SUMMARY

Since independence various parts of the country have witnessed the occurrences of communal riots. These riots have not only taken numerous innocent lives, damaged national and private properties but also have brought a bad name to the country. Such ugly occurrences remain a threat to national integration and international relations. Consequently politicians as well as Social Scientists are burning midnight lamp to identify the causes of communal riots and to suggest ways and means to control them. Though politicians and social scientists are working on different lines but they, at least, agree on one contributory factor, i.e. communal prejudice.

Prejudice is a very important aspect of inter-group relations and the study of inter-group relations has become a major scientific enterprise of the day. An operational meaning of prejudice has been given in the Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary (1965) which can be summarised as "a sort of prior unfavourable judgement or opinion of the members of a race or religion or the occupants of any other significant Social role (towards the members of another social group) held in disregard of facts that contradict it."

The most consistent point of agreement in various definitions of prejudice is that it is a sort of negative attitudes towards a particular group or its member. Thus,
Singh and Khan (1979) have commented:

"Prejudice is a negative attitude formed in the individual without proper rationality, justice or tolerance toward a socially defined group and toward any person perceived to be a member of that group."

A careful perusal of various explanations of prejudice reveals the fact that prejudices are widely held complex phenomena which are learnt in course of life, are multicausally determined. Numerous theories have been advanced to provide satisfactory explanations of prejudice. However, following Ashmore (1970), different theoretical explanations of prejudice may be classified into two categories on the basis of their level of analysis—societal and individual level. As far as the analysis at societal level is concerned, it has advanced two theories of prejudice (a) economic exploitation theory and (b) economic group conflict theory. The analysis of prejudice at individual level has produced two families of theories (a) symptoms theories and (b) socio-cultural theory. Under symptom theories, we have scapegoat theory and authoritarian personality theory. Another theory of prejudice, generated by the analysis at individual level, is socio-cultural theory. The theory is based on Socio-cultural learning processes (MacIver, 1948; Long, 1951; Marden, 1952; Sarnaff and Katz, 1954; and Pettigrew, 1959).
The study of prejudice, particularly that of religious prejudice in India, is very important because of our national ideals of democracy and secularism. Indian society is plagued with the problem of religious prejudice, resulting into frequent outbreak of communal riots between Hindus and Muslims. Hence, study of the religious prejudice constitutes one of the most sacred duties for the Indian social scientists. In the extent of increasing tension and social conflicts all over the world, it has become increasingly necessary to investigate into the personality organization of the individual which helps in the development of prejudice in them. Studies on prejudice, therefore, have achieved a central place in the entire domain of social psychology. A number of studies have focussed their attention on exploring the relationship between prejudice and authoritarianism (Luchins, 1956; Campbell and McCandless, 1951; Block & Block, 1951; Evans, 1952; Scodel and Mussen, 1953; Diab, 1959; and Scotland and Patchen, 1961).

Some researchers studied the relationship between religion and prejudice and found that religious people as compared to non-religious people were more prejudiced or conservative (Parry, 1949; Adorno et al. 1950; Blum and Man, 1960; and Allport and Ross, 1967). Many investigators have reported that Muslims as compared to Hindus have more prejudices and traditional socio-political attitudes (Adinarayana, 1953; Chaudhary, 1958; Hassan and Singh, 1973; Hassan, 1974, 1975, 1978; Singh, 1979; Khan, 1979; and Singh, 1980).

There have been relatively fewer studies on the relationship between personality variables and prejudice. Allport's view on prejudice suggests that personality variable may contribute significantly in the development of prejudice. For that matter a highly significant question is why does a person develop prejudice and the other does not? There is obviously something within the individuals that predisposes them to develop prejudice. For instance, anxiety ridden person tends to develop prejudice by attributing the cause of his anxiety to some person or a group. Siegel (1954) and
Rokeach (1960) found that anxious type persons are more closed minded or prejudiced than non-anxious persons. A number of studies reviewed above have shown that prejudiced persons are significantly high in anxiety, depression, aggression, frustration neuroticism and hostility. Thus individual with higher levels of anxiety, depression, aggression, hostility display higher levels of prejudice. A person who shows high levels of anxiety, depression hostility, aggression, neuroticism is considered as psychologically sick person. It may be assumed that psychologically sick personalities are more prone to develop prejudice as compared to healthy personalities.

