CHAPTER - III
SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS AS SOCIAL DISTANCE STUDIES IN INDIA

(I) **Beginning of Social Relationships as Social Distance Studies in India; Conceptual Development**

Soon after India attained Independence, the Government of India invited the eminent psychologist, Gardner Murphy, to organize a "Tension Project" to enquire into the nature of group tensions in India (1950). The primary focus of this project was Hindu-Muslim interaction, as this was the main problem before Independent India. But Murphy also studied inter-caste relations and brought out some significant findings. Earlier, Ziegler (1949) had already focussed the attention of Indian political leaders on the problems of social conflicts between Hindus and Muslims.

The initiative of Murphy in studying inter-caste distances was taken up by Radhakamal Mukerjee of the University of Lucknow. In October 1951, after consultation with Murphy, Mukerjee undertook a survey of Caste Distance and Tension in Uttar Pradesh. It is significant to note here that although Mukerjee was in touch with Bogardus, he did not try to emulate his social distance concept and to blindly adapt his Scale. He conceptualized social distance a little differently, in terms of cultural values and norms. He (1548: 158-159) observed that "It is cultural norms and methods of socialization of the child which reflect themselves in the social farness or nearness and formulate structure of both children and adults". He cautioned...
that, "Social distance is more than social stratification. It is impregnated with symbols, meanings and values accepted by all social strata". He observed that, "The framework of symbols, values and beliefs, moral codes or religion enter into the structure of social distance by instilling customs, habits and attitudes of dominance and deference that maintain and safeguard the smooth working mechanisms of human roles and statuses". He further observed that, "Simultaneously the types of personality in the various roles and statuses are moulded in their limited ecological and social space by appropriate cultural patterns". Accordingly, the classification of the different types or orders of personality depended on the use of certain role and status criteria and symbols. Man achieved his relative status and developed his unique personality in his limited life-space within the boundaries of his own class, caste, occupational group or profession. It was the segment or parts of the broad society where man was in regular daily competition with his peers which assigned his exact position and role and determined his relative vertical and horizontal mobility. These also governed his attitudes, life-values and the nature of his personality equilibrium in ecological and social space".

Mukerjee (1951b; 1965) maintained that the cohesion of the caste structure in India was preserved not only through endogamy, and unity of occupation, manners, customs, and standard of living but by the caste distance differential. Thus, contrary to Bogardus, Mukerjee visualized the phenomenon of caste distance in Indian society as positive and a culturally
approved behaviour. The caste distance differential, in fact, defined the structural aspect of the caste. Traditionally, caste distance was implied in the concept of caste. Rules and rituals were prescribed which not only maintained caste distance but reinforced it in time. Every effort to lessen the caste distance was resisted and detested. Indian history was replete with examples where high caste Hindus greatly resented the lower castes seeking to lessen or to do away with the traditional distance between them.

A very interesting account was provided by Hardgrave, Jr. (1969). By tradition in Travancore, the breast was bared as a symbol of respect to those of higher status. In the elaborate hierarchy of caste ranking, the Nairs, for example, bared their breasts before the Nambudiri Brahmins, and the Brahmins did so only before the deity. The Nadars, like all of the lower castes, were categorically forbidden to cover their breasts at any time. The manner of dress prescribed for the Nadars consisted of a single cloth of coarse texture, to be worn by males and females alike, no lower than the knee nor higher than the waist. When the Nadar women sought to cover their breasts, rioting broke out in October, 1958 in Southern Travancore. The higher caste Brahmins attacked Nadar women in the bazars, stripping them of their upper garments. Rioting soon followed in other districts. On January 4, 1859, some two hundred Brahmins, armed with clubs and knives, attacked the Christian Nadars of a village near Nagercoil, beating them and stripping the upper cloths from the women. Houses were burnt
and looted. Nagercoil was destroyed by fire. During the months of rioting and between October 1858 and February 1859, nine chapels and three schools were burned.

Thus, Mukerjee laid great emphasis on conceptualizing caste distance as symbolic, in the Indian context. Such a symbolic caste distance, evidently, was represented by a variety of distance-creating gestures and expressions which were invested with socially derived meanings and values for the participants. Among these, we may count: (1) the adoption of distinctive titles, surnames, sobriquets and stereotypes; (2) the mode of greeting, (3) the acceptance of kacha or pacca food; (4) the limits of hookah-pani; (5) the limits of the use and touch of household pots and utensils; (6) the seating arrangement; (7) the avoidance of visibility on auspicious occasions; and (8) the adoption of restrictions in respect of use of shoes, umbrellas, and dolls and women's dress and adornments. These manners were integrated into a complex set of customs attitudes and expectations that preserved the relative social farness and nearness of groups. Segregation, restriction of the use of common wells and temples and untouchability were exercised particularly against these groups that were all kept at a sufficient distance.

