CHAPTER II

GENERAL SURVEY OF THE FIELD AND RELATED STUDIES

Perception

The term perception is usually applied to the way one comes to know the world or the way one experiences the world of objects and events. A standard dictionary describes a percept as an impression of an object obtained solely by use of the senses (Weintraub & Walker, 1965). In the encyclopedia of psychology, perception is defined as a psychological function which enables an organism to receive and process information on the state of, and alterations in, the environment (Eysenck, Arnold & Meili, 1972).

Life goes on in a world of things and other people. Were the individual not sensitive and responsive to his environment, he would be unable to satisfy his needs, communicate with his fellows, or enjoy his surroundings. The individual learns to know his world through the data that come to him by way of his sense organs, but what he perceives depends also on what he brings along with him from his past experiences and what his present needs and wishes are as he faces the world. Thus perception has its developmental as well as its interactive aspects.
Perception is an extremely complex process, and scientists are devising methods for examining its anatomical and physiological correlates. Specific areas of the brain appear to have prime importance for different sense organs, but the physiological processes involved in selecting actions are still very poorly understood. Of course, the more that we learn about anatomical and physiological aspects, the more likely we are able to develop means by which to overcome certain kinds of perceptual disorders (Coe, 1972).

Although people's perceptions of many things are quite similar, it is also true that each person has a unique perception of events. A number of personality theorists have emphasized the importance of understanding man on the basis of his unique perceptual field, those events which he perceives as he interacts with the world. An individual's personal interpretation of the world about him is of utmost importance in determining the nature and direction of his adjustment. Each person has a characteristic way of scanning the environment, of selecting inputs, of attaching meanings to them, and of acting upon those meanings. In this sense every individual's perceptual field defines his reality (Coe, 1972). Each person has an individualized image of the world because his image is the product of the following determinants; (1) his physical and social environments,
(2) his physiological structure, (3) his wants and goals, (4) his past experiences. (Krech, Crutchfield & Ballachey, 1962).

Although no two persons have precisely the same conception of the world, there are many common features in the world images of all people. This is true because all human beings have similar nervous systems. They share certain wants and feelings and cope with certain common problems. The cognitive worlds of the members of a particular cultural group are similar to an even greater degree because of greater similarities in their wants and goals, in the physical and social environments to which they are exposed, and in their learning experiences (Krech et al., 1962).

The area of psychology that we call 'perception' can be broadly classified into two categories: object (physical) perception and social perception.

**Object Perception**

Physical objects are more easily perceived than social phenomena because they reveal themselves through their respective physical characteristics, for example, a person views a vase in terms of its shape, color, texture, contour, size, height, width etc. These attributes are easily seen and felt by the perceiver because their qualities are tangible and concrete. The accuracy of our perception of
objects depends primarily on the accurateness of two of our sensory organs - sight and touch. Our perception of objects also depends on external circumstances, such as light. Man is generally correct in his perceptions of objects. It is usually only where the stimuli are unclear or confusing that the mentioned factors can result in distorted perceptions (Wrightsman, 1972).

**Social Perception**

The field of social perception has two major divisions: the perception of other persons, and the personal and social factors that affect our general perceptual processes.

**Person Perception**

The most interesting objects of perception in our environment are other people. Much social conversation is an exchange of opinions and feelings about other people. In our everyday interaction with other persons, we frequently assess their intentions and motives with respect to us. We determine whether or not a person likes us, and our judgment of his feeling guides our own reaction to him. (Secord & Backman, 1964).

Person perception concerns the study of processes by which we come to know and think about other persons, their characteristics, qualities and inner states. Person perception focuses on the process by which impressions,
opinions, or feelings about other persons are formed. It includes subjective judgments and inferences that go beyond direct sensory information (Secord & Backman, 1964; Sills, 1968).

The process of perceiving other people follows the same general laws and principles that govern 'object perception.' However, when people are the objects of perception, additional principles and variables enter the scene. People have emotions, which may or may not be accurately perceived, depending on the circumstances. People have stereotypes about other groups of people, which may enter into their evaluation of a given individual. Some personal traits are more important than others in forming impressions of other people. Our own characteristics may interact with those of other person, thereby affecting the accuracy of our perception of others. Our customary roles and behavioral norms we hold can markedly influence our reactions (Wrightsman, 1972).

The characteristic factor in a perception we label "person" or "social" is that the functional activity giving rise to stimulus has a potentiality of affecting our purposes and being affected by us. Therefore, the "content" of perceptions, we call social is likely to be of vastly more significance and importance to us than the content of most non-social perceptions (Cantril, 1952).

Social psychologists are interested in person perception
mainly because of its relevance for understanding human interaction. Since interaction, as already mentioned is mediated by the feelings, thoughts, and perceptions that individuals have about each other, these subjective processes must be taken into account. In particular, person perception is important to understand the interaction processes of communication, influence, and change (Secord & Backman, 1964).

In everyday life impressions and judgments of other persons are formed in widely varying situations. These situations vary in three major respects: (1) the amount of information available to the perceiver for purposes of forming a judgment concerning the other person, (2) the extent of interaction between the perceiver and the other person, and (3) the degree to which the relation between the perceiver and the other person is a well-established one (Secord & Backman, 1964).

The different modes of perceiving others may be described in terms of a dimension varying from the simple to the complex. Some of the modes of person perception are as follows:

1. A person is described simply in terms of outward appearance or superficial characteristics; e.g. his body build, facial features, and mannerisms.

2. A person is described mainly in terms of a central trait and its immediate ramifications; e.g., a withdrawn
person may be described by such closely related terms as shy, quiet, retiring etc.

3. A person is described in terms of a cluster of congruous traits; i.e. traits which seem to belong together. For example, a large, strong man may be described as having a powerful voice and as being aggressive, self-confident, and forceful.

4. A person is described in terms of a variety of traits, including some which are incongruous. For example a person may be described as kind, thoughtful, dishonest, and unsociable.

Many situations in everyday life provide a minimum of information about another individual and there is minimum of interaction. In such situations non-verbal cues are likely to be used to form an impression of another person. Research has repeatedly shown that when people make judgments from very limited information and interaction, they usually show marked agreement on the characteristics of the person depicted. This is so because several inference processes are brought into play. Temporal extension is one such process: the perceiver regards a momentary characteristic of the person as if it were an enduring attribute. Sometimes, because he resembles a familiar person, the person under consideration may be assigned some of the traits of that person. A very common process is categorization or
classification of the stimulus person according to certain identifying characteristics. The person is then assigned all the attributes which are considered to belong to that class of persons (Secord & Backman, 1964).

What mode a perceiver adopts in person perception depends on the complexity and maturity of his personality. The Personal and Social Factors Affecting Perception

The proverbial man on the street believes that he sees and hears and smells the world as it really is. In other words, he assumes that his perception is veridical. A great deal of psychological research confirms this assumption, but psychologists have also found many instances where our perceptions of stimulus objects are not veridical. These instances are called illusions. Other very persuasive evidence that our perceptions can be wrong comes from the psychology of testimony. Persons who report witnessing certain events are often quite inaccurate, making gross errors of fact and incorrect inferences (Wrightsman, 1972). The question therefore arises as to what are the major personal and social factors that affect our perception.

The major personal and social factors that can influence perceptual experiences can be identified under various categories such as, aspects of stimulus, past experiences, contemporary situational influences, personality factors, group effects and cultural factors.
Properties of stimuli. Properties of stimuli, such as their value to the subject, can influence how objects are perceived. Several experimental findings reveal that when value is regularly associated with a stimulus series, these stimuli are judged larger in magnitude than stimuli from a corresponding series that has no consistent association with value. Thus value is capable of modifying our perception of the world around us (Secord & Backman, 1964).

Meaning of a stimulus object. Meaning of a stimulus object or a situation can influence an individual's perception. If an individual feels that an object he perceives or a situation he is confronted with is threatening, dangerous or anxiety-producing he may respond by developing psychological defenses known as perceptual defensiveness in which recognition threshold for an unpleasant stimulus is raised, making it less likely to be noticed. Another person may respond quite differently. He may develop perceptual sensitization i.e. his recognition threshold for unpleasant stimulus is lowered resulting in increased perceptual vigilance which may enable him to avoid unpleasant consequences associated with the stimulus.

Familiarity. Familiarity of stimuli is another aspect that often affects our perceptual responses to them. There is evidence that more familiar stimuli are recognized more quickly and accurately than less familiar ones. Familiarity
also interacts with other factors such as the meaning of the stimulus.

**Intensity.** Intensity also influences perceptual responsiveness. Many studies have found greater effectiveness with a higher intensity of stimulation. This raises a question as to whether subliminal perception is possible and if so, can it influence other responses such as consumer purchases. Subliminal means below the threshold of awareness. Many studies have shown that some degree of perceptual accuracy can occur even when subjects report as having no awareness of having seen anything and have no confidence in their judgments.

**Previous experience.** Previous experience of an individual with particular stimuli can affect the way they are perceived in contemporary situation. Certain experiences do not increase the probability of occurrence of response, but actually decrease it. If responses are followed by negative or punishing consequences under certain circumstances, the strength of a response disposition may be reduced.