Healthy personality is determined by the extent to which an individual express his ideas, feelings, desires, aggression, love hate etc. to another person in his social environment. Thus self-disclosure is essential for healthy mental personality. A number of researchers found a close relationship between self-disclosure and mental health (i.e. Ruesch and Baleson, 1951; Breaton, 1958; Jourard, 1963; Halversion and Shore, 1969; and Sinha, 1973). Other investigators, on the other hand, found a negative relationship (e.g. Pederson and Marks, 1970; Chaikin and Derlega, 1974; Cozby, 1972; and Traux Wittmer and Altman, 1973). Still others found no relationship (e.g. Stanley and Bowness, 1966; Pederson and Breglio, 1968). Cozby (1973) found that self-disclosure is curvilinearly related to mental health with usually low or high levels of self-disclosure being related to adjustment.
The importance of self-disclosure was first underlined by Lewin (1935) but systematic work on self-disclosure started with the studies of Jourard (1959, 1971). According to him "Self-disclosure is the act of revealing personal information to others". Sinha (1969) says "Self-disclosure is the ability to communicate one's real self to others". Self-disclosure in recent years has been the focus of many studies by psychologists as one of the major determinants of personality. More specifically, a relationship has been established between self-disclosure, conformity, submission and social distance on one hand and between self-disclosure and liking interpersonal attraction and hostility on the other hand (Jourard, 1959; Fitzgerald, 1963; Lefkowitz, 1970; Sinha and Tripathi, 1975; and Saxena, 1982). In short, it has been demonstrated that high disclosure subjects are more obedient, more submissive, less hostile and have better interpersonal relationship with others as compared to low disclosure subjects. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that there should be a relationship between self-disclosure and communal prejudice. In other words it may be hypothesized that high self-disclosees should be less prejudiced as compared to low self-disclosees. This contention would receive support and strength, if viewed in the light of the observations made by Buss (1961), regarding hostility. He says "Hostility is an attitudinal response that endures an implicit verbal response involving negative feelings (ill will) and negative evaluation of people as events".
Most recently the researcher of the present investigation (Qamar Jahan, 1986) studied communal prejudice in relation to self-disclosure among Hindu and Muslim youths. She found that high self-disclosure subjects were less prejudiced than low self-disclosure subjects. Thus there was negative correlation between self-disclosure and prejudice. However, it was observed that even among high self-disclosure subjects, some subjects obtained very high scores on prejudice scale indicating highly prejudiced attitude. These observations make it clear that beside self-disclosure another personality variable might be responsible for the development of prejudice even among high self-disclosure subjects. Thus the present investigation was undertaken to explore this personality variable. The personality variable selected to assess the individual's susceptibility to develop prejudice was that of adjustment.

Thus an important consideration which also influenced the thinking of the present investigator to undertake the present research is the presence of considerable body of evidence to suggest that self-disclosure and prejudice are positively related with adjustment. Adjustment, as defined by Coleman (1956) is the "effectiveness of the individual's efforts to meet his needs and adapt his environment". While stressing adaptations of general social conditions or to specific environmental requirements, White (1956) states that "the concept of adjustment implies a constant interaction,
each (individual and environment respectively) making demands on the other. Sometimes adjustment is accomplished when the person yields and accepts conditions which are beyond his power to change. Sometimes it is achieved when the environment yields to the person's constructive activities. In most cases adjustment is a compromise between these two extremes; and maladjustment is a failure to achieve a satisfactory compromise!