Majumdar and Madan (1956), likewise, observed that the basis of such distance was the fear, among higher castes, of pollution which resulted from proximity to, or contact with, the lower castes. When a Brahmin received a gift from another
person of his own caste, he had to acknowledge it in a loud voice; when from a Kahatriya, in a gentle voice; when from a Sudra he acknowledged it only in his own mind, thus indicating the pollution involved in accepting gifts from the lower castes. In Madras, a Pariah was said to pollute a high caste Hindu by approaching with a distance of sixty four feet. A Nayar might pollute a man of higher caste by touching him; and so on. The distance thus observed in Madras was accounted for by the mana concept which made avoidance compulsory to escape the evil consequences of superior mana. Similar practices, reported by Hutton (1946), were met with among the Naga and Munda Tribes. Such distance behaviours were mutual; the higher castes maintained distance from the lower for fear of pollution, and the lower castes for fear of being affected by the superior mana of the latter.

Mukerjee also considered social distance as overt which was represented by (1) endogamous marriage within the caste, clan or brotherhood; (2) exclusion from (a) the temple, (b) the public tank, spring, well or other sources of water supply, (c) the kitchen and the dining floor, and (d) the neighbourhood or villages.

Baljeet Singh (1951b), a colleague of Radhakamal Mukerjee, expressed that social distance was an increasing function of both caste and economic inequality while group status was represented by its reciprocity.

Narayan (1951), observed that social distance, as contr-
asted from ego-distance, characterized the sympathy and anti-pathy feelings of a group toward other groups. It was, in other words, the sense of "outer feeling" manifested by a group toward the other reference groups. He expressed his belief that social distance was more keenly felt in non-hierarchical societies, because they were based on the assumption that men were born equal, and there developed competition and struggle for occupying higher positions in a given social framework. The sense of competition grew so great that individuals developed antipathy toward other individuals. On the other hand, in a hierarchical society like India, social distance was taken for granted and every one accepted one's role and position with good grace.

(II) Nature of Social Distance Studies: Historical Evaluation

aspects of social distance.

The characteristic features of all these studies with respect to sample sizes, stimulus subjects, response objects, regions studies, respondents' characterisitics, measuring devices, etc., may be described as below.

(III) Sample Size

Most of the studies conducted in India had a sample size of 100-500 subjects. Only one study by Bannur (1969) had a sample size of 1777 subjects. Ansar (1956) studied 745 subjects; Kuppuswamy (1952) 591 subjects; Rath and Sircar (1959, 1960a, b, c) 1000 subjects; Sharma (1965) 650 subjects; Paranjpe (1970) 503 subjects and Roy (1965) 500 subjects. Subjects were at randomly selected without following any systematic sampling procedure. Only Rath and Sirkar (1960a, b, c) and Sinha and Sinha (1967), were reported to have selected their samples through stratified sampling procedures. Pranjpe (1970) adopted quota sampling procedures.

(IV) Stimulus Subjects

As in the case of social distance studies abroad, stimulus subjects in Indian studies comprised mostly of students of schools, colleges and universities. Besides, Hindu and Muslim subjects, and caste subjects, were also studied by a few scholars.

(V) Response Subjects

Responses of caste distance feelings were generally studied
amongst caste and religious groups toward each other. In certain cases such feelings were studied with respect to foreigners, lower castes, specific caste groups, state citizens, nationalities, regional groups, and linguistic groups.

(VI) Regions Studied

Indian studies of social distance collected data from such state subjects as Delhi, U.P., Gujrat, Mysore, West Bengal, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Assam, Orissa, Andhra Pradesh and Kerala. However, more studies were reported from Bihar, Orissa and Madras than from other states.

(VII) Characteristics of Respondents

The respondents mostly belonged to different religions (Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Sikhs, Parsis) regions (Nepalis, Bengalis, Assamese, Biharis, South Indians, Maharashtrians, Mysorians, Gujrati), ethnic groups (Indians, Americans, Russians, Britishers, Chinese and Burmese), caste groups (Brahmins and non-Brahmins), occupational groups; sexes; age-groups; educational standard groups; linguistic groups; residential groups; ecological groups, etc.

Mention may be made of the combination of stimulus characteristics studied by scholars. Bannur (1969) considered such stimulus characteristics as S.E.S., caste and race; Prakash and Reddy (1967) as caste, religion, education and sex; Hanumantha Rao (1960) as caste, sex, locality and religion, Narayan and Parmeswaran (1965) as length of stay in the hostel, sex and
language; Ray (1965) as age, sex, education and background as sociological stimulus conditions, and family, friends, and social contacts as psychological stimulus conditions; Sharma (1966) as family, sex, morals, age, caste, parents' education religion, faculty, income and sibblings; and so on.