**The contemporary factors.** The contemporary factors prevailing at the moment of perception can affect perception. Hunger, fatigue or anxiety can affect what is perceived. Some experimental findings reveal that the arousal of hunger increased response salience for food objects. A frightened person is more likely to perceive fearful objects (Secord &

**Personal needs and motives.** Personal needs and motives of an individual can affect his perception. A person directing behavior toward a goal does not carry out all possible behavior or respond to all possible stimuli. A hungry woman restaurant-bound in a strange city pays scant attention to attractive shop windows, which at other moments she might stop to admire (Newcomb, 1952).

**Perceiver's cognitive structure.** The cognitive structure and processes that characterize a perceiver are also related to the way in which he perceives other persons. For example, greater concreteness in a person is represented in many ways. He makes more extreme distinctions in his judgments good-bad, right-wrong, black-white, etc. He depends more on authority, precedent, and other extrapersonal sources as guidelines for action; he is intolerant of ambiguous situations. The more abstract person behaves in the opposite of these ways. People who are capable of subsuming diverse concepts under a single broad term were found to be able to see the diverse traits of a person as congruous with each other (Secord & Backman, 1964).

**Perceiver's biases.** Perceivers seem to have a set of biases in judging others. That is, without realizing it, the perceiver has a "theory" about what other people are like, and this "theory" influences his judgments. Although
little tendency was found to rate persons consistently higher or lower on particular traits, perceivers did appear to have definite ideas about traits that go together in other persons. For example, an individual might believe, through his experience, that a person who is friendly is also honest (Secord & Backman, 1964).

It has also been demonstrated that different perceivers emphasize different traits in describing other persons. There is no simple relation between perceiver traits and how the other person is perceived. A number of studies have shown that person perceptions vary systematically with the age and sex of the perceiver (Kohn & Fiedler, 1961; Secord & Muthard, 1955). The older persons vary more in describing different stimulus persons than younger perceivers was supported for the several adult stimulus persons. It was also found that male and female perceivers also differed consistently in their perceptions of the various persons. Females perceived the several adult figures in a less differentiated and more favorable manner than did males. It was therefore suggested that perhaps women, to a greater degree than men, use stereotyping in describing others, and that perhaps this is consistent with the common belief that women react "intuitively" to others and are not able to find logical reasons for their personality impressions (Kohn & Fiedler, 1961; Secord & Backman, 1964).
One aspect of personality widely investigated is the authoritarian personality (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson & Sanford, 1950). Various investigators have attempted to show that person perceptions are affected by the "authoritarian" traits of the perceiver. An individual of this type rigidly adheres to conventional middle-class values of his society. He is overly concerned with such values. He is submissive toward the moral authorities of his ingroup. He condemns and rejects people who violate conventional values. He is preoccupied with power and status considerations and tends to identify with powerful figures, and is generally hostile toward members of outgroups. These traits are thought of as belonging together. Authoritarians assume stimulus persons to be peers, to have values like their own, and to be high on authoritarian traits. Those low in authoritarianism do not make this assumption or rate stimulus persons in this fashion (Secord & Backman, 1964).

One of the most fundamental biases in person perception is that other individuals tend to be seen as constant, unchanging entities even when they are seen behaving very differently in different situations. This bias may be recognized as a form of temporal extension.

A second form of bias is the tendency to see persons as origins of actions. It is simpler to interpret a hostile act as a natural expression of a malevolent person than to
understand the situational and circumstantial factors that led him to commit the act. The average person exaggerates the role of the person as causal agent. Thus he fails to see the situational factors contributing to neurotic behavior.

A third form of bias is the tendency to organize our perceptions of other persons around an evaluative factor. We are likely to see all properties belonging to the same individual as positive or as negative.

**Structural aspects of relations.** Interaction between some persons takes place within structured relations, e.g. mother, son, father, daughter, teacher which affect how they perceive each other. Several structural aspects of relations to person perception are the role structure, the liking structure, and the status and power structures. Role relations place each participant in a role category having attributes associated with it that are likely to be applied to all persons in that role category.

**Perceived locus of cause.** Of various interactional contents that may affect person perception, one of the most important is the perceived locus of cause. In general, a benevolent action toward the perceiver which is internally caused - that is, voluntarily performed by the stimulus person - leads the perceiver to like him better. No change in liking occurs if the benevolent action is externally
caused.

**Frustration.** Research in the field of opinion and attitude change seems to demonstrate that the major condition for a change in a person's perceptions, attitudes or opinions is a frustration experienced in carrying out his purposes effectively because he is acting on the basis of assumptions that prove wrong (Cantril, 1957).

**Unconscious mental forces.** It has already been established that unconscious or underlying mental forces can affect perceptions, thoughts and feelings. For example, a person guilty of hostile feelings about another person, projects hostility in that person and thus perceives him as guilty or a person overwhelmed by hostile feelings whenever he sees someone he hates can conceivably defend against the dangerous discharge of those feelings by losing his sight. A minor everyday manifestation of the influence of psychodynamic forces upon perception can be noted in various forms of distractibility. Efforts of unconscious resistance to threatening stimuli are evidenced by perceptual defense and perceptual vigilance (Blum, 1966).

**Group effects.** Group effects can also modify perceptual responsiveness. The responses of other people can often lead to conformity in a person's behavior. Studies have shown that greater cohesiveness in an influencing group leads to greater shifts in the perceptual judgments of its naive
member and that, even in the absence of any group pressure to conform, purely informational influence can modify an individual's perception of stimuli (Wrightsman, 1972).

**Cultural background.** The most general factor affecting perception is the cultural background of the individual. Man's specific purposes are largely derived from the group loyalties and social and cultural norms he acquires. Anthropologists and sociologists have accumulated considerable evidence of the different ways people see things in different cultural groups. Several cross-cultural studies reveal differences in the perceptions of different ethnic groups toward the status of males and females and treatment of the aged in a family and social structure, differences in their opinions regarding child training practices, differences in their attitude toward money and worldly things. Several studies are also reported of changes in the perceptions, images, attitudes and beliefs as they occur in individuals of different socio-cultural background as a result of reciprocal interaction. As new group loyalties are acquired, or as loyalties change, the pattern of what is distinguished as social perceptions also changes. It has been found that the impact of cultural upbringing is so great that especially in the initial stages every new experience in a different cultural background is perceived and interpreted in the context of old cultural norms. How increasing length
of exposure to a foreign educational experience affects the visiting student's perception of his host and home culture has been evidenced by several cross-cultural studies (Coelho, 1959; Lambert & Bressler, 1956; Naidoo & Fiedler, 1962; Seth, 1960).

Among the various cultural or social factors that affect a person's perception, stereotypes play a very major role.

**Stereotypes.** Since it is impossible for most people to weigh reaction of a person, minute by minute, in terms of individual meanings and merits, they use stereotyped perceptions i.e. ready-made frames of references for interpreting events.

Lippmann (1966) first introduced the usage of "stereotype" as a social science concept in 1922. He proposed the term "stereotypes" to refer to the "pictures in our heads (p. 1)." He pointed out that most people think in stereotypes and that a man's actions are not based on direct and certain knowledge but on pictures made by himself or given to him. Thus we react not to the real world, but to our reconstruction of it.

The term "stereotype" has come to be widely used by social psychologists as a culturally determined, popularly held or highly standardized perceptions of all members of a class of people. Thus stereotypes are beliefs about the characteristics of people (Triandis & Vassiliou, 1967). For example, English people are sportsmanlike, conventional,
conservative, reserved and practical; Germans are industrious, scientifically minded and ambitious; Negroes are, musical, pleasure loving, ostentatious, and happy-go-lucky.

Stereotyping has three characteristics: categorization of persons, a consensus on attributed traits, and a discrepancy between attributed traits and actual traits (Secord & Backman, 1964).

Persons have many attributes differing greatly in visibility and distinctiveness. People select certain attributes as means of identifying various categories of persons, and ignore others. These attributes may be physical—such as age, sexual, or racial characteristics; they may involve membership in a group, organization, or society—as in occupational, church, or national affiliation; or they may even be based on certain distinctive behavior patterns. In other words, a stereotype is a special form of categorical response; membership in a category is sufficient to evoke the judgment that the person possesses all the attributes belonging to that category (Secord & Backman, 1964). Individual differences among members of a class which are perceived in stereotyped manner are largely ignored. Often some single cue, such as skin color in the case of a white man's perception of a Negro, is enough to call out the full, stereotyped perception. Attributes of personality, intelli-
gence, and morals may be included in such stereotyped perception, even though little more than skin color is actually observed.

By definition it is implied that those who hold the stereotype are in reasonable agreement with each other on the identifying or assigned characteristics of the category of stereotyped persons and also on the attributes they possess.