More or less similar definition of adjustment is given by Eysenck (1972). According to him adjustment is "a state in which needs of the individual on the one hand and the claims of the environment on the other hand are fully satisfied or the process by which this harmonious relationship can be attained".

Numerous studies have shown that good mental health and freedom from mental disabilities lead to better adjustment (Morgan, 1937; Landis, 1942; and Britton and Britton, 1951). Other researchers have demonstrated a correlation between loneliness and serious psychological problems such as depression and suicide (Lowenthal and Harven, 1968; Connally, 1962; Blau, 1961; Blanc et al, 1966; and Jacobs, 1971). Thus Lowenthal and Harven (1968), while investigating the causes of depression in old people, found that a crucial factor was the lack of confidant. Regardless of their level of general socializing, those old people who had at least one confidant—some one to whom they could reveal private thoughts and feelings—were the ones least likely to be depressed. Thus it seems that intimacy is extremely important for good adjustment. Since
intimacy is defined as a strong attachment, characterized by trust and familiarity between two people, it is reasonable to assert that self-revelation leads to intimacy. In other words self-disclosure increases trust and familiarity, hence intimacy. As more and more information is revealed, each person can piece together the logic of the other person's thoughts and emotions. Each comes to know the other's inner-self. Consequently, each can be more certain of understanding the other end of being understood. It deepens the attachment between two people simply by virtue of being rewarding. To the receiver the disclosure is a gift of trust and affection. To the giver, self-disclosure is rewarding in several ways. First, it relieves emotional loneliness: the private self revealed and accepted, no longer shivers in isolation, second self-disclosure relieves guilt and fear. As long as we conceal our mental bogeymen, they will continue to howl and cackle in the dark corridors of the mind. Once we reveal them, they look much less threatening.

As pointed out earlier intimacy is important for good adjustment and intimacy increases through self-disclosure, it should, therefore, lead better adjustment. There is considerable body of evidence to demonstrate that high self-disclosure subjects are better adjusted than low self-disclosure subjects (Traux and Carkhuff, 1965; Taylor, Altman and Frankfurt, 1968; Halversion and Shore, 1969; and Certner, 1973).
While defining the meaning of mental health, Patty and Johnson (1953) have commented that mentally healthy individuals have generally satisfying relationship with other individuals. They do not have inner needs which make them bow to every one nor they do feel impelled to dominate other. They do not suffer from inner feelings which must be assuaged by hurting their wives and children or by attacking minority groups. They have attained a high degree of personal adjustment. Those who fail in the adjustment process may be considered emotionally immature, maladjusted, or mentally ill. Their difficulties may show in attitudes toward themselves such as lack of confidence or guilt feelings. Their adjustment may come to light in relationship with their fellows. They may sulk, act huffy or fly into temper tentrums when they cannot have their own way. They may join the ranks of revolutionists rather than evaluationists. The emotionally induced anguish of such individuals may be as painful as illness caused by germs or injury, but to many layman they merely appear lazy, queer, inclined to "show off" difficult, or prejudiced. In short maladjusted persons reveal themselves in the form of antisocial behaviour, pain or general inability to accept oneself or others.

Some researchers have studied anxiety, self-perception as a function of adjustment, Mello and Guthrie (1958), for instance, observed that maladjusted subjects developed symptoms of anxiety and inferiority. More or less similar observations
were made by Chauhadn, Tiwari and Khattar (1972). Mukherjee and Upadhyay (1980) found negative relation between anxiety and adjustment in both normal and hospitalized subjects. While studying self-perception as a function of adjustment and anxiety, Alam and Shrivastava (1983) found that poor adjustment and high anxiety results into a feeling of inadequacy, inferiority, insecurity, unnecessary apprehension and self-evaluation of the individual leading to adverse impact on individual's self-perception.

