CHAPTER -II

REVIEW OF STUDIES
As mentioned in Chapter-I, the present investigation is undertaken to study communal prejudice in relation to self-disclosure and adjustment. More specifically, the present research investigates the influence of different degrees of self-disclosure and adjustment on the development of communal prejudice.

In this chapter we shall review some of the relevant studies which bear directly or indirectly to the problem. The chapter is divided into three parts. The first part review those studies that bring to focus some of the relevant sociological and personality correlates of communal prejudice. The second part is devoted to the review of those studies which, directly or indirectly, help in establishing a relationship between communal prejudice and self-disclosure. Finally the last part of the chapter reviews those studies which throw light on the relationship between communal prejudice and adjustment.

**PART - I**

**Prejudice and Religion**

Stoufer (1955) demonstrated that among a representative sample of American church members, those who had attended church within the past month were more intolerant of
non-confirmists (such as socialists, atheists, or communists) than those who had not attended. It appeared that on the average religious people showed more intolerance in general, not only toward ethnic but also toward ideological groups. Several investigators (Merton, 1940; Allport and Kramer, 1946; Bettelheim and Janowitz, 1950; and Kilpatrick et al., 1970) reported that Catholics were most hostile towards the Negroes; Protestants were next most prejudiced; and Jews and those with no religious affiliation were least prejudiced. But these reports got only partial support or no support from the other investigators (Mackenzie, 1948; Rosenblith, 1949). On the other hand, some investigators have reported little or no difference between Catholics and Protestants with regard to the extent of prejudice toward Jews. More or less similar findings were obtained by Adorno et al. (1950), Campbell (1947) and Harlan (1942). However, Triandis and Triandis (1960) observed that ethnic prejudice was highest among Catholics, next among Protestants, and lowest among Jews. Kilpatrick et al. (1970) indicated that Catholics were consistently more dogmatic than members of other religious groups.

Some researchers studied the relationship of religiosity with prejudice in different faith groups. Parry (1949) found that church going Protestants were more prejudiced than non-church going Protestants. Similarly, Ross (1950) found no prejudice among atheists and agnostics. Adorno et al. (1950) found that religious people as compared to non-religious one,
were more prejudiced towards Jews and Negroes. Blum and Man (1960) discovered that students associated with religious clubs were more anti-Semitic than those who were not associated with such clubs. Notwithstanding these researchers there are few studies that have reported contradictory results. In one study significant positive correlation was obtained between pro-religious attitude and liberal racial attitude (Liu, 1961). Allen (1965) found significantly negative correlation between religiosity and prejudice. Similar findings were reported by Evans (1952) Siegman (1962) and Stormmen (1963). Allport and Ross (1967), however, found that religious people were by and large, more prejudiced than non-religious people. They maintained that the relationship between religiosity and prejudice is curvilinear. Regular and devout church attenders tended to be less prejudiced than non-attending members, who in their turn appeared to be less prejudiced than average church goers.

The contradictory findings on the relationship of religiosity and prejudice might be due to the fact that most of the studies had not taken into account such factors like education, sex, religious affiliation, social class etc. which might have produced an effect on their relationships. Thus, Allport and Ross (1967) demonstrated that the relationship between religiosity and prejudice was influenced by education. The researches comparing the religious groups in the Indian context have also yielded inconsistent results. Many investigators have reported that Muslims, as compared to Hindus, have

While studying the prejudices among Hindu and Muslim subjects, Hassan (1974) found that Muslim subjects had more religious, caste and sex prejudice than the comparable Hindu subjects. The findings of Hassan's study also revealed that Muslim subjects showed a higher sense of religiosity than the Hindu subjects. In recent years, there have been a few studies which demonstrated differences between religious groups. Adinarayana (1977) reported that the South Indian Hindu had less social ill-feeling toward the Muslim than the North Indian Hindu. He found little significant difference between the racial and communal attitudes of men and women in India.

Singh (1979), for example, in his study of the development of religious identity and prejudice among Hindu, Muslim and Sikh children, found that the development of religious identity was earlier in the Muslim and Sikh children than in the Hindus. It was also observed that the levels of prejudice in Muslim and Sikh children were much higher than those of Hindus. Taking a large sample of 1150 school students from grade VIII (age 11-13 years) and grade XI (age 15-17 years), Singh (1980) compared Hindus, Muslims, Tribal Hindus and Christians on various dimensions of prejudice and attitude in relation to some important socio-psychological variables. The different religious and ethnic groups were ranked on their mean prejudice scores. The results revealed that Muslims were the most
prejudiced, the tribal Christians and Hindus the least prejudiced. Hassan et. al. (1976-1977), however, found no differences in anti-Hindu attitudes of Christians and non-Christian tribals.

Natraj (1962) observed that Hindus and Jains showed more conservative socio-economic attitudes than the Muslims. In another study conducted by Natraj (1965) on social distance within and between castes and religious groups of college girls, the subjects were approached individually and on the basis of a modified form of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale, they were requested to answer their preference for different types of social relationship. It was found that Sindhis were most distant from the other groups, Brahmins were the least distant from other groups, Hindus and Jains were the most conservative and the Muslims were the least conservative and they were most distant from the other groups. Natraj observed that social distance was more among religious groups than among the caste groups within any one religious group. Sarkar and Hassan (1973) also found Hindus having higher degree of economic conservatism than Muslims. In their famous study of Riots, Rourkela, Chatterjee et.al. (1967) compared attitudes and prejudice of Hindus, Muslims and Tribals, and found that despite the gruesome experiences undergone by the Muslim community, there was no evidence of communal mistrust among Muslims for either non-Muslims in general or different types
of groups based on language, religion, culture or political affiliation. On the other hand, there was more mistrust among Hindus for Muslims.