The following observations were made about various stimulus characteristics:

(1) **Age** :- Ray (1965) and Sharma (1969) found age-variations as having no significant impact on variations in social distance attitudes.

(2) **Sex** :- Prakash and Reddy (1967), Ray (1965), Hanumantha Rao (1960), Narayan and Parmeswaran (1965) found females maintaining more social distance than boys. Sharma (1965), however, did not find sex differences as affecting social distance feelings.

(3) **Caste** :- Adinarayan (1953) found that the South Indian Hindu had less racial ill-feeling toward the Muslim than the North Indian Hindu. The popular belief found that Muslims were less caste conscious than the Hindus was not to be true as regards their social distance attitude toward the Harijans. Agarwal (1965) found that lower castes showed much less inhibition in accepting persons from upper groups than upper castes had in accepting persons from the lower castes. Anant (1970) reported lesser social distance between caste Hindus and Harijans in respect of physical contact with them and their
admission into temples, and greater distance in respect of
dining with them and having marriages with them. His findings
led to conclude that many caste Hindus tended to reduce cogni-
tive imbalance created by conflicting legal and caste demands
by differentiation, conforming to the constitutional and legal
rules in areas where the interaction with Harijans was of
superficial nature, but sticking to the caste rules in areas of
intimate interaction.

Bannur (1969) found that Hindus showed willingness to
admit Harijans as "neighbours" and "class-mates" and not nearer
than these relationships. His findings corroborated the find-
ings of American investigators about antisemitism and white-
Negro relationship. Prakash and Reddy (1967) found the
existence of caste distance among the four caste Hindu groups:
Brahmin, Kshatriya, Kayastha and Vaishya, expressed in terms of
a definite hierarchy of preferences. Kuppuswamy (1952) found
that each caste group ranked itself as the first in the order
of preference. Again, the higher caste non-Brahmins were given
the relatively higher position by all the caste groups. However,
the non-Brahmins gave Brahmins a lower position. Again, he
found that the next preferred group after the ingroup was far
away in every case except among the non-Brahmin men who gave a
relatively low place to the lower caste non-Brahmins. This was
true of higher caste as well as of the lower caste non-Brahmins.
These findings found a support from Natraj (1963a, b, 1965).

Hanumantha Rao (1960) found that most of the Brahmins
were not only to allow non-Brahmins to stay in their locality but also as their neighbours. But they were not ready to take food and marry with non-Brahmins. The non-Brahmins (Nadars and Harikantras) were found to be more conservative than other caste groups. A general tendency was found on the part of the lower caste group to want to marry into the higher caste group.

Rath and Sircar (1960b) found that (1) the upper caste people appeared to be more liberal and progressive in regard to casteism. They were more against untouchability than even the untouchables against this evil. (2) The lower caste people were more rigid and intolerant about caste reforms than the upper caste people. (3) There was a greater unanimity among the castes in regard to inter-caste living in the schools and college hostels, but there was stiff opposition to inter-caste living in hostels in mixed castes, worshipping in temples from a significant section of the population. (4) A large majority of each of the caste groups was found to be in favour of giving political equality to all the castes and accept the principles of majority decisions in national and political issues.

Natraj (1963b) found Lingayats and Vysyas Brahmins as more conservative than others and hence showing greater distance toward others. Other castes showed lesser social distance with Brahmins, and Harijans showed the least distance toward themselves and Brahmins.

(4) Religion : Adinarayan (1953) found that the South
Indian Hindus had less racial distance toward the Muslims than the North Indian Hindu. Prakash and Reddy (1967) found caste distance more powerful than the religious distance. Prasad (1967) found religious intolerance being at a very high level among his subjects. Meade and Singh (1973) found that both Hindus and Muslims showed increased social distance between themselves; and that there were no significant change in social distance toward any of the other sub-cultural groups. Natraj (1963, 1965) found each religious group having no social distance towards its own group and some distance toward every other group. Natraj (1965) also found, as contrary to Prakash and Reddy, that social distance feelings were more intense among religious groups than among caste groups. Among religious groups Hindus and Jains were found to be more conservative as compared to Muslims. Panchbhai (1966a & b) found that religion alone, irrespective of race or ethnic considerations, was not so much effective in determining social distance between groups. However, the sense of belonging to one's religion was more valued than belonging to an ethnic group. Hanumantha Rao (1960) found that Muslims were more conservative than Christians, suggesting Muslims maintaining greater social distance with other religious groups than the Christians. Sharma (1965) found Christians as more liberal than Hindus.