Stereotypes are almost always thought of as at least partly false. A stereotype may be false in the sense that the traits attributed are an oversimplification of the true characteristics of the stereotyped individuals, or the traits may have little basis in fact. In one sense, the inaccuracy of a social stereotype follows from one of the elements of its definition - namely, that all persons in a given class possess the traits assigned to that class. Since individuals universally vary in the kinds of traits which make up a social stereotype, it is obvious that the stereotype traits do not apply in the same degree to each member of the class. If a perceiver makes known what traits he believes are possessed by the average member of a class of persons, and at the same time recognizes the existence of individual differences, there is nothing necessarily inaccurate about his judgments. On the other hand, if he attributes exactly the same characteristics to each individual member of the class, his
stereotype is necessarily a departure from reality. Much misunderstanding of stereotypes has occurred because of failure to distinguish between statements about a class of persons in the abstract and perceptions of persons whom one knows and interacts with. When provided only with an ethnic identification and no other information, as in most studies of stereotyping, the perceiver is forced to ignore individual differences and to respond to the group as a class of persons (Secord & Backman, 1964).

Stereotyping is a two-way process. Members of groups not only stereotype others but are also stereotyped by them; furthermore each group has a stereotype of itself (Vinacke, 1956).

Attitude toward the group stereotyped seems to be an important factor in determining what traits are attributed to which groups, with approved groups receiving favorable traits and disapproved groups receiving unfavorable traits which are not considered to be characteristics of the self (Child & Dobb, 1943; Vinacke, 1956).

According to the results of a study by Karlins, Coffman and Walters (1969), it was found that social stereotypes do not always favor own group. The characterization of American subjects' about themselves in their study was decidedly less flattering than the previous studies. The authors therefore, maintain that the character of stereotyping may follow an
ethnocentric pattern or may not, depending upon the perceivers, but ethnocentrism is evidently not inherent in the stereotyping itself.

Stereotypes support prevailing social distances. In fact, stereotypes can be taken as one index of social distance. The favorableness and unfavorableness of stereotypes attributed to different groups varies in terms of their position on the social distance scale (Sherif & Sherif, 1956).

Edwards (1940a, 1940b) proposed four dimensions of stereotypes. He suggested that responses to stereotypes vary in (1) uniformity - the extent to which an individuals response is in accord with the responses of others; (2) direction - the response is favorable or unfavorable; (3) intensity - the degree of favorableness or unfavorableness; and (4) quality - the content of the response.

The review of literature indicates that some of the factors that are responsible for the origin of ethnic or social stereotypes are: a belief in the racial or ethnic superiority and individual differences, competition, past and/or present experiences frustrating or rewarding between people especially of different backgrounds.

Each culture is saturated with stereotypes about various ethnic groups acquired by individuals from a number of sources, including direct experience with some members of the
stereotyped groups. For the most part however stereotypes are learned by word of mouth or from books, newspapers, films and television. These media create a vast cultural matrix in which images and caricatures of various ethnic or social groups can develop and persist irrespective of the reality they are supposed to represent (Karlins et al., 1969). Most probably as Klineberg (1966) says the relation is a circular one, with the mass media reflecting stereotypes already in the public domain.

The stereotypes become relatively fixed in a person's thinking and especially in his emotional life. For example, a white man's predominantly unfavorable stereotype of a Negro has remained relatively unchanged. Stereotypes become rigid, as the etymology of the term indicates. Several studies reveal that national and ethnic stereotypes show marked stability over the last 40 years (Cauthen, Robinson & Krauss, 1971).

This phenomenon of resistance to change leads directly to the problem of the amount of truth contained in these stereotypes. The view is rather widely held that a stereotype cannot develop out of nothing and therefore must have at least some basis in reality. The phrase "kernel of truth" is often used to characterize this hypothesis. The findings of similar stereotypes amid diverse groups and their resistance to change leads one to believe that the
more permanent the stereotype, the more likely it is to contain at least some truth.

Several striking changes in the stereotypes of certain ethnic or nationality groups make the assumption of a "kernel of truth" hypothesis improbable and they cast considerable doubt on the whole hypothesis. Some of these striking instances are changes from predominantly positive to predominantly negative stereotypes of Americans about Japanese before and immediately after the Second World War; about the Chinese before and after the sudden deterioration of economic condition in California and competition of the cheap labor of Chinese with Americans in 1870 (Klineberg, 1950).

These and similar studies of sudden changes in stereotypes indicate that the basic motivating factor for the existence and maintenance of particular stereotypes is self and group preservation. Therefore, whenever there is a threat to self or group preservation, there is a sudden change in stereotypes. This phenomenon therefore, indicates that stereotypes react to circumstances that do not have anything to do with the real characteristics of the group concerned.

This does not mean stereotypes are always false; it does mean that they may be. The danger arises out of the fact that we use them, often blindly and automatically, without really knowing anything about their truth.
The question whether or not stereotypes are real i.e. in this context corresponding to an objective reality can best be answered in the words of Klineberg (1950):

As a psychological phenomenon the stereotype is, of course, very real indeed. It has frequently been pointed out that the beliefs we hold of another people may be much more important for our relationships with them than their actual behavior ....

The stereotype then becomes a psychological reality of tremendous importance, which operates in both directions in determining group relations and group behavior (pp. 122-123).

Stereotypes reveal the direction of the shaping of the social forces. They reflect the positive or negative feelings between people. The UNESCO study (Buchanan, 1951), of the nine nations did demonstrate a relation between the "feeling of friendliness" toward a country and the extent to which the stereotype of that country contained favorable traits.

Ethnic stereotypes indicate the extent of prejudice about a particular group. Stereotypes are not identical with prejudice. They are primarily rationalizers. They adapt to the prevailing temper of prejudice or the needs of the situation (Allport, 1958). Therefore, periodic stereotype studies should reveal the nature of prejudice regarding various groups.

Do negative stereotypes generate hostility and prejudice? As Klineberg (1951) maintains: "Though unfavorable stereotypes do not by themselves lead to overt hostility, they make it easier for hostility to develop (p. 506)."
Impact of stereotypes on people is so great that as a result of thinking in terms of stereotypes, masses of people have been swayed into communal riots between Hindus and Moslems in India.

A recent study by Karlins et al. (1969) reveals that although people still continue to have stereotypes about other people, the attitude of the younger generation toward stereotyping is progressively changing. The authors maintain that the younger generations show more careful thinking about ethnic generalizations than their counterparts in 1930s.

It is felt that this change is due to upswing in intellectual education, civil rights movements, increase in cross-cultural contact, advancement of social sciences, growing realization of the dependence of the people of the world on one another.

Questions have often arisen as to whether the existence and use of stereotypes represent an unmitigated evil or whether they have a function which at least in some circumstances justifies their existence and use. As Lippmann (1966) pointed out, stereotypes are not necessarily "bad". They are not only convenient and time saving, but without them it would be necessary for us to interpret each new situation as if we had never met anything of the kind before. It is argued that we must have generalizations and short cuts in formulating our attitudes toward groups. We cannot dispense
with certain general ideas which facilitate dealing with individuals. Perhaps the most pertinent statement that can be made is that stereotypes have the virtues of efficiency but not of accuracy. It may be impossible to prevent people from generalizing on the basis of a few outstanding characteristics, real or imaginary. From the ethical as distinguished from the psychological point of view, we might say that stereotypes ought to serve as hypotheses, not as facts (Newcomb, 1952).

The majority of stereotype studies have used one of the three techniques: the adjective checklist, ratings of photographs, or ratings of statements.

The adjective checklist as a measure of stereotype was developed by Katz and Braly (1933). Those five words which best describe the group in question are selected from a list of 84 adjectives.

Eysenck and Crown (1948) maintain that the results of the stereotype studies conducted with the checklists are predetermined by the methodology used. They state:

When we look for stereotyped views, and give the subject no chance to reply in any non-stereotyped fashion, we should not be surprised that the answer we get is a stereotyped one. It is strictly inadmissible to conclude from such results, however, that the views actually held by the subjects are stereotyped; such a conclusion goes beyond the data and makes unwarrantable assumptions about the dynamics of the total situation which gave rise to the responses in question. We may ask a person: "What are Turks like?, and most likely the answer
will be "I don’t know." Ask him: "Are Turks cruel, or brave, or sensual, or musical, or what not?", and if he dare not say that this is an absurd request..

he will, usually quite consciously and deliberately, give the answer which he knows is expected of him..

the true explanation of stereotyped responses is rather different from the one generally accepted. There is in existence a culturally determined picture, a stereotyped view, of various nations and races; this view is expressed in fable, story, play cartoon, newspapers, song and other media of expression.

Most people know to a greater or lesser degree what this stereotype is, and a certain proportion may even believe in the objective accuracy of the picture in question. When challenged to reply to a question to which he has no answer, the subject falls back on this universal stereotype, even though he may not believe in its accuracy at all. Thus our "stereotype" score is more a measure of the knowledge of popular stereotypes possessed by subjects, than of their actual belief in them. It is in this sense that it should be interpreted. Similar considerations apply of course to other experiments into stereotypes such as those of Katz and Braly.

We cannot, however, discuss these studies in detail; the application of the general principle that stereotyped views may be merely the last resort of a subject driven into a neurotic choice situation ("I don't know the answer - I must give an answer") to a particular case will be obvious enough (pp. 35-36).

