INTRODUCTION

The discoveries made during 19th and 20th centuries by Darwin, Hegel, Marx, Einstein and Freud have revolutionised the world of knowledge and a new civilization has taken place. Man today is making a myth. He has walked on the moon and is preparing for holidays on mars. It certainly demonstrates how rapidly we have progressed in securing outstanding achievements in the material world, but these achievements are shadowed by human sufferings, anxiety and frustrations etc. Thus Coleman (1969) characterized 17th century, 'The age of enlightenment', The 18th 'The age of reason', The 19th 'The age of progress' and the 20th, 'The age of anxiety, struggles, frustrations, hate and what not? It is a world where personality disorders, mental and social disintegrations are common phenomena.

Since independence various parts of the country have witnessed the occurrences of communal riots. The 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 mid night lamp to identify the causes of communal riots and to suggest way 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.

Indian population consists of several religious groups, Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Christians, Buddhists, Jains and other religions but communalism in India is mainly limited between the two religious groups namely, Hindus and Muslims. These two communities have many stereotypes and prejudices against each other, this results into disharmony, hatred, dislike, schism and separatism against each other. This separatism and prejudice toward each other result into communal riots that have caused destructions to life and property at a large level.

There are different views on the historical origin of communal riots. Ghurye (1968) thinks that the cause of communal tension goes back to 14th century i.e. with the very early settlement of Muslims in India; others think that the Britishers are responsible for communal tensions, for they followed the policy of "divide and rule" after the failure of the mutiny of 1857. As Nehru (1955) pointed out in his Autobiography: "It is interesting to trace British policy since the rising of 1857 in its relation to the communal question. Fundamentally and inevitably it has been one of preventing the Hindus and Muslims from acting together and of playing off one community against another" (P.460).
Even if it is correct that the medieval period of India was free from the communalism and the separatism between the Hindus and Muslims was created by the Britishers, it remains a fact that there existed a gulf between Hindus and Muslims. The Britishers, however, exploited their prejudiced attitudes which put them against each other. During the British rule, particularly toward the beginning of the 20th century, the cleavage between Hindus and Muslims became much more apparent and wider. In 1906 "The Muslim League" was formed to safeguard and advance the political rights and interests of Indian Muslims (Dalwai, 1968; Shakir, 1970; and Zakaria, 1970). The Muslim community, by and large, became alienated from the mainstream of the Indian National Congress and rallied round the Muslim League partly because of their prejudiced outlook and narrow mindedness and partly because of their reaction against Hindu revivalist movement, Hindus militant nationalism of some political leaders and their religious dogmatism. Consequently the gulf between these two major communities was further widened. The partition of the Nation that took place in 1947 added additional fuel to fire. The dawn of independence was preceded by borrowing a blood bath. One of the largest human killings and migration took place not only in the subcontinent but also in the world history in the wake of large scale Hindu-Muslim communal riots. The number of persons killed during these communal riots ranged from three lacs to one million.
Even today India is facing the problems of communalism. In recent years, communalism is increasing at a serious proportion. Not only the frequency of communal riots has increased but also the destruction and the damages caused by these communal carnages have folded many times.

Indian Society has always been in the grip of different types of social prejudices. The most prevalent among them are religious, linguistic, regional and caste prejudice. Religious prejudice is most prevalent type of prejudice among different Indian communities generally between Hindus and Muslims that creates antagonism and conflict. Hence communal prejudice deserves special attention.

Here it would not be out of place to say few words about the nature of prejudice and to give a brief account of its theoretical explanations. The word prejudice is derived from the Latin world prejudicium and has, like most words, undergone a change of meaning since classical times. There are three stages in the transformation:-

(1) To the ancients, prejudicium meant a 'precedent', a judgement based on previous decisions and experience.

(2) Later, the term, in English, acquired the meaning of judgement formed before the examination and consideration of the facts - a premature or hasty judgement.

(3) Finally the term also acquired its present emotional flavour of favourableness or unfavourableness that accompanies such a prior and unsupported judgement.
Prejudice is, however, defined as "a composite of stereotypes, myths and legends in which a group label or symbol is used to classify, characterise, and define an individual or group considered as totality" (Kimbalyoung, 1948).