(5) Occupation: Ansari (1956) found clerks among both Hindus and Muslims to be maintaining more social distance against other communities than the professional persons and labourers. Singh (1965, 1967) found professors, army officers,
advocates and private businessmen maintaining some social distance from each other. Nearest distance was expressed toward one's own occupational group. Professors were considered more nearer than others by all other occupational groups.

(6) **Socio-economic Status** :- Bannur (1969) found variations in socio-economic status of subjects as significantly affecting their social distance toward each other. It was found to be more or less inversely related to social distance. Sharma (1965) also found social distance as significantly related to the income of the family.

(7) **Education** :- Sharma (1965) found social distance as negatively related to educational level.

(8) **Language** :- Panchbhai (1966) observed that both language and religion were equally important referents in an intergroup situation. Narayan and Parmeswaran (1965) also found language of the subjects as significantly related to their attitudes of social distance.

(9) **Locality** :- Hanumantha Rao (1960) found that most of the Brahmins were not willing to allow non-Brahmins to stay in their locality.

(10) **Length of Stay** :- Narayan and Parmeswaran (1965) found that social distance diminished with increased length of stay in a particular place.

(11) **Nationality** :- Adinarayan (1957) found both Hindus
and Muslims as showing a relationship between liberalism-conservatism attitude and colour prejudice with more prejudice against foreigners. Rath and Sircar (1958) found Indians showing lesser social distance toward Britishers than toward Americans, Russians and Chinese; the greatest being towards Russians and Chinese. Sinha and Upadhyaya (1961) found that Indians expressed the least social distance toward Russians and maximum toward the Americans.

(VIII) Measurement of Social Distance

(a) Adaptations of Bogardus Technique

Various measurement techniques were used by Indian scholars to measure social distance attitudes of Indian subjects. Adinarayan (1953, 1957) used the original Bogardus social distance scale. He administered this test to South Indian Hindus prior to the attainment of independence of India, and again after the event. It was found that the attainment of independence by Indians brought about a change for the better in their attitude toward Britain.


Kuppuswamy (1951, 1952, 1956) modified the relationship in the Bogardus test as: (1) to kinship by marriage, (2) to
take food in your own dining room, (3) as an intimate personal friend, (4) as a guest in your house, (5) as your neighbour, (6) as an acquaintance. The subjects were asked to indicate their preferences regarding each group as a whole and not with reference to any particular individual of that group. Prakash and Reddy (1967) also used Kuppuswamy's modified scale in their study. They included the six relationships of nearness and farness as (1) would like to establish kinship by marriage; (2) would accept to take food in my dining room; (3) would like to cultivate friendship; (4) would allow him as a guest in my house, (5) would allow him as a neighbour; (6) would like to strike acquaintance. This scale was used to measure social distance among eight social groups: Brahmin, Christian, Harijan, Kayastha, Kshtriyas, Muslims, Sikhs, and Vaishyas.

Natraj and Murthy (1963) and Natraj (1965) modified the Bogardus scale items of relationships as follows: (1) willingness to allow others to temple; (2) willingness to marry; (3) willingness to take food; (4) willingness to accept as personal friend; (5) willingness to have as neighbour; (6) willingness to allow others to stay in locality; and (7) willingness to allow others to stay in our country without citizenship rights. In place of ethnic categories, the eight caste groups were substituted in the scale.

Subramanian, et al., (1973), adapting the Bogardus test, prepared a nine-item continuum of social relationships as follows: (1) to close kinship by marriage; (2) to interdine in each
others house (3) to my home as family friend (4) to participate in family festivals and celebrations, (5) to participate in the religious and community festivals, (6) as visitors to the temple; (7) as participants in cultural and recreational programmes (such as dramas, bhajans, village games, sports, etc.); (8) to my street as neighbours; and (9) to reside in my village as community members. The scale was administered to Thevar castes to measure their social distance toward Gowder, Naidu and Pillai castes.

Sinha and Upadhayaya (1960a; 1962), modified the Bogardus scale in as much as they included only six categories of relationships among eleven ethnic groups, viz., Indians, Americans, Burmese, Chinese, English, French, German, Japanese, Negroes, Pakistanis and Russians.

Lakshminarayana (1975) modified the Bogardus scale so as to include the following relationships: (1) as a citizen of the country, (2) as neighbours, (3) as guest, (4) to take food together, (5) to kinship by marriage. The social distance scores were collected in respect of six ethnic groups: Brahmins, High caste non-Brahmins, low caste Hindu, Harijans, Christians, and Muslims. Bannur (1969) used the Bogardus scale as adapted by Zeligs and Hendrickson (1933).