Cauthen et al. (1971) maintain that the problem is that the adjective checklist may not contain traits relevant to that group and that the continued use of a list of traits derived from a group of Princeton students over 35 years ago ignores the possibility of changes in the meaning of the stereotype.
Cross-Cultural Studies

The present study, 'Changes in Perceptions About Indians' falls under the broad area of 'Cross-Cultural Contact.' In current literature, it is also mentioned as 'Cross-Cultural Adjustment,' 'Inter-Cultural Learning,' or 'Acculturation.' A cross-cultural interaction is a two-way process. It implies a diffusion of two cultures in which both the cultural entities are affected in varying degrees. The phenomena that are generally studied in this area are the changes in perceptions, images, attitudes and beliefs as they occur in individuals of different socio-cultural backgrounds as a result of reciprocal interaction.

Systematic studies of the effects of international or intercultural contacts on individuals began in the middle of the present century. Several factors have contributed to stimulate research in this area. They are as follows:

1. After witnessing the horrible effects of the atom bomb on men, material and culture in the Second World War, nothing was more evident than the fact that if the peoples of the world are to learn to live together in peace they need to know one another better. In the words of Gardner Murphy (1955), "International disorders call for international remedies (p. 3)." He further states that more and more our attention has been drawn to the psychological factors, whether conscious or unconscious, which lie behind
prejudice, suspicion, authoritarianism, and other failures of human beings to understand one another and devise means of working toward group ends. The UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) having realized the fact that wars begin in the minds of people promoted several studies concerning the beliefs and ideas people of one nation hold concerning their own and other nations. As a part of its project 'Tensions Affecting International Understanding' the Social Sciences Department of UNESCO has completed several studies on national stereotypes (Buchanan, 1951; Klineberg, 1950, 1951). In the earlier days of UNESCO, research occupied a somewhat higher place in the program. A series of community studies, in which psychological techniques played a significant part were undertaken as a contribution to the understanding of national cultures. What was formerly the Tension Project has become incorporated into a Division of Applied Social Sciences (Klineberg, 1956).

2. Migration of people from other parts of the world to the United States has created various problems of prejudice, discrimination and other aspects of intergroup relations. As Gordan Allport (1958) says the checkerboard of prejudice in the United States is perhaps the most intricate of all. While some of this endless antagonism seems based upon a realistic conflict of interests, most of it, we suspect, is
a product of the fears of the imagination. Yet imaginary fears can cause real suffering. This situation has presented considerable field for psychological and sociological research in the area of culture change (Lee, 1951; Pedersen, 1950), resistance to acculturation (Maslow, 1951), acculturation and social mobility (Spiro, 1955), ethnic assimilation (Broom & Kitsuse, 1955; Gordon, 1967), personal change in adult life (Becker, 1964), cultural influences in the perception of people (Fong, 1965), and the consequences of immigration in changing from the native land to a rather markedly new environment (Kunz, 1968).

3. Although the flow of students across national boundaries has a long history, the emergence of the United States of America as a leading world power, the scientific and technological advancement of the country and opportunities of earning and learning simultaneously, has brought an influx of foreign students especially from the developing countries of Asia into the United States. The figure of foreign students in the United States has considerably increased. Therefore, as Sellittiz and Cook (1962) maintain, the focus on students who have studied in the United States reflects the distribution of studies of cross-cultural education; to date there have been so few systematic studies of foreign students in other countries that it is not possible to draw even tentative generalizations beyond the
American setting.

4. Several voluntary private Organizations were interested in intercultural activities. In addition, since the World War II, the United States federal government has deliberately participated in the activities that would promote international relations (Cieslak, 1955). These situations presented opportunities to promote research in the following areas: International understanding (Kiell, 1951), national status and attitudes of foreign students (Morris, 1960), the effects of situational factors on personal interaction between foreign students (Selltiz, Hopsen & Cook, 1956), factors associated with cross-cultural social interaction (Goldsen, Suchman & Williams, 1956), cross-cultural education as a research area (Smith, 1956, 1958), factors influencing attitudes of foreign students toward the host country (Selltiz & Cook, 1962), personal growth and general educational development (Coelho, 1962), suggestions to change hostile or neutral attitudes into friendly ones (Kelman, 1962).

As mentioned in the preceding chapter, contact between Indians and Americans on an extensive basis is a phenomenon of very recent years. Therefore, cross-cultural studies or studies of acculturation on Indian population in the United States are mostly limited to students. Since the present research is on the theme of 'Changes in Perceptions about
Indians,' the review of literature will include only those studies which in one way or another have some psychological bearing on the theme of research.

John Useem and Ruth Hill Useem (1955) report a study of the effectiveness of foreign education and experience on 110 Indian nationals who had received their training in the United Kingdom and the United States of America. The study is known as 'The Western - Educated Man in India.' Using the investigative methods of anthropology and sociology, Useems interviewed and analysed the roles of the Western - Educated Indians within their environmental setting in India. The findings of the study evidence long - run positive changes in character and outlook of the Foreign - Returned. Foreign experience appears to have served as a catalytic force; latent tendencies within the individual are brought out in all but the most rigid and the most mature. Most students evidenced changes in their personality and outlook as follows: getting over inferiority complexes or general shyness, gain in self-confidence, enlarged vision of life, improved methods of thinking and working, the breakdown in stereotypes, the weakening of ethnocentrism, lessening of intolerance and changes in perception, gradual realization of the common unity of mankind, democratic ways of acting in interpersonal relations, belief in the fact that majority of the qualities are not
inherited but acquired due to interaction with environment, development of sensitivity to other's opinions, change in political ideologies, heightened patriotism. Many became curious about their own land and began to read seriously about India for the first time, and many more started to think about India's future. These students discovered India while in the West and in the process, discovered a part of themselves. That is to say, while overseas, their patriotism in general was heightened, although the degree varied according to individuals. The Useem study also evidences that positive changes were reported even by those Indian students who were "antagonistic" to American culture as they state:

...even those who reacted negatively to their foreign experience, who were antagonistic to the alien culture, who considered the customs of the inhabitants inferior, or who rejected what they observed as unsuitable for India, returned home with a changed outlook and changed habits... The process of living and studying in another society produces diverse effects on the individual's conception of himself and of his roles. A comparative view engenders a fresh perspective and presents a new model by which persons judge their own society (pp. 30-31).

Most apparent modal difference between the British - educated and the American - educated is that the former tend to accent stability and the latter, adaptability. The British - returned and the American - returned are equally self-confident, but why they are differs. The Indians in America strengthened their egos in a different way. Since
the Americans were not rulers, the Indians felt less intensively an inner drive to excel them in order to prove themselves the equal to the Americans. The American trained were more optimistic about taking chances. Informality in interpersonal relations between boss and worker and between teacher and student predominated more among the American - returned. Both the groups reported heightened aspirations for themselves, but the American - educated were more exuberant.

Lambert and Bressler (1956) made an intensive sociological study known as the 'Indian Students on an American Campus.' The study consists of experience of sixteen Indians, two Pakistanis, and one Singalese who were enrolled during one academic year at the University of Pennsylvania. The major thesis of the study is that the determinants of the experiences of Indian students in the United States lie in India, not in the United States, and that Indian socio-cultural norms provide the primary context for their selection and interpretation of experiences in the United States. In other words, throughout their stay in the United States, the judgments of what these visitors see in the United States are determined by the cultural assumptions and political policies of India. Not only is there a 'remarkable uniformity and stability of images' concerning the United States, but also the 'Indianness' of the student
affects his image of the United States. In short, the Indian students bring their particular cultural 'a priori' to the observations which they make in the United States. What is the Indian content of this a priori? The basic role of the patriarchal joint family was widely admired by the Indian students for ensuring stability and for providing a satisfactory, conflict - free psychological setting. In contrast to this, the Indian students perceived in America a loosely knit structure providing for limited interactions and restricted functions. The behavior of young men with young women and the marital relations of adults in the United States were viewed as capricious and frivolous. In the perceptions of Indian students, the American family life is caught in the cross fire of an Indian value conflict. Americans are seen as lacking a proper respect for the aged and dominated by selfish personal ends rather than spiritual and social values.

The experience of the Indian students is presented in terms of three roles; Student, Tourist and Unofficial Ambassador. As a student, he tries to make the most from the viewpoint of his career in India. As a tourist, he seeks to expand his knowledge of American life and institutions, but his perceptions and interpretations are governed by Indian terms of reference as mentioned previously. As an unofficial ambassador, the Indian visitor tries to impress
upon Americans a favorable view of India. In doing this, however, he tends to react with exaggerated antagonism and defensiveness in what the authors call 'areas of sensitivity.' Briefly, American perception of Indians is viewed by Indians as - "Indians are basically inferior. Westernization is superficial. India will never be equal to the Western countries (p. 73)." Any reference to one of these images is experienced by the Indian visitor as an affront to India, and thus as a personal 'ego assault.' These perceived assaults enhance his personal identification with the prestige of his home country, and he reacts by erecting a series of mechanisms in defense and praise of his country.