According to Ackerman and Jahoda (1950) "Prejudice is a pattern of hostility in interpersonal relations which is directed against an entire group, or against its individual member; it fulfills a specific irrational function for its bearer". 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 occupations of any other significant social role (towards the members of another social group) held in disregard of facts that contradict it".

After a very careful examination of the writings on prejudice, Harding, Proshansky, Kutner and Chein (1969) have advanced a definition of prejudice. According to them prejudice is a "failure of rationality or a failure of justice or a failure of human heartedness in an individual's attitude toward members of another ethnic group". In fact, the definition of prejudice advanced by Harding et.al. is a sharp one. They have held only those attitudes as prejudices which deviate from the norms of rationality, justice or human-heartedness.
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 towards a socially defined group and toward any person perceived to be a member of that group."

These definitions of prejudice indicate certain essential ingredients and certain characteristics of prejudice. These are: Prejudice is an unfavourable attitude which makes an individual to perceive, think, feel and act unfavourably towards the members of other religions, caste, racial, ethnic and rationality groups. It is, based on prejudgement, stereotypes, hasty judgements and over-generalization. It is a negative and hypothetical construct which can not be observed directly but can be inferred from unfavourable intergroup perception and behaviour. Prejudice includes feelings of intergroup hostility, discrimination and conflict. In most cases prejudice is developed by frustration, hostility, insecurity, aggression, anxiety and weak ego. Finally prejudice is a type of attitude which is normally disapproved in a society. In every society or culture prejudice is always considered to be bad.
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 multiply causally determined and are functional in character for the individual. Numerous theories have been advanced to provide positive explanations of prejudice. However, following Ashmore (1970), the 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) realistic group conflict theory.

Economic exploitation theory asserts that prejudices are product of economic exploitations of the minority groups by the majority group. This exploitation, in turn, enhances conflict between the two groups. As a matter of fact economic competition is one of the chief source of inter-group conflict. In our social and economic set up, the attitudes of dominant group toward the subordinate one have usually been friendly so long as the system of economic relation was not challenged, but the attitudes have become hostile whenever the subordinate group attempted to improve its position. Realistic group conflict theory, on the other hand, advocates the importance of actual or perceived nature of inter-group relations in the development of prejudice. Thus Secord and Backman (1964) have observed: "The character
of the existing relations between inter-group and out-group generate attitudes toward the outgroup that are consonant with those relationships." It has generally been observed that whenever the members of one group perceived the members of other group with distrust and hostility, inter-group conflicts originate. Prejudice in Indian situation, for example, emerged due to the conflicts between Hindus and Muslims during the partition of the country (Murphy, 1953).

In order to make this theory more explanatory, social Scientists have divided inter-group conflicts into different types. For instance, Rose (1956) suggested that there are three types of inter-group conflicts (i) political (ii) ideological and (iii) racist. According to him political conflict (e.g. Capitalist VS. Socialist) is for scarce political, economic and geographic resources. Ideological conflict (e.g. Hindu-Muslim conflicts) originates due to differences in ways of living or differences in cultural or religious ideology. Finally, racist conflict (e.g. tribals vs. non tribals or white vs. Negroes) is the product of struggle for biological dominance.

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 of prejudice and the authoritarian personality theory. Scapegoat theory of prejudice is based on
Freud's concept of hostility displacement and Dollard's frustration aggression hypothesis. According to this theory, frustration leads to aggression which is inhibited and displaced on to some outgroup in the form of prejudice, Bettelheim and Janowitz (1950, 1964), who were strong proponents of this theory, explained prejudice as a displaced hostility in response to "feelings of deprivation and downward social mobility". The other symptom theory i.e. the authoritarian personality, viewed prejudice as the manifestation of basic flaws in personality structure. The theory argues that the prejudice, a generalized form of attitude, develops in particular type of personalities which are characterised by rigid adherence to conventional values, admiration for power and toughness, generalised hostility, etc. Adorno et al. (1950) believe that highly prejudiced persons manifest more rigid personality organization, greater conventionally in their values, more difficulty in accepting socially deviant impulses as part of the self, a greater tendency to externalize these impulses by means of projection and more inclination to be power-oriented in their personal relationships.

