sense of fear that they might be submerged into Hindu Culture and loss their identity. This
probably gave rise to a tendency of escapist and separatism in Muslims which provided a base for the development of inhibitions among Muslims to express their feelings, ideas, emotions, love and hate to others.

The fact that Hindus are higher in self-disclosure than Muslims may also be interpreted in terms of Indian Social setup. Though Indian population is comprised of at least seven religious groups namely, Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Sikhs, Buddhists, Jains and other religions, Hindus are in majority while Muslims are the largest minority of the nation. In any democratic country like India it is the majority that rules the country. Being in majority, Hindus not only have upper hand in the affairs of the nation but have more opportunities to interact with others. Muslims, on the other hand, after remaining in power for many decades, failed to adjust themselves to the changed situation where they found themselves in minority. This created a psychological condition for the development of inhibitions among them.

The last finding of the present research i.e. Hindu subjects are significantly better adjusted than Muslim subjects, is too obvious to need any explanation. However, several possible explanations may be offered. One of the most important possible explanation is inherent in the definition of adjustment itself. Adjustment, according to Eysenck (1972), is "a state in which needs of the individual on the one hand and claims of the environment on the other hand are fully
satisfied or the process by which this harmonious relationship can be attained". It is an open secret that Muslims are not only educationally backward, but they are also economically backward. It is nothing but natural that any section of the society which is backward educationally as well as economically is unable to fulfill its social as well as biological needs. Thus Muslims, being a backward class of the society, have less facilities for the fulfillments of their biogenic and sociogenic needs which in turn may lead to maladjustment. Hindus, on the other hand, are comparatively much well off and they, therefore, have all physical, social, economical and other facilities for the fulfilment of their biogenic and sociogenic needs. They are, therefore, relatively better adjusted than their counterpart i.e. Muslims.

Recently Saeeduzzafar and Alam (1985) observed that when one looks at the numerosity and complexity of experiences which people derive from physical, social and psychological environment, it becomes clear that the members of a particular social group or community are not subjected to identical interactions with identical intensity and extent, nor live in identical habitat. In fact, soci-cultural life in any setting can be conceptualized as a continuum at one end of which lie those who have all the physical, social, economical and other facilities for the fulfillment of their biogenic as well as sociogenic needs, while on the other end lie those who are materialistically, socially and psychologically
handicapped for the fulfillments of these needs and acquisi-
tion of diverse experiences. The persons lying on the first
end of socio-cultural continuum are considered as non-deprived
persons and those lying on the other end are deprived persons.
Saeeduzzafar and Al in found that Muslims are more deprived
than Hindus. These findings provided empirical support to
the findings of the present study. Deprivation of Muslims
may contribute in the development of maladjustment or poor
adjustment among them.

The overall findings of the present research identify
three important variables, namely self-disclosure, adjustment
and religion which play crucial role in the development of
communal prejudice in India. Once the causes of any disease
are explored then it becomes rather easier to search its
remedy. Communal prejudice, like any physical disease may
also be cured by attacking its causative agents. Keeping the
three causative agents of communal prejudice in mind, three
remedies may be suggested to control communal prejudice. Thus
Communal prejudice may at least be reduced to a greater extent,
(i) if people are made to disclose their hidden feelings, urges,
ideas, emotions, love and hate to others; (ii) if people of
different religions are educated to develop what Allport (1954,
1966) has called interiorised or intrinsic religious outlook.
According to Allport, persons with interiorised religious outlook are personally absorbed in their religion. They adhere
to religion because its basic creed of brotherhood expresses
the ideals one sincerely believes in. Persons with such religious outlook tend to be more tolerant and less prejudiced, and (iii) if sincere efforts are made to create such conditions that may provide equal opportunities to all for good adjustment. For instance, some mechanisms should be evolved to control deprivation, particularly economic, educational and social deprivation. Every citizen of the nation irrespective of numerical value, religion, caste and creed should get more or less equal facilities for the fulfillment of his/her biogenic as well as sociogenic needs. If we are able to achieve this goal, then, we can control maladjustment to a great extent and consequently communal prejudice may at least be reduced.

Further researches are, however, required to explore the ways and means by which people may be made to disclose personal information and to develop interiorised religious outlook. Moreover, it is suggested that it would be a great contribution if psychologists, sociologists and economists start an inter-disciplinary research to evolve such mechanisms that may help in controlling the deprivation of all sorts.

At present, however, it may simply be suggested that people of different walks of life should be encouraged to participate in social gatherings, organised by different religious groups and to express their doubts and suspicions in friendly manners. Moreover, the good values and ideas of each religion should be propagated by the government agencies.
It may also be suggested that appropriate steps should be taken by the government to eradicate at least psychological and social deprivation experienced by the minorities of the nation. Such steps may reduce maladjustment which in turn may at least lessen the magnitude of prejudices. By putting these suggestions into practice if communal prejudice is eliminated or at least reduced, it would not only accelerate the economic development of the country but would also accelerate the process of national integration.