The study ends with an emphasis upon loyalty to India and Indian culture as the main criteria of what happens in their interpretation of American experience.

The study includes information on how the integration of the Indian visitor into American culture changes as the length of his stay increases.

Evidence of how increasing length of exposure to a foreign educational experience affects the visiting student's perception of his host and home cultures comes from 'Changing Images of America' by George V. Coelho (1959). The study consists of a sample of sixty Indian students representing different lengths of residence in the United States.

The main instrument used was a series of written addresses
on the topic of Indian - American relations prepared by each student during a fifteen minute period. These short speeches were prepared for an American audience and were designed to elicit each student's images, feelings, and perceptions about both his country of origin, i.e. India, and his country of residence, i.e. the United States of America. A series of face to face interviews were followed with the purpose of ascertaining what specific groups the student had had in mind when addressing his imaginary audience.

The salient finding of the study is that there appear to be distinct and predictable phases in the responses of foreign students to their new environment. The dominant themes of the speeches, for example, changed with a change in the length of time spent in the United States. Diplomatic and political themes occurred most frequently in the speeches written by those students who had spent less than nine months in the United States; educational themes among those who had spent between one and a half to three years; and finally, in the last phase studied, that is after four years, personal and social considerations came to the fore.

The following tentative generalization is drawn by Coelho regarding the changes occurring in the foreign student's perception of his home culture: During a foreign educational experience, extending between one to three years, the visitor may be expected to show increasingly different-
iated perspectives with regard to his home culture. Thus, within specified temporal limits which in this study turned out to be three years, exposure to a foreign educational experience facilitates the re-centering of the Indian student's national sentiments and loyalties based on a broadened and differentiated perception of his home culture. Genuinely cosmopolitan orientations are achieved by the visiting student.

The results of the study indicate that psychologically, not before eighteen months and not beyond thirty-six months of sojourn, the Indian student expresses freely a more realistic criticism of some aspects of his home culture - a minimum precondition, it seems for healthy personal growth and national development in a free society. According to Coelho, the apparent increase of unfavorable attitudes of the Indian student as a result of increasing length of exposure to the new educational experience reflects the development of a more independent and critical attitude of mind toward changing social institutions, both domestic and foreign, viewed in a broadly human and democratic perspective.

The study further reveals that after about four years of residence in the United States, the young Indian finds that he is losing touch with his native land; it has become blurred in his mind while his perceptions of America are growing more sharply. At this stage, he is more concerned about his
personal problems: Shall he return to India? Shall he marry an American girl? Am I an Indian or American? It seems this is what tends to happen with a sojourn abroad of more than four years.

One of the unanticipated products of Coelho's (1959) research was that a sharp profile of national character traits emerged from the spontaneous comments of the Indians during their interviews.

By contrast, the traits attributed to Indians were relatively few, homogenous and general. Indians were characterized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Unfavorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful-peace-loving</td>
<td>Prejudiced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonviolent</td>
<td>Cynical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant (in religion)</td>
<td>Hypocritical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Jealous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispassionate</td>
<td>Arrogant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>Fatalistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodative</td>
<td>Apathetic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a whole, the Indian students seemed to attribute to themselves cultural traits which belong to a dimension of feeling or suffering - e.g. patient, dispassionate, passive, and apathetic.

One generalization emerging from 'A Study of Attitudinal Change of Indian Students in the United States' by Madan Gopal Seth (1960) is as follows: Although Indians in America appreciably change toward certain aspects of American culture, they do not adapt to American life-ways in totality. They
neither remain like Indians in India nor are they so completely transformed so as to conform to Americans. The results of this study in general confirm the findings of Useems (1955) that the changes in the foreign-educated are selective, i.e. they occur in some aspects of personality rather than in the total personality. The various findings of Seth's study are as follows: The attitudes of Indian students in America change to such an extent that they become a distinguishable group from the general population of Indian students in India. Their stay in the host society, no matter how long, does not show any significant change in their native religio-philosophical beliefs. The changes in the sojourning students are more pronounced with regard to the material prosperity of the United States. They show a shift from the attitudes of Indian students in India with regard to democratic principles when applied to certain interpersonal and social situations. They exhibit distinct changes in their attitudes toward class or caste distinctions. These students, as against their peers in India, give more importance to sex-education. The Indian students in America seem to change from an attitude of contentment to that of ambitiousness. They become more self-assertive, pragmatic and realistic in their approach. These students as compared to their peers in Indian universities show a decline in pure idealistic approach
toward internationalism and international issues although they still remain more idealistic than their American colleagues.

Overall findings of Seth's study indicate that Indian students prefer to stand on the Indian base and yet conceive a fabric of life that borrows liberally from American value-system.

An interesting study by Naidoo and Fiedler (1962) investigates the influence of the cultural context within which the individual grows up. It compares the way in which American and Indian graduate students in the United States see themselves and various others. The results of the study indicate that Indian students in the United States esteem themselves and others more highly than do subjects from a matched sample of American students. The findings further indicate that there are very few changes in Indians' interpersonal perceptions as a function of length of residence in the United States. Only the concepts of Best Friend and Ideal Self change becoming more similar to the American descriptions of these concepts. The authors maintain that the American culture has little effect on the interpersonal perceptions of the Indian student.

Even though priest is held in high esteem in the Indian culture Indians esteemed "Priest" less than did the American group. The authors explain this phenomenon by pointing to
the atypical nature of the samples. They say that the Indian students who go abroad are in all probability less bound by tradition, more enterprising and more independent than Indian males in general. In addition the authors maintain, "This may well account for the relatively low esteem for 'priest' supporting Coelho's (1958) interpretation that Indian subjects in his study showed a distinct pattern of breaking away from traditional religious practices (p. 124)."

Tamar Becker (1968) in his study 'Patterns of Attitudinal Changes among Foreign Students' traces the differences of perceptions to the differences in the visitors' cultural backgrounds, their desire to enhance their national image and to protect their traditional values. As predicted, compared with the Europeans, Indian and Israeli students were less favorable to the United States, more defensive about their home country, and expressed a far greater sense of patriotic obligation to it. They tended to associate with their compatriots and selected communications on the basis of their nationalistic relevance. Indian and European students displayed almost diametrically opposed patterns of attitudinal and behavioral changes.

Findings of the Cross-Cultural studies on Indian student population have been largely supported by a number of other studies that have employed essentially the same approach.
Some of these Cross-Cultural studies were conducted on German visitors (Lippitt & Watson, 1955); Norwegian Fulbright Grantees (Lysgaard, 1955); Scandinavian Students (Sewell & Davidsen, 1956); The Mexican Students (Beals & Humphrey, 1957); African Students (Veroff, 1963); Foreign Trainees from twenty-nine different nations (Deutsch & Won, 1963); Students from fifty-nine countries (Selltiz et al., 1963); Chinese in America (Fong, 1965).

Various Cross-Cultural studies of the foreign students in the United States reveal that the way the students perceive of Americans and are affected by them, is dependent upon their national and cultural background. They always carry with them, implicitly or explicitly their national frame of reference against which they judge everything they find in the host society. The extent and the directions in which they change is also dependent upon their national characteristics. For example, Mexicans (Beals & Humphrey, 1957) and Swedes (Scott, 1956) show high degree of social adaptability. The Swedes and Indians (Lambert & Bressler, 1956) as against Mexicans show high emotional control. The Swedes as against Indians and Mexicans show confident self-expression. The Mexicans tend to inhibit formation of strong ties with non-relatives; the Indians feel considerable uneasiness and shyness in interpersonal relations. The Mexicans and Indians show acceptance of authority, high
degree of social conformity; they get on well with their superiors, associates and colleagues. The Swedes on the other hand tend to be more individualistic and independent-minded. The Indians exhibit an inquiring intellect but tend to be dependent and less self-confident. In some measure an inferiority feeling was manifested among Indians (Lambert & Bressler, 1956) and Germans (Lippitt & Watson, 1955) which influenced their interpersonal behavior and social contacts.

Language, to some extent, has played a part in the formation of attitudes and adjustment of foreign students (Selltiz et al., 1963). The Swedes and Indians because of their comparative competency in English made a little better adjustment to American social and academic life.

The age and maturity of a foreign student was found to be another factor affecting their adjustment to the host society (Seth, 1960). Mexican study (1957) shows that the cases of maladjustment were more among undergraduates than among graduate students. A sojourner's professional security at home, as in the case of Indians (Useems, 1955) and Swedes (Scott, 1956) is also a contributory factor in his adaptive process. Lambert and Bressler (1956) have pointed out that the initial adjustment occurs more rapidly in places where a sub-culture of one's own nationality exists. They discuss at some length the existence of Indian students' sub-cultural environment in Pennsylvania area, where a practicing Indian
physician and his American wife took an active part in organizing group activities and providing assistance and counseling to students in need. This was a considerable help in the adjustment of newcomers to the host culture.