Khan (1979) studied the relationship between religiosity and prejudice. The aim of this study was to examine the differences between persons affiliated to different religious groups and the impact of the intensity of their faith in religions on their religious prejudices. He hypothesized that there would be significant difference between Hindu and Muslim subjects with regard to both the degree of religiosity and extent of religious prejudice in them; the Muslims were expected to score higher on both the variables than their Hindu counterparts and there would be high positive correlation between the religiosity scores and the religious prejudice scores of the Hindu and the Muslim subjects.

The sample of the study consisted of 110 Hindu and 75 Muslim graduates engaged in different professions in Gaya and Ranchi towns. They all came from upper-middle and lower-upper socio-economic status groups. The age of the subjects ranged from 24 years to 47 years (average age = 31.5 years). Keeping in view the requirements of the author's main survey on the impact of parents on the development of religious prejudice in children, the purposive sampling technique was used to draw the sample.
Religious Prejudice Scale as developed by Singh and Khan (1975), Religiosity Scale as developed by Bhushan (1970), were administered on the sample. The data were analysed by using two types of statistical techniques. The first type of analysis was done to test the significance of difference between the Hindu subjects and the Muslim subjects with regard to both religiosity and religious prejudice. For this purpose 't' ratio was calculated. He found that there existed a significant difference between Hindus and Muslims with regard to both religiosity and religious prejudice. Muslim subjects were found to be more religious than the Hindu subjects. Similarly Muslim subjects scored significantly higher than the Hindu subjects on religious prejudice scale. Such findings were explained in the light of Islamic teachings that require strict adherence to the religious duties like Namaz (prayer), Roza (Fasting), Zakat (obligatory religious tax), Haj (Pilgrimage), etc. Every Muslim is essentially required to perform these duties. This makes a Muslim more religious than the people of other religions. The relatively greater degree of religious prejudice in Muslims than the Hindus was attributed to the facts of minority status of the Muslims as well as greater degree of religiosity in them.

Another type of statistical analysis was done to examine the nature of relationship between religiosity and religious prejudice. For this purpose, coefficient of correlation was calculated. The results indicated that there existed a high
degree of positive relationship between the two factors. In other words, a person who was more religious might be expected to be more prejudiced to the people of other religious and vice-versa.

In a comprehensive study Singh and Sinha (1981) administered a scale to measure prejudice among Hindu and Muslim students from mixed and segregated schools. The age of the subjects ranged from 14-16 years and other factors such as sex, education and parental economic and educational status were kept constant. They found that Muslim students in mixed or segregated schools were more prejudiced as compared to Hindu students. Similarly, findings obtained by M.W.Carithers (1970), revealed that desegregated schools reduce prejudice than segregated schools.

**Parental Influence**

There are a number of studies reporting positive correlation between parental prejudice and those of children (Frenkel - Brunswik and Sanford, 1945; Radke, Trager and Davis, 1949; Bird et.al. 1952; Radke - Yarrow, Trager and Miller, 1952; Frenkel - Brunswik and Havel, 1953; Mosher and Scodes, 1960; Anisfeld et.al. 1963; Goodman, 1964; Epstein and Komorita, 1966 a; Troll et.al. 1969). Other studies indicating the similarity between the attitudes of parents and children are provided by Horowitz and Horowitz (1938),

Vyas (1973) studied the development of religious, caste, class and linguistic prejudices in Hindu, Muslim and Christian children of 3 to 8 years of age. Her aim was to study the influence of various socio-psychological factors, like age, sex, religion, caste, socio-economic status etc., on the learning of concepts and respective prejudices among children. She also attempted to study the role of parental attitudes and behavioural practices in the learning of prejudices among the children. She found that some socio-psychological factors as well as parental influence had an impact on the acquisition of prejudice in children.

Khan (1977) attempted to explore the factors related to the origin and development of religious prejudice in Indian children. More specifically, the study was designed to investigate the role of certain socio-psychological factors in the development of religious identity and prejudice among the children. The factors selected for examination were: (a) age, sex, religion and school's set up (b) parental characteristics, namely authoritarianism, religiosity, religious
prejudice and attitude concerning child rearing practices. The main hypothesis of the study were as follows:

(i) there would be significant difference between the children of different age-levels with regard to the development of religious identity and prejudice in them; showing an upward trend with the increase in their age-levels; (ii) there would be significant positive correlation between the development of religious identity and religions among children at each age level; (iii) the development of religious identity and prejudice would be faster in female children than in male children; (iv) the development of religious identity and prejudice would be faster in Muslim children than in Hindu children; (v) this hypothesis had two parts; (a) the development of religious identity would be earlier in children attending integrated school than in children attending segregated schools; (b) the development of religious prejudice would be more in degree in children attending segregated schools than in children attending integrated schools; (vi) the development of religious identity and prejudice in the children would bear a positive correlation with their parent's authoritarianism; (vii) the development of religious identity and prejudice in the children would bear a positive correlation with their parents religious prejudice; (viii) the development of religious prejudice and prejudice identity would bear a positive correlation with their parents domineering attitudes concerning child rearing practices; (ix) the development of religious identity and prejudice in children would bear a positive
correlation with their parent's possessive attitudes concerning child-rearing practices and (x) the development of religious identity and prejudice in the children would bear a negative correlation with their parent's ignoring attitudes concerning child-rearing practices.