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; Pettigrew, 1959). According to socio-cultural theory, prejudice, is an
attitude which is learned more or less directly as one interacts with his social environment. Long (1951), for instance, is of the view that prejudice is derived through external social and cultural sources and acquired through role-learning without ego-motivation."

**Causes of Prejudice:**

In his somewhat recent book entitled "Prejudice in Indian youth: A Socio-Psychological Study", Hassan (1981) discussed sociological, cultural and personality correlates of prejudice. Among the sociological factors religion, education, social class, occupation, income and parental influence are some of the important causative agents of prejudice. Frustration, aggression, anxiety, rigidity, security, insecurity and intolerance of ambiguity are the major personality correlates of prejudice which are frequently researched and discussed.

As the scope of present research does not permit us to discuss each of the variable in detail, the discussion, therefore, would be limited to most important sociological, cultural and personality correlates of prejudice.

One of the most important sociological correlate of prejudice is religious affiliation. A large number of studies have investigated the influence of religious affiliation on the development of prejudice. The findings of these
studies, whether conducted in India or abroad, are inconsistent and conflicting. For instance Merton (1940), Glock and Stark (1946), Allport and Kramer (1946), Bettelheim and Janowitz (1950), Stoufer (1955), Goldsen et al. (1960), Lenski (1961), Kilpatrick et al. (1970) have reported that Catholics were most hostile toward the Negroes; Protestants were next most prejudiced; and Jews and those with no religious affiliation were the least prejudiced. However, Mackenzie (1948), Rosenblith (1949), Adorno (1950), Campbell (1947) and Harlan (1942) have reported little or no differences between Catholics and Protestants with regard to the extent of prejudice towards Jews. More or less similar conflicting results were obtained by Indian researchers. Thus one group of researchers such as Adinarayana (1953), Chaudhary (1958), Hassan (1975-1978), Enayatullah (1980), and Singh (1980) have observed that Muslims are more prejudiced than Hindus. The other group of researchers, on the other hand, failed to confirm this observation (e.g. Natraj, 1962; Sarkar and Hassan, 1973; and Chatterjee, et al., 1967).

The personality correlates that have been most frequently researched in recent years are authoritarianism, anxiety and rigidity.

A large number of studies have established a positive correlation between authoritarianism and prejudice (Allport and Kramer, 1946; Gough, 1950; Kaufman, 1957; McClosky, 1958;
Roberts and Rokeach, 1956; Smith and Rosen, 1958; Rai, 1980; and Singh, 1980). Other investigators have demonstrated that anxiety plays crucial role in the development of prejudice. Thus investigators like Rokeach (1960), Chatterjee et al. (1972), Hassan (1975-1978), Enayatullah (1980) and Singh (1980) and others have reported a strong positive correlation between anxiety and prejudice. Still other researchers such as Adorno et al. (1950) Jackson Messick and Solley (1957) and Brown (1962) reported positive correlation between rigidity and authoritarianism. Since authoritarian personality is more likely to develop prejudice attitude, it is reasonable to infer that rigid persons would be more prejudiced than non-rigid individuals.

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 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 have achieved a central
place in the entire domain of social psychology. A number of studies (Luchins, 1950; Campbell and McCandless, 1951; Block and Block, 1951; Evans, 1952; Scodel and Mussen, 1953; Scotland and Patchen, 1961; and Diab, 1959) have focussed their attention on exploring the association between prejudice and authoritarianism. There have been relatively fewer studies on the relationship between personality variables and prejudice. Theoretically prejudice is an important mark of personality. As Allport (1954) writes—"A person acts with prejudice in the first instance because he perceives it in a certain way. But he perceives it in a certain way partly because his personality is what it is".