The change that takes place in foreign students is a selective process. Certain aspects of host culture influence different groups of foreign students in different ways. The three nationality groups, viz., Mexicans, Indians and Swedes indicated least change in the area of socio-sexual relationship - each claiming superiority for their own code of behavior. The most perceptible change was with regard to upbringing of children. All the three groups liked the American way of independence in child training practices. They also approved the prevalence of equality in husband-wife relationships in the United States.

Both Mexicans and Indians found wider spread of religion in America than they expected. But Mexicans acclaimed their own "moral superiority" and Indians their "spiritual heritage" over and above the host culture. As Seth's study (1960) evidences Indian students' attitudes and beliefs in the religio - philosophical basis of their home culture did not undergo significant change as a result of their American experience.

The studies so far discussed, have dealt with the change in foreign students as a result of their education and
experience in the United States. What actually seems to change is the opinions, beliefs, attitudes and perceptions of self or others in certain areas.

Studies of Cross-Cultural Adjustment on Time Dimension

Several cross-cultural studies discussed so far have reported changes in attitudes and adjustments of foreign students in their host culture in the form of U-shaped curve of changing attitudes (Coelho, 1959; Dubois, 1956; Lysgaard, 1955; Sewell & Davidsen, 1956; Smith, 1956). Initially the sojourners report optimism and feelings of elation associated with positive expectations regarding interaction with their hosts. As they actually become involved in role relationships and encounter frustrations in trying to achieve certain goals, they become confused and depressed and express negative attitudes regarding the host culture. If they are able to resolve the difficulties encountered during this crucial phase of the acculturation process they then are able to work effectively and interact positively with their hosts.

It is worth noting that the writers differ widely in their estimation of some crucial parameters of the model, especially the duration of each of the phases of adjustment. Thus Lysgaard (1955) estimated the trough, the period of least satisfactory social relations and personal adjustment
to occur between the sixth and the eighteenth months of the students' stay in the United States. Morris's findings (1960) suggest that the trough is to be found between the tenth and nineteenth months of stay.

Other investigators, Beals and Humphrey (1957), in their study of Mexican students seem to agree with the U-curve hypothesis of adjustment pattern but they say that it is impossible to document such pattern positively for Mexican students. Similarly the experiences of twenty-nine different foreign trainees in the study of Deutsch and Won (1963) tend to support the U-curve hypothesis.

Even though Lambert and Bressler (1956) have abandoned the time dimension, particularly in the area of attitudes and redvided the sample into three generations, their second generation students sought to become as American as possible in dress, mannerisms, behavior and speech. The study thus evidences that the integration of an Indian student into American culture changes as the length of his stay increases.

Coelho (1959) found evidence of a very interesting phenomenon with regard to the length of residence in his study of Indian students. Analysis of hypothetical talks of his students revealed that newly-arrived students made many more favorable than unfavorable statements about both the United States and India; statements about both countries
by those who had been here from three months to three years were about equally divided between favorable and unfavorable comments; those who had been here four years or more showed a very slight increase in favorable statements about the United States. For neither country however, was the initial enthusiastic, uncritical approach completely recaptured. According to Coelho, "the length of exposure to a foreign educational experience is, therefore, a crucially important variable in cultural learning (p. 86)."

Naidoo and Fiedler (1962) study, only partially confirms previous findings. In their study only the concepts of 'Best Friend' and of 'Ideal Self' change, becoming more similar to American connotation of the concepts. The writers therefore, conclude that there are very few changes in Indians' interpersonal perception as a function of length of residence in the United States.

Seth's (1960) findings evidence that the amount of attitudinal change in Indian students does not appear to be in direct proportion to their length of stay in the United States.

Becker (1968) feels that the U-curve pattern of adjustment and attitudinal change may be a valid generalization of the Western European or Scandinavian student in the United States but may not apply to the majority of students from underdeveloped countries. His findings are based on a study
of a trinationality sample of foreign students.
Another useful and accurate extension of the U-curve hypothesis is discussed by John and Jeanne Gullahorn (1963). While they admit the apparent limited validity of the U-curve, they go on to recommend an extension of the U-curve to a W-curve which they conclude describes the sojourn more accurately. The W-curve extends beyond the U-curve to describe a re-adjustment period when the visitor returns home again.

The cross-cultural studies discussed so far are mostly conducted on students who hold membership in both the native and host society and are mostly concerned with certain temporary adjustments in a host culture. The U-curve or better still W-curve hypothesis appears to give a realistic picture of adjustments of foreign students.

An immigrant or a refugee in a foreign country must reach certain permanent adjustments since his plans of permanent return to his country of origin are indefinite. What would be the effect of the length of residence in a foreign country on the attitudes, perceptions and adjustments of these individuals? Psychologically, how long do they continue to hold membership in both the societies? What kinds of curves of adjustment do they go through? These are some of the questions that have remained unanswered especially for Indians since there are no comparable cross-
cultural studies on Indians in the United States of America.

Studies of American Perceptions of Indians

India was first known to America through the missionaries. In their enthusiasm to convert the heathens to the Christian way of life, American Missionaries went forth to distant parts of the world. The average man in the Western World knew little about the people of India. Americans knew even less, for living in a vast country rich in natural resources and sparsely populated, they had no need to look outside their own land. They had a vast scope for development, and all through the nineteenth century they were fully occupied with their own internal problems and problems relating to adjacent countries (Sing H., 1949).

According to Bernard Stern (1956) the Indian Mutiny in 1857 marked the beginning of a serious interest in India, for this event involved the lives of American missionaries and British establishments. India was no longer a vague dreamland to Americans.

Whatever ideas Americans possessed about India in the mid-nineteenth century were essentially derived from legends which were accepted as "common" information. The utterance of the word 'India' produced in the minds of many Americans a kaleidoscope of many-hued mental images, a pageant of elephants, snake-charmers, giant tigers, swart, lissome females performing the nautch, pukkah sahibe sipping pegs
of brandy on clubhouse verandas hidden from the noonday sun and holy men walking on beds of glowing coals or reclining on beds of vertical ten-penny nails. Such ideas, as they passed through the American culture, became fixed stereotypes, so deeply engrained in the thinking of the people, that they virtually defied analysis. Often these misconceptions were trimmed by the viewers themselves to fit certain emotional needs and prejudices. "Eyewitness" accounts, lectures by returning missionaries, and travel accounts served often to reinforce old stereotypes or else to create new ones. Already existent knowledge of India was so scanty during this period that the judgments of observers based largely on phantasy, rumor, and prejudice could scarcely be distinguished (Stern, 1956).

Although these ideas or images diminished in vividness due to the growth of the media of information and education, stereotypes die hard and the impressions imbedded into the minds and writings of Americans on India persisted to a large degree.

The political struggle of the Indians for independence dispelled some of the old notions in certain quarters, but many misconceptions lingered on. The Non-Cooperation Movement in India aroused interest in the United States, but it was the personality of Mahatma Gandhi and the methods he sought to employ for the emancipation of Indian people
which were more intriguing to the Americans. Therefore, the American Press in the early twenties wrote more about Gandhi and his technique of struggle than about the movement itself (Singh H., 1949).

'Mother India' of Katherine Mayo (1930) first published in 1927 was a scalding and horrified recital of examples of child marriage, extreme caste practices, the plight of the untouchables, backward conditions of health and sanitation in India. Miss Mayo wrote:

The British administration of India, be it good, bad, or indifferent, has nothing whatever to do with the conditions above indicated. Inertia, helplessness, lack of initiative and originality, lack of staying power and of sustained loyalties, sterility of enthusiasm, weakness of life-vigor itself — all are traits that truly characterize the Indian not only of today, but of long-past history (p. 16).

'Mother India' was the product of Miss Mayo's six-months' stay in India. The purpose of the trip and the book according to Miss Mayo was to test facts to lay before the American public who knew little about India.

The most salient point made by the book's more thoughtful Indian and Western critics was that while the book did not lie in its main particulars, it lied monumentally as a whole. Any reader of the book was justified in coming away from it, for example, with the notion that every female in India above the age of five was the enslaved and brutally maltreated victim of the male population which consisted in its entirety of active, frustrated, or exhausted sex maniacs.
'Mother India' became a sensation in the United States, in Great Britain, and in India. The Mayo issue was peculiarly painful for American missionaries in India because Mayo's India was indistinguishable from the missionary's India and the Englishman's India. 'Mother India' went through 27 editions in the United States for a total of 256,697 copies, by far the most widely sold book about India in the United States (Isaacs, 1962). Somewhat contradictory images of India seemed to have persisted in the minds of American people almost till the middle of the present century. Rosinger (1950) writes: In the year 1939, for example, Americans might have occasionally thought of India in one or more of these ways: as a poverty-stricken, "backward" country; as an exotic, strange country of Yogis, fakirs, snake-charmers and rope-trick performers; as a country of mystical wisdom and lofty philosophy; as a country seeking desperately its democratic birth right of independence, as the United States had done many decades before (p. 8). Isaacs (1962) 'Images of Asia' contains the results of a rather intensive inquiry into some American ideas and impressions of China and India, and particularly of Chinese and Indian people. The panel of 181 informants in his study occupy important and key posts in government, university, business and mass communications. Of the total number of informants 99 had been to India. The author provides vivid illustrations of the existing images and attitudes of these highly placed persons. Overall about 70
per cent of the panel were positive to China, and 54 per
cent were negative to India.