A sample of school-going Hindu and Muslim boys and girls ranging in age from 4 years to 9 years was selected for this study. Parents of these children were educated. They were service holders and their monthly income ranged from Rs.400/- to Rs.1000/- per month. All the children were from Gaya town attending two integrated (in which at least 25% children of other religious communities were also enrolled) and four segregated (in which more than 95% children of only one religious community were enrolled) schools.

Altogether 286 Hindu and Muslim children of both the sexes were interviewed. The interviews were conducted by using the Doll-Picture Interview Schedule and the responses of the children to the questions of the schedule were recorded therein.

For the purposes of examining the influence of parental characteristics on the development of religious identity and prejudice in their children, certain characteristics of the parents (both fathers and mothers) of the children were also studied with the help of test namely, California P-Scale, developed by Adorno et.al. (1950), Religiosity Scale, developed by Bhushan (1970), Religious Prejudice Scale, developed by
Singh and Khan (1975) and Parental Attitude Survey, adapted in Hindi by Sinha (1970). Altogether fathers of 255 children (171 Hindus and 94 Muslims) and mothers of 241 children (155 Hindus and 86 Muslims) were tested. The response of the parents towards items of these tests were converted into scores according to the scoring schemes of the tests. These scores were later put to appropriate statistical analysis.

The results revealed that age and religion of the children played significant role in the development of religious identity and prejudice in them. But the role of sex in the development of RI (Religious Identity) and RP (Religious Prejudice) in the children does not appear to be important. The set up of the school of the children played a specific role in the development of RI but its role in the development of RP could not be determined.

Moreover, it was found that development of religious identity in children was positively related with the religiosity and religious prejudice of their parents. Similarly, the development of religious prejudice in children tended to be correlated positively with their parent's authoritarianism, religious prejudice and their domineering attitudes concerning child-rearing practices.

In a recent study, Hassan (1983) examined the role of parents in the development of child's prejudice by comparing children of four parental categories namely, prejudiced
parents, unprejudiced parents, prejudiced father/unprejudiced mother, and prejudiced mother/unprejudiced father.

A stratified random sample of 800 parents (400 pairs) and their 400 tenth and eleventh grades school children were selected from Ranchi and Dhanbad districts of Bihar. Prejudiced and parental behaviour were measured by specifically developed scales. The stratification was based on religion (Hindu/Muslim) and sex (Male/Female).

Religious, caste, class and sex prejudice were measured by Likert type four subscales. Hassan (1983) found that parents tended to produce definite effects on the development of children's prejudice as was evident from the fact that children whose parents were prejudiced had highest degree of prejudices and were brought up under restriction and authoritarian parental discipline. Conversely, children having unprejudiced parents were least prejudiced. However, he found no differential impact of father's and mother's prejudice on their male child but female child tended to be influenced by the prejudice of her mother.

Authoritarianism and Prejudice

Several investigators have also indicated the relationship between parental discipline and prejudice. Murphy (1953) observed that prejudice in India may be associated with child rearing practices that are most typically characterized by
emphasis on dependence and obedience to authority, early freedom from frustration leading to the absence of habit controlling aggression and lack of encouragement for group planning thinking. Carstair (1957) found differences in child-rearing practices and family patterns among different castes and felt that these differences influenced the deeper core of personality and attitudes. Kali Prasad (1964), Koestler (1940) and Taylor (1948) have commented that Indian Society is basically an authoritarian society characterized by hierarchical caste structure and joint family systems. In an Indian family, children are exposed to non-permissive and authoritarian parental discipline which possibly gives rise to prejudice in them. In three separate studies, Hassan (1974, 1976, 1977) found that prejudiced children were brought up under authoritarian child-rearing practices, whereas "unprejudiced" children were brought up under permissive child-rearing practices. Singh (1980) found that authoritarian child rearing practices were associated with high prejudice in Hindu, Muslim and Christian School students. Enayatullah (1980) found similar results in Hindu, Muslim and Christian College students. Rai (1980), in her comparative study of "prejudiced" and "unprejudiced" Hindu female children and their parents, found that authoritarian and restrictive child rearing practices as opposed to permissive and friendly ones were associated with prejudice. Khan (1980) also found more or less the same results. These studies and
other numerous studies have established that there is positive relationship between authoritarianism and prejudice.

However, investigators have reported that other factors are more related to prejudice than authoritarianism. Srole (1956), thus, administered on a sample of 401 white adults, a scale consisting of 15 items; five in order to study their racial and religious prejudice, five questions in revised form of the F-Scale to measure authoritarianism, and five questions to measure feeling of anomie (the sense of isolation from others). Srole (1956) found that the correlation between anomie and prejudice was .35 when the effect of authoritarianism was held constant; that an authoritarianism and prejudice was .12 when the effect of anomie was controlled. The investigator concluded that anomie was more related with prejudice than was authoritarianism. This finding, however, could not be substantiated by other studies.

Roberts and Rokeach (1956) found a correlation of .35 between authoritarianism and ethnocentrism when anomie was held constant, and a correlation of .37 between anomie and ethnocentrism when authoritarianism was controlled.