The foregoing discussion makes it clear that intimacy is extremely important for good adjustment. It becomes also evident that intimacy which is defined as a strong attachment, characterized by trust and familiarly, increases through self-disclosure. Furthermore a positive relationship has been found between good adjustment and mental health. Thus well adjusted is one who has satisfying relationship with other individuals and who is able to consider the interests of others and to feel a part of group. Maladjusted person, on the other hand, is one who is mentally ill, joins ranks of revolutionists and shows anti-social behaviour. Moreover, it has been found that well adjusted persons donot suffer from inner feelings which must be assauged by hurting their wives and children or by attacking minority groups. Those who fail in the adjustment processes are considered emotionally immature. Their difficulties may show in attitudes towards themselves such as lack of confidence or guilt feelings. Their poor
adjustment may come to light in relationship with their fellows. In view of the relation between adjustment, intimacy and self-disclosure and in view of the behavioural characteristics of maladjusted and well adjusted persons it is logical to hypothesize that well adjusted persons should be less prejudiced than maladjusted persons, since maladjusted persons are found to be more anxious and tense, they resort to aggressive behaviour in order to reduce tension. In these cases the actual frustrating agent is ignored. Some one or something else receives the attack. This mechanism is in part responsible for the phenomenon of discrimination and prejudice against minority groups. Thus it is highly reasonable to hypothesize that maladjusted persons should be more prejudiced than well adjusted individuals.

As mentioned some where else, numerous studies have shown that high self-disclosure individuals are better adjusted than low self-disclosure individuals, it would be interesting to study communal prejudice in relation to adjustment and self-disclosure. The importance of such study becomes many folded in the light of our recent findings that high self-disclosure subjects are less prejudiced than low self-disclosure subjects (Qamar Jahan, 1986) and our observations that even among high self-disclosure subjects some were found highly prejudiced. Such observation suggests that beside self-disclosure some other personality variables might be responsible for the development of prejudice. Thus it may be
possible that the high self-disclosure groups of subjects may consist of maladjusted individuals. Thus the present study is designed to test this possibility. More specifically the present research is undertaken to study communal prejudice as related to self-disclosure and adjustment.

In the best knowledge of the present investigator no attempt has been made so far to study communal prejudice as related to self-disclosure and adjustment. The present study aims at filling up this gap.

The findings of the present study would not only provide us useful information about communal prejudice but would also help us to suggest certain conditions by which communal prejudice may be reduced, if not wholly eliminated. As a matter of fact, communal prejudice is not only an obstacle in the advancement of the nation but also remains a threat to national integration. Thus the findings of the present research may be useful in removing such obstacles and therefore may contribute in the speedy development of the nation and in enhancing national integration.

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 religions 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.

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) subjects. On the basis of their scores, two extreme groups, namely high self-disclosure group and low self-disclosure group, were formed. Aligarh Adjustment Inventory, developed by Bell and adapted by Umaruddin and Qadri (1964), was administered on these two groups. On the basis of their scores on Aligarh Adjustment Inventory, each group was subdivided into two groups to form four groups of subjects. Each of the four groups was further subdivided into two groups on the basis of religion to form eight groups mentioned above.

Prejudice Scale, developed by Qamar Jahan, Bhardwaj and Saeeduzzafar (1986) was administered on all the eight groups of the subjects. The data thus obtained were tabulated
groupwise and were analyzed with the help of analysis of variance and t-test.

The main findings of the present research were:
(i) high self-disclosure subjects were less prejudiced than low self-disclosure subjects; (ii) adjusted subjects were less prejudiced as compared to maladjusted subjects; (iii) Muslims were found to be more prejudiced than Hindus; (iv) there were interactional effects of self-disclosure and adjustment, of self-disclosure and religion, of adjustment and religion, and of self-disclosure, adjustment and religion on the degree of prejudice; (v) no relationship was found between self-disclosure and adjustment i.e. high and low self-disclosure subjects did not differ with respect to adjustment; (vi) Hindu subjects were significantly higher in self-disclosure than Muslim subjects and (vii) Hindu subjects were significantly better adjusted than Muslim subjects.