The images of India are organized into types: fabulous
Indians, religionists and philosophers, very benighted
heathens, lesser breed, Gandhi image, Nehru image, and the
Indians encountered.

Under 'Indians encountered' Isaacs reports of the images
that were formed of Indians as a result of encounters between
Americans and Indians, either in India or America. Listed
by the number of panelists who mentioned them and arranged
by their contrasts, here is an initial picture of how they
said they found Indians to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Number of Panelists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charming, friendly, hospitable</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to communicate with</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalized positive reaction</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual qualities,</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent, able.</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual, high-minded</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westernized, in positive</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically attractive</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devoted, dedicated</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulate</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vital, good sense of humor</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable and honest.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpleasant, uncomfortable to be with</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to communicate</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalized negative reaction</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual qualities,</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impractical in workaday affairs</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holier-than-thou,</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypocritical</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Western</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking social responsibility</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-seeking</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrulous</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiority-inferiority</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unvital, no sense of humor</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreliable, dishonest</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p. 324).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the whole panel 28 per cent expressed a predominantly favorable, 40 per cent predominantly unfavorable and 24 per cent mixed view of Indians.

Isaacs (1962) says:

None of these images seems to me wholly a creature of pure fantasy. Each represents the effect of somebody's experience, the "truth" of somebody's perception. However fleeting, every perception is still an encounter of some kind between perceiver and perceived, one of that endless succession of interlocking observations that never quite tell the whole story. I know it would be simpler if it were otherwise, but I have no set of models, no certified genuine original portraits to which I can compare these many vignettes, no master answer sheet on which I can now tick off, true or false, any of these many images we have glimpsed through these American eyes (p. 380).

In spite of all the contradictory images of India, American sympathy for India seems to have increased as time passed. This might be attributed to the two causes - the growing familiarity of the Americans with Indian problems; and the natural propensity of an American mind to uphold the cause of all those struggling for independence and democracy. Sympathetic understanding of India is expressed in the writings of some of the political thinkers of America in recent years.

Chester Bowles (1961) writes:

I have always believed and believed very deeply that there can be no real stability in the world unless India succeeds and the United States succeeds. The dual successes of these two great democracies is essential if we are going to be living in any world that we can remotely call rational. Yet, India and America have never found it particularly easy to
understand each other. We have a sort of stereotyped view of India and India has an extremely stereotyped view of us (p. 28).

Similarly, Averell Harriman (1961) writes:

I know that some Americans are puzzled by the foreign policy of the Indian government. . . . this question of non-alignment. Well, India is not neutral. Anyone who thinks India is neutral doesn't understand India. There is no country, there is no group of men, those in the government. . . . who are more determined to preserve the fundamental principles on which our own nation is founded than you find in India. And if that is neutrality, I don't understand the word. They are vigorous allies of ours in the attainment of the fundamental objectives which we, our nation and our people have. That is, independence for themselves and independence for other people (pp. 32-33).

Studies of Stereotypes About Indians

It has generally been assumed that a person's stereotypes about a group affect his perception of individual members of that group (Sheikh, 1968). Therefore, in an effort to investigate American stereotypes of Indians, literature on stereotypes by Edwards (1940), Eysenck and Crown (1948), Razran (1950), La Violette (1951), Fishman (1956), Richter (1956), Vinacke (1956; 1957), Lambert and Klineberg (1959), Wedge (1966), Campbell (1967), Triandis and Vassiliou (1967), Cauthen et al. (1971) and stereotype studies with checklists by Katz and Braly (1933), Meenes (1943), Gilbert (1951), Centers (1951), Hoult (1953), Jamison (1971), Scherer (1971), Karlins, et al. (1969) were reviewed. None of these studies revealed American stereotype
of Indians. Thus, Indians do not seem to have been included so far as a nationality or ethnic group in the systematic study of stereotypes in the United States especially with the instruments of checklists.

Several checklist studies were conducted in India by Rath and Das (1958); Sinha A.K.P. and Upadhyay (1960a, 1960b); Sinha G.S. and Sinha S.P. (1966); Jain (1967); Sri Chandra (1967) to measure Indian stereotypes of themselves and other nationality groups. The results of these studies with various checklists reveal that the following attributes are most frequently assigned to Indians as their characteristics:

1. Religious  
2. Peaceloving  
3. Hospitable  
4. Idealistic  
5. Easily Satisfied  
6. Superstitious  
7. Democratic  
8. Friendly  
9. Honest  
10. Tradition Loving  
11. Brave  
12. Cultured

Social Distance Studies

Since time immemorial members of one cultural group have come in contact with members of other groups - having other norms. In some societies, most people make few distinctions among other people on the basis of color or nationality and there is little hostility among groups which differ in these ways. In most societies, however,
some distinctions of this kind are commonly made, and in some of them intergroup hostilities are strong (Newcomb, 1952).

In the United States, the influx of people from various parts of the world, differing in religious, national, racial or ethnic background, social status and political ideology has made the problem of distinction along color and religious lines more pronounced. The greater the differences, the greater have been the problems of personal or social acceptance of the immigrant groups into the core culture of American society. This core culture consists of White Anglo-Saxon Protestant community.

The more general question of the extent to which Americans feel friendly or hostile toward various minority groups has been dealt with by many investigators, employing a variety of measurement techniques. The various studies reveal that Americans, not withstanding differences in social class, background, interest etc. manifest considerable communality in their relative preferences for various ethnic groups; and the preferred pattern tends to persist. The results of various studies indicate a rather definite hierarchy of preferences, with groups like British, French, Canadian, and Scandinavian peoples among the most preferred. Italians, Russians, Poles, Jews, and others, in an intermediate category; and usually Chinese, Japanese, Indian
(also referred to as Hindus) Turks, and Negroes among the least preferred. The specific results vary from one study to another but the pattern just described has generally existed. (Albig, 1939; Ames, Moriwaki & Basu, 1968; Bogardus, 1925a, 1925b, 1947, 1968; Fishman, 1956; Gordon, 1967; Guilford, 1931; Katz & Braly, 1933; Klineberg, 1950; Kosa, 1957; Sherif & Sherif, 1956; Triandis & Triandis, 1960).

In an effort to understand perceptions and attitudes of Americans toward Indians and the degree of acceptance assigned to Indians by Americans, studies on 'social distance' conducted mainly in the United States were reviewed.

Social distance, according to Bogardus (1925a, 1925b) refers to the degrees and grades of understanding and feeling that persons experience regarding each other. It explains the nature of a great deal of their interaction. It charts the character of social relations.

Emory S. Bogardus was one of the first to design a technique for the specific purpose of measuring and comparing attitudes toward different nationalities. His social distance scale was made up of a number of statements which were selected, on an a priori basis, to elicit responses indicative of the subject's degree of acceptance of any nationality group (Krech et al., 1962).
Bogardus Social Distance Scale (1925a) is simple. While the various users have modified the instructions, and occasionally the items, the general format has usually been kept. In its original version Bogardus (1925a) states as follows:

According to my first feeling reactions, I would willingly admit members of each race (as a class, and not the best I have known, nor the worst members) to one or more of the classifications under which I have placed a cross:

(1) To close kinship by marriage
(2) To my club as personal chums
(3) To my street as neighbors
(4) To employment in my occupation
(5) To citizenship in my country
(6) As visitors only in my country
(7) Would exclude from my country (p. 301)

Under the seven points as column headings were spaces to rate a large number of ethnic and nationality groups.

Some ten months after Bogardus first published the scale, Allport and Hartman published their article 'The Measurement and Motivation of Atypical Opinion in a Certain Group' which is often cited as the beginning of scientific attitude measurement. In course of time, so dominating became the aura of scientific respectability that even Bogardus himself felt its weight, and in 1933 published a revision of his scale with "equal" steps, as established by processing some 60 social distance steps through the equal-appearing-intervals method. However, this revision of the scale has not been extensively used (Campbell, 1953).
Bogardus (1925b) in an effort to find out the degrees of understanding, intimacy or acceptance conducted an experiment. In this experiment 248 American students, chiefly members of two graduate and upper division classes in social psychology, were asked to classify a list of 36 racial and language groups in three columns as follows: greatest friendliness, neutrality of feelings and antipathy. The results of the study reveal that Indians were grouped in the column number three which consisted of the races whose mention aroused feelings of antipathy and dislike. They were assigned the 5th rank among 36 racial or language groups which were arranged in the order of decreasing antipathy.

Further exploration into the causation of feelings of greatest antipathy toward a particular race revealed that traditions and accepted opinions, unpleasant racial sense impressions personally experienced in the early years or during adulthood with a few individuals were some of the causes.