**Psycho-social and Personality Correlates of Prejudice**

There have been very few studies on the relative influence of socio-psychological correlates of prejudice. However, in their study on riots, Chatterjee et al. (1967)
observed that the deeply rooted Psychological factors and particular social climate were the most important causes for the communal conflicts. Similarly, the study of Singh (1967) demonstrated that high and low tension individuals differ on certain Psychological characteristics, but he did not attempt to examine the relative influence of sociological and psychological variables on prejudice. There is, however, one Indian research which makes a comparative evaluation of psychological and sociological correlates of prejudice (Singh and Hassan, 1976). The researchers observed that out of the three sociological variables namely, religious affiliation, caste-status and urban-rural origin, only religious affiliation was associated with prejudice. On the other hand, both the psychological variables, namely anxiety and authoritarianism were highly correlated with prejudice.

However, Hassan (1976-77) undertook an extensive study to investigate some important sociological and psychological correlates of prejudice. The main objectives of the study were: (1) to study the sociological correlates of prejudice; (ii) to study the personality correlates of prejudice; (iii) to make a comparative evaluation of sociological and personality correlates of prejudice and (iv) to test the generality of prejudice. Religious affiliation (Hindu/Muslim), caste status (upper/lower and urban-rural origins) are the sociological correlates whereas anxiety and authoritarianism were the personality correlates covered by the study. Three
dimensions of social prejudice, namely religious, caste and sex were taken into consideration. Moreover, religion information, allied attitudes (religiosity and belief in caste system) and social stereotypes (religion, caste and sex) were also studied.

A stratified random sample of 320 college students was taken from colleges of Ranchi and Jamshedpur. Stratification of the sample was done on the basis of religious affiliation, caste status and urban-rural origin. There were eight groups namely, upper-caste Hindu urban origin, lower caste Hindu urban origin, upper caste Hindu rural origin, lower caste Hindu rural origin, upper caste Muslim urban origin, lower caste Muslim urban origin, upper caste Muslim rural origin, and lower caste Muslim rural origin. There were 40 subjects in each group. All the eight groups were equivalent in all respects. The questionnaire applied on the sample for collection of data included prejudice scales consisting of three sub-scales: religious, caste and sex prejudice scales; Religious Information Scale; Religiosity Scale; Belief in caste system scale; Stereotypes Scale consisting of an adjective check list to measure religious, caste and sex stereotypes; Sinha's Anxiety Scale; and a modified and adapted version of California F-Scale to measure authoritarianism.
The main findings of the study were as follows:

(i) The Muslims were found to be more prejudiced than Hindus and also had a higher degree of religiosity and belief in caste system. They had also higher, though not significant, degree of anxiety and authoritarianism.

(ii) Significant negative correlation between prejudice and religious information was found.

(iii) Personality variables (e.g., anxiety and authoritarianism) were found to be more powerful correlates of prejudice than sociological variables (e.g., religious affiliation, caste status and urban-rural origin). Both anxiety and authoritarianism were positively correlated with prejudice whereas only religious affiliation, among sociological variables, had a significant positive correlation with prejudice.

(iv) Prejudice appeared as an expression of personality. The three dimensions of prejudice namely, religiosity, caste system, anxiety and authoritarianism were positively correlated.

As mentioned above, Hassan (1976-77) found that, though not statistically significant, the Muslim had a higher degree of anxiety and authoritarianism than the Hindus. Their higher levels of anxiety could very well reflected their socio-economic and political insecurity, particularly because the sample had been taken from Ranchi and Jamshedpur with recent memories of communal riots. The general tendencies of their
research indicated the importance of personality variables in prejudice. On the whole, it might be concluded that personality variables are more related to prejudice than the sociological variables.

On the basis of his findings, Hassan argued that anxiety is the most powerful correlates of prejudice. Many researchers revealed that high anxious individuals displayed higher levels of prejudice than low anxious subjects. Rokeach (1960), for example, found that his close minded or prejudiced subjects were more anxious. Siegel (1954) administered the F-Scale and the Taylor's Manifest Anxiety Scale. He found that subjects high in authoritarianism also tended to be high in anxiety. This shows that anxious people are more susceptible to develop prejudice Cooper (1956) found that subjects high in authoritarianism expressed more anxiety than those who were low in authoritarianism. Altus and Tefejian (1953) observed more anxiety, obsessive - compulsive traits and paranoid tendencies among groups scoring high in ethnic prejudice. Some studies conducted in India also reported a strong positive correlation between anxiety and prejudice (Chatterjee et.al. 1972; Hassan, 1975, 1978; Sinha and Hassan, 1975; Singh and Hassan, 1976; Enayatullah, 1980; and Singh, 1980).

Many studies have demonstrated that highly prejudiced individuals have a greater tendency to displace hostility than unprejudiced individuals; and prejudiced individuals are more
susceptible to frustration (Raper, 1933; Houland and Sears, 1940; Cantril, 1941; Pettigrew and Cramer 1959). Several Psychoanalytically oriented authors like Brown (1942), Fenichal (1946), Sterba (1947), Ackerman and Jahoda (1950), Battelheim and Janowitz (1950) have stressed the role of displaced aggression in prejudice. Wright (1945) and Cohen and Murphy (1966) have reported, that displaced aggression plays a very important role in the growth of prejudice.