Allport's view on prejudice suggests that personality variables 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 persons or a group. Individuals with higher levels of anxiety display higher levels of prejudice. Rokeach (1960) found that anxiety manifestations were more among close minded or prejudiced persons. In an extensive study, Siegel (1954) found that anxious type of persons are more susceptible to develop prejudice than non-anxious persons. On the basis of these findings one may
easily infer that psychologically sick personalities are more prone to develop prejudice as compared to healthy personality. An individual is assumed to have healthy personality if he reveals himself. As Jourard (1961) points out that the expression of "true-self" in a proper degree in an approved form is a symptom of healthy personality. In other words healthy personality is determined by the extent to which an individual expresses his ideas, feelings, desires, aggression, love, hate etc. to another person in his social environment. Numerous researchers found a close relationship between self-disclosure and mental health (Jourard, 1959a, 1963b; Ruesch and Baleson, 1951; Breaton, 1958; Halversion and Shore, 1969; Traux and Carkhuff, 1965; Altman and Frankfurt, 1968; and Sinha, 1973). It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that there should be a relationship between self-disclosure and the development of prejudice.

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". Pederson and Higbee (1969), on the other hand, defined self-disclosure as a process in which a person interacts his ideas to others. Sinha (1969) says "Self-disclosure is the ability to communicate one's real-self to others".
Self is known as the 'inner-core' of one's personality, which plays an important role in human behaviour. Psychologists categorized 'self' into two forms: One is the 'true-self' which is the replica of one's own personality and is known to the individual only. Another is 'Exposed-self', the way of life in which one discloses himself in outer social environment. Lesser the difference between the types of 'selves' greater are the chances of 'sounder mental personality'.

'Self has got the different aspects and self-disclosure' is one of them. Self-disclosure in recent years has been the focus of many studies by psychologists as one of the major determinants of personality. Man is basically a biological organism at birth, but gradually this biological organism undergoes a lot of changes and ultimately becomes a bio-social organism. During this process of socialization man learns how to express himself in the society. He has to observe some cultural, moral, social and ethical norms and taboos.

At the same time the expression of 'True-Self' in a proper degree and in an approved form is a symptom of healthy mental personality. It implies, how much and how truly a person expresses his ideas, feelings, desires, aggressions, love, hate etc. to another person in his social environment. Thus, extent and modes of self-disclosure become important factors for personality studies.
Self-disclosure means to express a person's desires, expressions, feelings, conflicts etc. to others in one's environment. It is one of the most important characteristic of personality. Although self-disclosure is important to every person but it is more important to adolescents, because adolescence is the age of storms, fantasies, aggression, love, hate; and in the present scientific age, there is no proper channelization to these psychic powers. Horney (1936) remarked "More the individual ignores his real feelings, wishes and wants, more alienation from the real self. This estrangement alienation from one's real self is at the root of neurotic personality". If we create a proper understanding and proper environment, where an individual may disclose his urges to others in a proper way, there are more chances that his psychic energy will be manifested in constructive and creative deeds. Most recently, while writing in the September issue of over 21, Vernon Coleman (1986) comments "Try not to hide your feelings for those who are close to you. Remember that it is a kiss and caddie, not an apple, that will keep the doctor away". Thus, self-disclosure is essential for healthy mental personality.

Theoretically self-disclosure can not be the same for all aspects of the self. It is quite easier to talk with others about the natural phenomena. Thus the degree of self-disclosure is not expected to be the same for all aspects of the self. It depends upon many important factors and
conditions. One of the most important factor is the culture and social environment in which one is living. Lewin (1935), Jourard (1958b), Malikian (1962), Plog (1965) have accepted the importance of culture in self-disclosure. Another important factor of self-disclosure is sex. Jourard (1958b), Pederson and Higbee (1969), Himelstein and Lubin (1966), and Dimond and Hellkemp (1969) have found that females disclose more than males. Dimond and Hellkemp (1969) also found that later borns disclose more than 1st born (ordinal difference in self-disclosure).

Another important factor, affecting the self-disclosure is the relationship between the disclosee and the target figure. It depends upon the conditions that how much close he is to him - psychologically?