Another study with the Social Distance Scale was conducted by Bogardus (1925a) with a group of 110 individuals. Some of them were businessmen and some public school teachers. They were asked to measure their acceptance of people of various races to social contacts. The results of the study are presented in terms of arithmetic means under various
indices as follows:

The Social Contact Range index varied from 1.18 for the Turks to 4.60 for the English. The score for Indians was 1.30. The smaller the score in this category, the less, presumably, the opportunities according to Bogardus for accommodation or assimilation. Social Contact Range assigned by the businessmen and the Public School teachers to Indians was 0.56 and 1.58 respectively.

Under the category of Social Contact Distance index, Canadians were given the closest "Contact" possibilities with a social contact distance index of 0.30, while the Turks were put the farthest away with a Social Contact Distance index of 4.80. Indians were assigned an index of 3.35 in this category.

The indices of Social Contact Range and Social Contact Distance were quantitative according to Bogardus. Therefore, he introduced Social Contact Quality index which according to him measured the quality of Social Contact. Under this category Canadians with their index of 22.51 were at the top, and the Turks with 2.91 at the bottom. Social Contact Quality index of Indians was 3.08.

Findings of the studies evidence that around 1925, Indians were held almost at a farthest social distance by Americans.

In 1926 Bogardus (1947) had a group of native-born
Americans rank 40 ethnic groups in order of favoring them for close kinship by marriage. The list of ranking shows English in the first place, Hindus in the last place with the other groups in between.

In Guilford's (1931) study, fifteen races or nationalities which represented American population and which asked for admission by way of immigration were rated by the method of paired comparisons upon their desirability as American citizens. The judges were approximately one thousand college students. The Swedish, English, Russian, Italian, Spanish, French, German were rated on the positive side. All Asians were consistently rated negative, with the Japanese higher on the scale than the Indians or the Chinese. The lowest rating was received by the Turks.

The results of Albig's (1939) study of attitudes of 1725 Americans toward forty different races on a Social Distance Scale were presented in terms of classification as the first four; the middle four and the last four of the nationalities. Indians were rated as the last of the last four nationalities. These results evidence that even around the year 1939 Indians were assigned farthest social distance by Americans. Compared to Indians the Koreans, Mulattoes and Chinese were nearer to Americans.

Bogardus (1947) conducted a study in 1946 similar to his previous study in 1926 with his social distance scale.
The subjects in 1946 study were 1950 Americans from different regions of the United States. The list of "races" were nearly the same as was used in 1926. The results are as follows: In 1926 the Indians were 36th i.e. the last on the rank. In 1946 they were 34th on the rank. Bogardus says that the East Indians (i.e. Indians) have been given a somewhat closer position but also they are still relatively distant. He further says, "They too have been considered as enemies of Japan and their good will is appreciated, but their differences in religion, dress, and general appearance are factors which keep them well down the distance scale (p. 61)."

Bogardus (1947) has drawn some conclusions from his comparison of both the studies as follows:

Racial distances as a whole change very slowly, ....... Racial distance decreases slowly when deeply imbedded in fixed or established feelings and sentiments. ...

The knowledge factor as represented by inter-cultural education of one kind or another, both formal and informal, has undoubtedly increased considerably in the United States between 1926 and 1946. People have become informal in varying degrees regarding other peoples of the world. The average citizen of the United States is thinking today much more in international terms than in 1926. However, this fact is offset by a growing degree of general unrest, insecurity and even fear.

People normally feel nearer to other people of similar cultural backgrounds than to other people of dissimilar culture. Even two wars with Germany have not influenced people of the United States to move Germans out of the nearness half of the distance scale (pp. 61-62).
Bogardus (1968) compared three recent social distance studies that bear an interesting relationship to one another despite the fact that one was made in Ethiopia, one in South Africa and one in the United States. They are comparable in important aspects because each used the same Ethnic Distance Scale.

One of these studies was made by Dr. Brown at the Haile Selassie I University at Addis Ababa in 1966. The subjects in his study were 336 lower division college students in sociology and ethnology courses.

The results show that the Ethiopians and the Negroes received the smallest distance scores of 1.18 and 1.88 respectively. After them came all nationalities from northern Europe or with north European backgrounds. The Japanese 2.71 and Indians 3.03 rank near the middle of the results. The Turks received the highest distance score of 4.22.

Dr. Brown found that as a rule the females received somewhat higher scores than did the males, averaging about 0.54 higher, serving clearly to differentiate sexes.

In Dr. Brown's study Westernized peoples appear in the near half of the social distance continuum, while in the farness half are countries such as Czechs, Poles, Russians, and also the Chinese.

The second of these studies was made by Dr. Lever and
is based in part on data obtained by using the Ethnic Distance Scale and in part on personal interviews of selected adult members of households in their Johannesburg homes. The data were gathered in 1964. This study was limited to white residents, and included 1,026 English-speaking South Africans, 386 Afrikaans-speaking South Africans, and 333 Jews.

The scores given by the English-speaking South African adults were in order of increasing distance indices: English-speaking South Africans 1.16, British 1.34, Afrikaans-speaking South Africans 1.56, and Indians 4.45.

The scores given by the Afrikaans-speaking South African adults list the Afrikaans-speaking South Africans first with an index of 1.17, followed by the other racial groups in the following order: English-speaking South Africans 1.34, British 2.03, Indians 5.65.

The scores given by adult Jews placed the Jews nearest on the distance scale at 1.04. English-speaking South Africans received 1.80, and Indians 3.75.

The third racial distance study was made by Bogardus. In this study the racial reactions of 2605 college students in 35 different colleges and universities located in 25 different states of the United States were measured. This study parallels similar studies made by Bogardus in the years 1926, 1946, 1956, with results that are comparable with the
findings of Dr. Lever in South Africa and Dr. Brown in Ethiopia.

The results of the social distance studies conducted by Bogardus in the United States from time to time reveal the Racial Distance Indices for Indians as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Racial Distance Index for Indians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1925</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1926</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td>30th</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1946</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>28th</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 1956</td>
<td>2053</td>
<td>29th</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 1966</td>
<td>2605</td>
<td>30th</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bogardus (1968) interprets some of his results as follows:

... When the Distance Scores for the third or farther distance levels are considered, it will be noted that a marked decrease in distance reactions had been taking place over the forty years for most of the given races. For example, although the rank order of the Indians is thirty for both 1926 and 1966, the Racial Distance Score has made an outstanding decrease of 129 points (1.29), from 3.91 in 1926 to 2.62 in 1966 (pp. 153-154).

Bogardus maintained that when Racial Distance scores are examined in the upper or nearness sector, no great changes have occurred over the forty years that have transpired.

Comparison between the studies in the United States and South Africa reveal that the distance scores run much
higher for the dark-skinned races than for other groups.

In his concluding statements Bogardus (1968) says:

1. Over a forty-year span there has been a measurable decrease in racial distances in the United States experienced by many races.
2. This comprehensive decrease in racial distances would have been greater had it not been slowed down by World War II, the Cold War, a serious economic Depression, and by antiracial propaganda that usually accompanies social conflicts.
3. The decrease in racial distances in the United States, barring a national catastrophe, may be expected to continue in the next forty years very much as it has done in the past forty years, but at a decreasing rate as the distances between the nearest races and the other races become progressively shortened. Moreover, the data of this study do not indicate that racial distances will disappear entirely in any foreseeable future.
4. The over-all decrease in social distance has been fostered by a developing appreciation of the similarities in the basic human needs and longings of all racial groups.
5. These developments in sympathetic understanding have been stimulated by persons acting both as individuals and as members of social organizations and institutions, such as the public schools, which have proved a common ground on which most American youth have been able to meet regularly in terms of democratic interaction.
6. The decrease in racial distances in the United States indicates that there is taking place, however slowly and irregularly, a melding of cultures from many lands into an American culture more composite and more cosmopolitan, also more dynamic and stimulating than has heretofore functioned in the United States (p. 155).

Results of a study by Triandis and Triandis (1960) reveal that for white subjects race and social class were found to be more important determinants of social distance than religion or nationality. The relative importance of the various factors, however, varied from group to group. Women were found to show more social distance than men, lower-class
subjects more than lower middle-class subjects and these more than upper middle-class subjects.

Findings of Landis, Datwyler and Dorn (1966) support the hypothesis that social class affiliation is more important than ethnic group affiliation in determining cultural behavior. Secondly, the authors say that the findings of their study corroborated the results of a study by Bogardus which had reported that males tend to show less social distance than females toward other race, nationality, and ethnic groups. This is explained in part by more isolation on the part of the female and fewer intergroup contacts. Thirdly, prejudice defined in terms of social distance tends to be generalized to several groups, and to non-existent or nonesuch groups.

Ames et al. (1968) study explores the sex difference in social distance responses and relates them to studies by Bogardus. The data for the analysis of Ames et al study was collected by Bogardus in a nationwide survey of 2,605 college students taken in 1966. The findings of the study support the previous results that girls tend to be more rejecting than boys. The social distance is normatively determined rather than by ideosyncratic choice. Despite previous findings that women are less variable in responses, these data show that women are more variable in responses to racial and ethnic groups between whom there is less social distance and less variable for groups which are seen as more distant.