In an experimental study, Berkowitz (1959) found that anti-semitic college girls when subjected to frustration, tended to displace their aggression towards their males. Further supporting evidences that prejudiced individuals tend to show greater hostility after frustration, were provided by Berkowitz (1961), Weatherby (1961), and Berkowitz and Green (1962). Similarly, there are studies to indicate that prejudiced individuals as compared to non-prejudiced ones are more easily frustrated. In a study Lindzey (1950) selected 10 prejudiced and 10 non-prejudiced subjects and subjected them to the frustration, manipulated by the experimenter Lindzey (1950) found prejudiced subjects more frustrated than non-prejudiced subjects. Silverman and Klieman (1967) found that prejudiced subjects scored higher on measures of frustration and response deviance than non-prejudiced subjects. Many investigators have also observed positive correlation between prejudice, and frustration (Allport and Kramer, 1946; Morse, 1947; Rosenblith, 1949; Bettelheim and Janowitz, 1950; and Gough, 1951).
Prejudice and Self-disclosure

A number of studies reviewed above have shown that prejudiced persons are significantly high in anxiety, depression, aggression, frustration, neuroticism and hostility. Thus individuals with higher levels of anxiety, depression, aggression, frustration and hostility display higher level of prejudice. A person who shows high level of anxiety, depression, aggression, hostility, neuroticism is also considered as psychological sick person.

On the basis of these findings, 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. If we create a proper understanding and proper environment, where an individual may disclose his urges to others in a proper way, there are bright chances that his psychic energy will be manifested in constructive and creative deals. Thus self-disclosure is essential for healthy mental personality. A number of researchers have found a close relationship between self-disclosure and mental health (Ruesch and Baleson, 1951; Breeton, 1958; Jourard, 1963; Traux and Carkhuff, 1965;
Altman and Frankfurt, 1968; Halverson 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; 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 unusually low or high levels of self-disclosure being related to maladjustment.

Ruesch and Baleson (1951) reported a positive relationship between self-disclosure and psychological health of personality. They pointed out that mentally ill were deficient in some of the skills for communicating with others i.e. in the ability to transmit their thoughts and feelings. The fear of communicating these aspects of one's experience to others seriously deteriorates mental health. The aim of psychotherapists is to help the patient to discover the self and encouraging the patient to disclose his experience to others. Ruesch (1951) examined the relationship between self-disclosure and Psychological health and found that the competence of communication indicates the degree of psychological health of personality. Fitzgerald (1963), found the relationship between self-disclosure and self-esteem and social distance. Lubin (1965) found that low disclosure subjects were more anxious, depressed and hostile as compared to high disclosure subjects. In India few studies
have been conducted on the relationship between self-disclosure and mental health. Sinha (1973) found a positive relationship between self-disclosure and mental health. Sinha and Tripathi (1975) found high obedience, high conformity and high submission among high disclosure subjects. Sinha (1977a) tried to know the degree of self-disclosure in anxiety and hysterical patients and found that anxiety and hysterical patients were much low on self-disclosure scale than normal subjects.

**Self-disclosure and Hostility**

Saxena (1982) investigated the relationship between self-disclosure and hostility. Saxena Hostility Scale was administered on a large sample of Gorakhpur University students enrolled in the faculties of Arts, Commerce and Science. The age of all the students was between 17 to 23 years. On the basis of their scores on this scale, two extreme groups were formed namely, high hostile (HH) subjects and low hostile (LH) subjects. There were 100 subjects in each group. These two groups were given Sinha's Self-Disclosure Inventory (SSDI). SSDI was developed on the pattern of Jourard's self-disclosure questionnaire and measured self-disclosure in eight areas of self namely (i) personality (ii) money (iii) study (iv) body (v) interest (vi) feeling-ideas (vii) vocation and (viii) sex. Six target figures towards whom the disclosure was studied
were (a) mother (b) father (c) brother (d) sister (e) friend and (f) teacher.

Before the administering of SSDI, students were interviewed. As a result of the interview only those students were selected in the sample who had parents and siblings (both brother and sister) alive. The subjects who were deprived of any of the target figures were excluded from the sample.

The results revealed a significant difference between HH and LH subjects, LH subjects showed significantly high self-disclosure than HH subjects. Regarding preference target figures the rank orders for LH subjects was, friend, father, mother, brother, teacher and sister. The pattern of preference order for HH subjects was identical to LH subjects. It seems that given first place to friend and last place to sister by HH and LH was related with age linked behaviour.

The amount of personal information that one person is willing to disclose to another appears to be an index of the 'closeness' of the relationship and of the affection, love or trust that prevails between the two persons. In more general terms, self-disclosure and cathexis for the other person may be said to be correlated. Thus Jourard (1959b) designed a study to investigate the relationship between self-disclosure and other cathexis.
The eight members of a newly organised college of nursing, together with Dean, served as subjects in the study. Self-disclosure output was measured. Each subject was interviewed by the investigator in order to obtain the information that was collected for in the questionnaire. Since the questions do not presume extreme intimacy, the subjects can be assumed to have been frank in disclosing themselves to the interviewer. Each subject was then asked to indicate to which of her colleagues she had disclosed information about each item. It was thus possible to determine the total amount of disclosure output for each subject, and the varying amounts that each subject had disclosed to each colleague.

Cathexis for the other persons was determined by paired comparisons in terms of the procedure of rank order of preference for each subject, with the best liked colleagues receiving the largest number of choices, and the least liked colleagues receiving the lowest number. Jourard (1959b) found that liking, self-disclosure, self-disclosure intake, knowing, and being known were interrelated. He further demonstrated that despite the existence of a formal role-structure, viz., a dean, various levels of academic rank, different departments, etc., dyads had tended to develop with varying but highly mutual degree of intimacy. Moreover, Jourard (1959b) 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.
A positive relationship between liking and self-disclosure had been obtained in correlational studies in which the level of disclosure was allowed to vary freely (e.g. Jourard, 1959 and Worthy et al. 1969) but was not consistently obtained when level of intimacy was brought under experimental control (e.g. Daher and Banikiotis, 1976; Ehrlich and Greaven, 1971).