Many studies, (Block, 1952; Argyle and Dean, 1965; Bach, 1966; Ora, 1968a, 1968b) explored the effect of experimenter's disclosure on the extent of self-disclosure made by the SS. Friedman (1968) explored the role of eye contact in self-disclosure. Hurley (1967) studied the influence of structured confrontation and inter-personal process on self-disclosure in counselling groups. Orne (1962) and Masling (1966) also believed that the relationship between E and S affects research outcomes. Vondracek (1969a, 1969b), Weigel et. al. (1969), Worthy et. al. (1969), Yalom et.al. (1966) also emphasized the importance of experimenter's disclosure for the subject's self-disclosure.
Following Jourard, several subsequent investigators recognized the importance of self-disclosure. An increasingly greater number of studies were conducted to relate it with important social phenomena. Fitzgerald (1963), explored the relationship between self-disclosure and self-esteem and social distance. Lubin (1965), for example, pointed out the relationship of self-disclosure, anxiety, depression and hostility. Jourard (1959), inquired into the relationship between self-disclosure and liking. Lefkowitz (1970) designed an experiment to study the relationship between self-disclosure and interpersonal attraction. Sinha and Tripathi (1975) prepared a personality profile of high self-disclosure students. Lubin (1965) found that low disclosure subjects were more anxious, depressed and hostile as compared to high disclosure subjects. Fitzgerald (1963) observed that there was less social distance among his high disclosure subjects in comparison among low disclosure subjects. Jourard (1959) found that subjects tended to vary the amount of disclosure output to colleagues with degree of liking for colleagues, and to know more about the colleagues whom they liked best than those whom they liked less. Lefkowitz (1970) observed that reputation for readiness to disclose one self is a factor of interpersonal attraction. Sinha and Tripathi (1975) noticed high obedience, high conformity and high submission among high disclosure subjects. In his recent study, Saxena (1982) investigated the relationship between
self-disclosure and hostility. He found that high self-disclosure subjects were less hostile (as measured by Saxena Hostility Scale, 1979) than low self-disclosure subjects. Moreover, there has been a great deal of interest in the effect of self-disclosure on the quality of interpersonal relationships. A number of researchers (see, e.g. Jourard, 1971) have maintained that individuals react positively to others who make disclosures to them and the act of revealing personal information to others has a beneficial effect on the development of interpersonal relationships. Several investigators have argued that disclosure is reciprocated because it results in increased interpersonal attraction and trust and this process causes the relationship to become closer and more intimate (Jourard, 1971; Altman and Taylor, 1973; Rubin, 1974).

The above discussion reveals that self-disclosure as a personality variable influence certain social behaviour. More specifically, a relationship is established between self-disclosure, conformity, submission and social distance on the one hand and between self-disclosure and liking, interpersonal attraction and hostility on the other hand. In short it has been demonstrated that high disclosure subjects are more obedient, more submissive, less hostile, less anxious and have better interpersonal relationship with others as compared to low disclosure subjects. Since hostility, anxiety and arrogance are the characteristics of prejudiced
persons, it is, therefore, reasonable to assume that there should be a relationship between self-disclosure and communal prejudice. More specifically whether or not persons disclose personal information to others may have differential effect on the development of communal prejudice. In other words self-disclosure, a personality variable, may influence the development of communal prejudice.

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 attitudes. These observations make it clear that beside self-disclosure and other 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 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 adaptation 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."

In fact the concept of adjustment was originated in biology. In biology the term 'adaptation' is usually used which is equivalent to adjustment. The concept of adaptation was a corner stone in Darwin's (1859) theory of evolution. According to Darwin (1859) only those species most
fitted to adapt to the hazards of physical world would survive. Biologists and physiologists are still concerned with adaptation, and many human illness are thought to be the result of physiological processes of adaptation to the stress of life (Selye, 1966). The biological concept of adaptation has been borrowed by the psychologists and renamed 'adjustment'. Adjustment and adaptation together represent a functional perspective for viewing and understanding human-animal behaviour. Behaviour is seen as having the function of dealing with or mastering demands that are made upon the individual by his environment.

As physiologists are concerned with physiological survival or adaptation, the psychologists, on the other hand, are interested in psychological survival or adjustment. Parallel with the biological concept of adaptation, in psychology, behaviour is interpreted as adjustment to demands or pressures. These demands, according to psychological analysis, are of two kinds. The first kind of demand is social or interpersonal which results from having to live inter-dependently with other persons. A second kind of demand is primarily internal, arising in part from the biological make-up of man which requires certain physical conditions such as food, water and warmth for comfort and survival, and in part from his having learnt from his personal history to desire certain kinds of social conditions such as approval and achievement. Thus adjustment consists of
psychological processes by means of which the individual manages or copes with various demands or pressures. This point is further elaborated by Singh (1977) who states "the process of adjustment requires an understanding of the nature of motivating forces, characteristics of reactions to frustration, proper resolution of conflicts, maintaining anxiety and stress at an intensity that may be best conducive to a useful level of drive, relative freedom from the bondage of different defense mechanisms and adequate learning and profitting from that learning. When this process is established with economic psychological effort, an inner as well as outer harmony or homoestasis is established."