The first finding of the present study was consistent with the findings obtained by Srole (1956) who found a correlation between anomie and prejudice. This finding was explained in terms of social interaction, mental health, and consequently was considered to provide empirical support to the concept of catharsis. The first finding of the present research was also explained in the light of the results obtained by numerous investigators who demonstrated positive relationship between self-disclosure and interpersonal 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). The finding also provide indirect support to the findings obtained by Saxena (1982) who demonstrated that high self-disclosure subjects were significantly less hostile than low self-disclosure subjects. Most recently Joshi and Joshi (1986) found that high self-disclosures were significantly more creative than low self-disclosures. Our finding provide indirect support to this contention.

The second finding of the present research i.e. adjusted subjects are less prejudiced than maladjusted subjects, was explained in the light of the criteria of good adjustment proposed by Tyson (1951) and in the light of the findings obtained by numerous investigators. According to Tyson an adjusted person is one who is free from fear, anxiety and tension, has good interpersonal relationship with others, extends co-operation to others and loves and is being loved by others. These characteristics of adjusted person minimized the possibility of the development of prejudiced attitudes (Horney 1936; Siegel, 1954; Altus and Tefejian, 1953; Hokeach, 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).
The finding was also explained in the light of personality correlates of adjusted and maladjusted person. Some investigators found that intimacy is extremely important for good adjustment (e.g. Lowenthal and Harven, 1968; Jacobs, 1971), others demonstrated that high self-disclosure subjects were better adjusted than low self-disclosure subjects (e.g., Traux and Carkhuff, 1965; Taylor, Altman and Frankfurt, 1968; Halversion and Shore, 1969; and Certner, 1973) and still other researchers observed that maladjusted subjects were significantly more anxious than adjusted subjects and they developed a feeling of inadequacy, inferiority, insecurity, unnecessary apprehension and self-devaluation that had adverse impact on their self-perceptions (e.g. Mukherjee and Upadhyay, 1980; Alam and Shrivastava, 1983). The finding under discussion provided indirect support to the findings obtained by various groups of investigators.

The third finding of the present study i.e. Muslims were more prejudiced than Hindus, though consistent with the findings of numerous investigators (Allport and Kramer, 1946; Bettelheim and Janowitz, 1950; Rosenblum, 1958; Rokeach, 1960; Triandis and Triandis, 1960; Khan and Singh, 1975; and Hassan, 1981), was explained on four grounds. The first explanation was based on the type of religiosity namely, 'Institutionalised', and 'Interiorised', as proposed by Allport (1954). The second explanation of the finding was made in the light of the history of communalism in India. The third explanation took into
account the fact that Muslims are very sensitive about their religion and culture. Finally, the third finding of the present research was interpreted in term of an old saying 'tit for tat' i.e., victims of prejudice tend to develop prejudice (Allport and Kramer, 1946; Gray and Thompson, 1953).

The next finding of the present research i.e. all the interactional effects were statistically significant, suggested that prejudiced attitudes were contributed by all the variables studied. In other words neither self-disclosure nor adjustment nor religion alone contribute in the development of prejudiced attitudes. All these variables play equally important role in the development of prejudiced attitudes.

The next finding of the research i.e. high and low self-disclosure subjects did not differ with respect to adjustment, though contrary to our expectations, was explained in terms of defective techniques of communication used by the high self-disclosure subjects (Calhoun and Acocella, 1978).

The finding that Hindu subjects were significantly higher in self-disclosure than Muslim subjects, was explained in the light of historical perspectives of independence of India as well as in the light of Indian Social Set up.

The last finding of the present research i.e. Hindu subjects were significantly better adjusted than Muslim subjects, was explained in the light of the definition of adjustment as proposed by Eysenck (1972), as well as in the light of
the psychological construct known as prolonged deprivation (Mishra and Tripathi, 1977).

On the basis of all these findings of the present research, some suggestions were made about the ways and means by which communal prejudice may be reduced, if not completely eliminated. Moreover, new areas of research were also pointed out.