Self-disclosure and Social relationship

Social accessibility or self-disclosure refer to the process of communicating information about one self to other person. The readiness to confide personal information has been shown to contribute to the development of social relationship. Jourard and Lasakow (1958) and Jourard (1959b) found that the degree of liking another person was correlated with the amount of self-disclosure to that person, while Jourard and Landsman (1960) indicated that receiving self-disclosure from another person leads to greater disclosure toward that person. Newcomb (1961) also noted that the exchange of personal information leads to the establishment of friendship. Jourard (1961) found that nursing students who scored high on a self-disclosure questionnaire tended to be rated a year later as high in the ability to establish and to maintain a communicative relationship with parents and showed a high degree of openness with the nursing faculty. Presumably, persons who were socially open to others were seen as more
interpersonally competent than individuals who were guarded and closed in their personal affairs. Colson (1965), Frankfurt (1965) and Taylor (1965) found that persons reporting high self-disclosure revealed more about themselves in social interaction situation than low scorers.

Halversion and Shore (1969) investigated the relationship between self-disclosure and interpersonal functioning. Fifty three peace corps trainees were administered a self-disclosure questionnaire during a pretraining assessment programme. Trainees who demonstrated a readiness to confide personal information to others were found to be more well liked by the other trainees and the training staff after 6 weeks of training than trainees who were reluctant to disclose personal information. Halversion and Shore (1969) found that self-disclosure was negatively correlated with authoritarianism and positively correlated with the conceptual complexity, while the negative correlation with the polarity scale was of marginal significance. These findings showed positive relationship of self-disclosure with the behavioural rating of interpersonal flexibility and adaptability, indicating a substantial degree of convergent construct validity for the interpretation of self-disclosure within a framework of interpersonal flexibility and openness.

Many psychologists studied the relationship between self-disclosure and interpersonal attraction. Lefkowitz (1970) designed an experiment to study the relationship between
investigators, on the other hand, found no evidence for a relationship, between disclosure and liking (Ehrlich and Greaven, 1971; Schneider and Eustis, 1972). Such conflicting results obtained by these investigators may be explained in the light of temporal aspects of self-disclosure. As pointed out by Altman (1973) the temporal aspects of self-disclosure have received almost no consideration from past investigators. Most of the investigators (see, e.g. Rubin, 1974) have argued that a disclosure is most likely to enhance interpersonal attraction when we attribute it to the fact that the disclosee likes us, trusts us, and wants the relationship to continue and deepen. If some one makes a disclosing remark after he or she has been talking to us for a while, we are likely to take the remarks personally and infer that it has positive implication for the relationship. This reasoning may help to explain why a number of past experimenters have failed to find a positive relationship between disclosure and liking. Thus Wortman, Anderson, Herman and Greenberg (1976) designed an experiment to examine the role of the timing of the disclosure in determining whether a person's reaction to a high disclosing other would be positive or negative. In their experiment, male subjects were induced to converse with an experimental confederate for about ten minutes. In all cases the confederate reveals something quite personal. Half of the time, the confederate made disclosure shortly after the onset of the interaction and in the remaining session, the
confederate made the disclosure near the end of the conversa-
tion period. The results clearly revealed that an individual
who disclosed something personal quite early in the relationship
was viewed as more immature, maladjusted and tended to be
viewed as more phony and insecure than the late discloser. The
late discloser was liked significantly more than the early
discloser.

Petty and Mirels (1981) tested the hypothesis that the
relationship between the intimacy of self-disclosure and
liking for the self-disclosing person is mediated in part by
the perceived scarcity of the revelations. Within a factorial
design, 220 undergraduates expecting to hear a same-sex partner
disclosed information that was low medium, or high in intimacy
were either given no information about the scarcity of the
disclosures or were led to believe that the partner would
ordinarily reveal such information to a great many people or
very few people. Although both males and females gave clear
evidence of disclosure reciprocity, male's liking for their
partners failed to be influenced by either the intimacy or
scarcity of the expected revelations. For females, when no
scarcity information was provided increased information intimacy
produced greater liking. Petty and Mirels found insignificant
effect of intimacy on attraction when scarcity was held constant
at a high or low levels.

Nakamura and Masahiko (1984) investigated the effect
of self-disclosure on interpersonal attraction on 32 male
subjects. After showing intimate or superficial disclosure, a confederate attributed the cause of this either to the subjects (personalistic condition) or to the confederate himself (non-personalistic condition). They found that subjects who received intimate and personalistic disclosures liked the confederate significantly more than those who received intimate and non-personalistic disclosures. However, those subjects who received superficial and personalistic disclosures disliked the confederate significantly more than those who received superficial and non-personalistic disclosure.