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). While discussing the relationship between mental health and adjustment, Tyson (1951) prepared following detailed list of criteria of good adjustment:

(1) Adaptability - acceptance of changes both in himself and in his environment.
(2) Capacity for affection - ability to love others and to accept love and support from others.
(3) Relative freedom from fear, anxiety and tension.
(4) Appropriate behaviour for one's age, sex, status or role and for the time and place.
(5) Ability to determine issues on which one may yield and those on which one should stand firm.

(6) Balanced life - varied activity, multiple interests in life.

(7) Code acceptance with adequate emancipation from group or culture.

(8) Confidential or intimate relationship with some person.

(9) Cooperation - balance between enjoyment of working alone and working cooperatively.

(10) Acceptance of honest criticism without sacrificing independence of thinking.

(11) Ability to profit from experience.

(12) Tolerance of frustration - acceptance of facts of success with joy and graceful acceptance of failure; ability to meet failure with humour, constructive ideas, and fighting spirit rather than with fear, rage, hopelessness, or suspicion.

(13) Goals that are in harmony with socially approved aims; ability to delay immediate satisfaction for long-term values.

(14) Ability to live within limits of reasonable health requirements.

(15) Ability to maintain sense of humour.
(16) Balance between independence and dependence.

(17) Self-insight (realistic self-concept).

(18) Permanent loyalties with mutual satisfaction.

(19) Selection of mate on the basis of reason, not fantasy.

(20) Moderation - no over emphasis on any aspect of life.

(21) Objectivity in new situations, decisions, evaluation of failures.

(22) Orderly existence in sleeping, eating, working, etc.

(23) Primary attention to the present.

(24) Healthy outlook on life.

(25) Persistence - Continued adaptation action in spite of obstacles.

(26) Acceptance of reality.

(27) Postponement of rewards - willingness to wait for future pleasures.

(28) Satisfaction - energy, zest, and spontaneity.

(29) Self-control - reasonable intellectual control of emotions.

(30) Self-respect of self-esteem.

(31) View of sex expression as normal phase of life.

(32) Social adjustment - even-temper, alertness, social consideration.
(33) Tolerance - effort to get along with and understand others.

(34) Social awareness - creative use of leisure time by contributing to school, family, and community.

(35) Vocational adjustment.

Robert Hoppock (1957), on the other hand, has reduced all criteria into one sentence definition of good adjustment. He says "if a man is healthy, he earns enough for necessities, is not often unemployed, is satisfied with his work and in his human relations, in general, he is well adjusted." While discussing the symptoms of healthy personality, Jourard (1971) commented "Self-disclosure is a symptom of personality health and a mean of ultimately achieving healthy personality. Every maladjusted person has not made himself known to another person and in consequence does not know himself." Horney (1950) too has stressed "the significance of not ignoring one's true feelings, wishes and wants. The more one ignores the expression of his self, the more he is likely to feel alone and isolated". Numerous 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 a confident. Regardless
of their level of general socializing, those old people who had at least one confident—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 and 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 is, therefore, reasonable to assume that self-disclosure
should 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 relationships with other individuals. They do not have inner needs which make them bow to everyone 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 temtrums when they cannot have their own way. They may join the ranks of revolutionists rather than evolutionists. 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 Guthri (1958), for instance, observed that maladjusted subjects developed symptoms of anxiety and inferiority. More or less similar observations were made by Chauhan, Tiwari and Khattar (1973). 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-de-evaluation of the individual leading to adverse impact on individual 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 familiarity, 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 antisocial behaviour. Moreover, it has been found that well adjusted persons do not suffer from inner feelings which must be assuaged 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 relationship 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 individuals, they resort to aggressive behaviour in order to reduce tension. In these cases the actual frustrating agent is ignored. Someone or something else receives the attack. This same 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 whereelse, 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.