PART - III

Prejudice and Adjustment

The review of the above studies reveals that self-disclosure as a personality variable influences 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 other words, it has been demonstrated that high self-disclosure persons are more submissive, less hostile, have better interpersonal relation and are liked more by other individuals than low self-disclosure persons. These characteristics of high self-disclosure individuals
suggest that high self-disclosure individuals should be less prejudiced than low self-disclosure persons. This contention receives support and strength from 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". Thus this contention was put to test in a recent study conducted by Qamar Jahan (1986). She studied communal prejudice in relation to self-disclosure among Hindu and Muslim youths. The findings of her study revealed that high self-disclosure subjects were more prejudiced than low self-disclosure subjects. These results confirmed the hypothesis formulated by the author. However, it was observed that even among high self-disclosure subjects, some subjects were found to be highly prejudiced. Such observation suggested that beside self-disclosure some other personality variable might be responsible for the development of prejudice. Since it has been demonstrated that self-disclosure is curvilinearly related to mental health, with unusually low or high levels of self-disclosure being related to maladjustment (Cozby, 1973), it might be possible that the high self-disclosure groups of subjects consisted of maladjusted individuals. Thus an important consideration that influenced the thinking of the present investigator to undertake the present study was to see whether or not adjustment – maladjustment contribute in the development of communal prejudice. In the following section of this chapter we shall review some of the relevant studies
that bear directly or indirectly to this problem. Fischer (1949) observed that the feelings of insecurity, anxiety and rigidity lead to maladjustment. Radke (1946) suggested that the personality traits of children and model of behaviour depend upon the type of home. Thus, a rejective, over protective, dominating, submissive, aggressive, sadistic, jealous and delinquent type of environment bring difficulties in adjustment.

**Personality Correlates of Adjustment**

A multi-dimentional study exploring personality correlates of adjustment problems among adolescents was conducted by Pandey (1968). He used Hindi version of Cattell's 16 P.F. test prepared by Jalota and Asthana (1959) to measure personality variables and Hindi form of Mooney Problem Check List to evaluate problems of adjustment together with Hindi forms of survey of Study Habits and Attitudes, Social Behaviour and Social Preference Inventories on a sample of about 500 adolescents. He observed following characteristics among well adjusted and maladjusted adolescents. Emotional maturity or ego strength, submissiveness, expressiveness conventionality, self-sufficiency, sobriety, seriousness, concernedness, withdrawn, restrained, carefulness, and considerateness, aloofness, stiffness, help-seeking, imaginative in life, relaxed, practical, shrewdness, group dependency, low self-sentiment formation and high intelligence were found to be the outstanding characteristics of the better adjusted
adolescent's personality make up. The poorly adjusted adolescents were characterized by the following traits:

- dissatisfied
- emotionality
- dominance
- surgency
- weak super-ego
- tough
- unimaginative
- suspicious
- jealous
- guilt-prone
- conservative in temperament
- self-centered
- lower intelligence

While studying social maladjustment among children as a function of feeling of insecurity, Sanders (1948) found a relationship between mental insecurity and social adjustment with its accompanying behaviour difficulties and non-social attitudes. Moreover, the insecurity was, to a great extent, bound up with feeling of social underevaluation.

Some psychologists investigated the relationship between creativity and social adjustment. For instance, Roe (1953) observed that creative persons were better adjusted as compared to non-creative persons. Mackinnon (1962) examined life history of creative individuals and found not all of them had happy homes and favourable life circumstances and some underwent brutal treatment at the hands of sadistic fathers. Torrance (1962) observed that creative individuals experienced some unusual problems. Thus Sinha (1966) found that low achievers were significantly high on anxiety and were generally more maladjusted. High achievers, on the other hand, were found superior in intelligence better in adjustment and experienced moderate level of anxiety. They were found to be more well-adjusted in areas of home, health and emotions. Similarly Lavin (1965) obtained the evidence concerning
relationship of personality adjustment and academic performance and found that better adjusted students have good academic achievement. They had higher activity level, higher endurance, more responsibility, more emotional stability, higher morale, less anxiety, and independence. They were also docile, passive and obedient. Terman (1964) studied scientists and non-scientists and found higher social adjustment as one of the characteristics of genuis. Gust (1964), Drevedahl (1964) and Cattell (1964, 1965) found that creative individuals were better adjusted in the field of personal, social and emotional adjustment as compared to non-creative individuals. Wallach and Kogan (1965), however, remarked "...... the data in hand do suggest that it is equally unrealistic to assume that the most creative children are the happiest children". Foster (1968) studied human relationship of creative individuals and found that creative individuals may experience some special problems in relation to other persons. Sinha and Sharma (1978) investigated the relationship between different dimensions of adjustment and creativity and found no consistence relation between various dimensions of adjustment and creativity index in female students while in male students, they found significant negative correlation between creativity and adjustment in the areas of home, health and emotional dimensions of adjustment.

Some what recently Singh (1980) undertook an important study with the following major objectives:
(a) To find out the nature and extent of relationship between creativity and adjustment, creativity and frustrations reactions and between creativity and level of aspiration.

(b) To find out the extent to which high and low creative students differ in respect of adjustment, frustrations reactions and level of aspiration.

Six hundred students of IX and X classes served as subjects in the study. Study was ex-post-facto in nature and was carried out by using differential and correlations techniques. The major findings of the study were:

(i) Creativity was found to be positively and significantly related to social and educational adjustment at .05 level but it was not found to be significantly related to emotional adjustment. (ii) High and low creative students were found to differ significantly in their total, emotional and educational adjustment at .05 level but they were not found to differ significantly in their social adjustment.

Some investigators 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 insecurity and tended to be disturbed about interpersonal relationships. Similar observations were made by Chauhan, Tiwari and Khattar (1973). Singh and Kaur (1977) conducted a study to investigate the adjustment of college students belonging to high anxiety and low anxiety groups in
relation to sex. For this purpose, two groups, a high anxiety group and a low anxiety group were formed out of a total sample of 300 subjects from five different colleges of Patiala district studying in the undergraduate classes. They were administered Dutt's Personality Inventory for measuring anxiety. On the basis of Q3 and Q1 Scores on anxiety, two groups of subjects were formed. In this way, 79 subjects (38 boys and 41 girls) fell into the high anxiety group and 76 subjects (42 boys and 34 girls) fell into the low anxiety group. The final sample consisted of 80 boys and 75 girls.

To measure adjustment, subjects belonging to the two anxiety groups were administered Saxena's Vyaktitva Prashnawali (MA-62). The mean S.D. and critical ratio's of adjustment scores of high and low anxiety groups were calculated. Singh and Kaur (1977) found that subjects of low anxiety groups were better adjusted as compared to high anxiety groups. The mean adjustment score in the case of low anxiety group was 69.31 and in the case of high anxiety, it was 52.22. This difference was found to be highly significant statistically as the C-ratio was found to be 7.8 which was significant at .01 level. It seemed that persons with low anxiety were better adjusted as compared to persons with high anxiety. However, no significant differences in the adjustment of boys and girls either for the high or for the low anxiety group were found.
The differences between the adjustment of subjects belonging to the two anxiety groups were found to be statistically significant with respect to all the five aspects of adjustment. The C.Rs were to be 4.02, 7.32, 4.25, 7.74 and 4.95 in case of home, health, social, emotional and college adjustments respectively, each of which was significant at .01 level.

More or less similar study was undertaken by Alam and Srivastava (1983). They studied self-perception as a function of adjustment and anxiety. A 3x3 factorial design comparing three types of adjustment and three levels of anxiety was used. A seven point Semantic Differential Scale having bipolar traits was administered over one hundred eighty undergraduates. The results revealed that self-perception was a function of adjustment and anxiety. Poor adjustment and high anxiety resulted into de-evaluation of the individuals leading to adverse impact on individual self-perception.

Mukherjee and Upadhyay (1980) investigated the dynamics of adjustment and anxiety in relation to health. The main aim of this study was to sift the differences in adjustment and anxiety of normal and hospitalized patients. This study was carried out on seventy males, equally divided into normal persons and hospitalized patients. Hospitalization period of the later group was one to three months. The age range of the ethnic sample was from 20-25 years.
Asthana's (1967) Adjustment and Sinha's (1968) Anxiety scale were used for measuring the degree of adjustment and anxiety respectively. The data were calculated individually. The results obtained by Mukherjee and Upadhyay (1980) revealed that normal subjects were significantly more adjusted than hospitalized subjects. Normal subjects were found significantly less anxious than hospitalized subjects. Furthermore a negative relation between anxiety and adjustment in both types of subjects—normal and hospitalized—was found. In other words, irrespective of the type of groups, well adjusted subjects were found significantly less anxious than maladjusted subjects.

Socio-economic Status and Adjustment

Some researchers attempted to study adjustment as a function of socio-economic status. Shukla and Mishra (1980), for instance, demonstrated that lower class children were higher in maladjustment as compared to the upper class children. Gunthey and Sinha (1983) studied adjustment, anxiety and affiliation as a function of socio-economic status. Thirty advantaged and thirty disadvantaged boys were identified on the basis of S.E.S. Scale (Joshi and Tiwari, 1976). They were matched for age and educational qualification. Adjustment Inventory (Sinha and Singh, 1976), Anxiety Scale (Sinha, 1968) and TPPS (TPPS measures 15 personality variables, one of which is used for affiliation) were administered to each subject.
individually. Results showed that the adjustment of socio-economically deprived boys was poorer as compared to their non-deprived counterparts. On the basis of these results it was inferred that socio-economically deprived boys had emotional instability and were poorly adjusted towards their curricular and co-curricular activities and they had submissive and withdrawal nature. Non deprived boys, on the other hand, were found to have stability in emotions, they were interested in school programmes and have aggressive behaviour. It was also found that disadvantaged boys significantly differed from advantaged boys on anxiety scale. Socio-economically deprived boys had greater degree of anxiety than non-deprived boys. Furthermore need for affiliation was found significantly high in disadvantaged group as compared to their counterparts.

The review of the above studies reveals that self-disclosure and adjustment influence certain social behaviour. So far as self-disclosure - a personality variable is concerned, a positive relationship is established between self-disclosure, conformity, submission and liking on the one hand and a negative relation is found between self-disclosure, anxiety, social distance and hostility on the other hand. In other words high self-disclosure subjects are submissive, less anxious and tend to conform the norms of the society. They are liked by others and they develop cordial interpersonal relations with others. Whereas low self-disclosure subjects
are hostile, aggressive, anxious and fail to develop good relations with other individuals. In view of these characteristics of high and low self-disclosure subjects, it was hypothesized that high self-disclosure individuals should be less prone to develop prejudice and discriminatory attitudes than their counterparts i.e. low disclosure subjects. This hypothesis was recently tested by the present author (Qamar Jahan, 1986) and the results obtained were in the predicted direction.

So far as adjustment variable is concerned the review of studies has made it crystal clear that intimacy is extremely important for good adjustment. It has also become evident that intimacy which is defined as 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 is satisfying relations 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 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 be shown in attitudes toward themselves, such
as lack of confidence or guilt feeling. 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 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 elsewhere, 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 manyfolded in the light of our recent findings that high self-disclosure subjects are less prejudiced than low self-disclosure subjects (Qamir 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 mal-adjusted individuals. The present study is therefore, 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.