Rath (1959) used a 5-point scale of social distance somewhat like the Bogardus scale. In this case also the first statement expressed intense friendliness to the extent of desiring to have marital relationship with them whereas the last expressed the wish to eliminate them completely if necessary by killing. As an illustration of the feelings of intense
friendliness, the 5-point statement read as follows:—

(1) If a Bengali girl is up to my choice, will marry her without hesitation.

(2) I will be willing to have a Bengali as a guest for a meal in my house.

(3) I would be willing to have a Bengali merely as an acquaintance to whom one talks on meeting in the street.

(4) I do not enjoy the companionship of the Bengali people.

(5) I wish some one would kill all the Bengalis.

Mahar (1960) used a Ritual Distance Scale which was adapted from the Bogardus Social Distance Scale and from Blunt's (1931) ritual ranking of castes of the United Provinces, and combined these with the Guttman (1944) scaling technique for ranking objects according to a single consensual attitude dimension*. His ritual distance scale contained the following items:—

1. can a ... touch you? Will you object to it or will he (or they) become polluted?

2. can a ... sit on your cot? Will you object to it....

3. can a ... come on your cooking area? Will you object to it....

4. can a ... touch your brass utensils? Will you object to it....

5. can a ... touch your earthenware vessels? Will you object it....

6. can a ... smoke the stem of your pipe? Will you object to it....

* The Guttman scale has been elaborated into types of scales by Matilda. Riley, John Riley, Jackson, Toby and their Colleagues (1954). The types they have called "object scale" and "group scale" may be combined into a technique applicable to the study of ritual ranking of Indian castes.
7. can a...smoke the bowl of your pipe? Will you object to it....

8. can you eat pakka (cooked in milk or butter) food from the hand of a.....?

9. can you eat Kachcha (cooked in water) food such as cooked pulse, bread or rice from a hand of a.....?

10. can you take dry uncooked food (Sukha sidha) from a.....?

11. can you take water from the hand of a.....?

12. can a....touch your water vessel? Would you object to it....

13. can a....touch your children? Would you object to it....

(b) **Adaptation of Campbell and Levine Technique**

Bose and Roy (1963) used the technique adopted by Campbell and Levine (1961). In this technique, the subjects were interviewed on a questionnaire consisting of several derogatory names (ethnophaulism) to refer to outgroups and their members. The presumption was that no major culture or racial division was immune to stereotyping. The prevalence of it was so well illustrated by the numerous derogatory nicknames used by the members of racial or ethnic groups to refer to other racial or ethnic groups.

(c) **Percentage Scale**

De and Sinha (1962) used the "Percentage of Population Scale" technique, in which sewometric preferences of subjects ranged from -100 to +100. Social distance score from 1 was qualified by subtracting the preference score from 100.
(d) Adaptation of Triandis Technique

Meade and Singh (1973) used Triandis (1964) technique for measuring social distance, containing a 7-point scale concerning the desirability of engaging in 10 kinds of social activities with members of 9 sub-cultural groups.

(e) Projective Test Technique

Natraj (1963a) used the technique of "mental pictures" to measure the relationships between stereotypes and social distance. The same technique was earlier used by Rath and Sircar (1959). Prasad (1957) also used Projective Tests through questionnaires and interviews.

(f) Semantic Perception Test

Rath and Das (1958) used the Semantic Perception Test. The subjects were given a list of 60 important attributes and asked to select such traits as would correctly describe the characteristics of the different groups in question. After selecting their own list of attributes for each of the groups they were also asked to mention any other appropriate adjectives which were not given in the list. The procedure followed was similar to one used by Protho & Miles (1952a & b) and Gilbert (1951) in their studies of stereotypes. Rath and Sircar (1960b) also used the Semantic Perception Test technique and the subjects were given a list of 47 traits - 22 favourable and 25 unfavourable.
(Kumari) Sinha (1968) found Bogardus technique as also Semantic Perception Technique used by various Indian scholars as most inappropriate for a study of social distance among Hindu castes. Therefore, in her own study of social distance among five Hindu castes of Agra, she preferred to use a questionnaire of 20 items covering important areas of distance - social, economic, educational and cultural.

(g) **Adaptation of Katz and Barly Technique**

Mrs. Devi (1968), following Katz and Barly (1932) method of studying social distance and stereotypes, used a questionnaire which contained a list of 30 characteristics or qualities as were thought of typical for the given ten regional groups. The subjects were asked to choose as many qualities as they liked for the people of each province.

(h) **Questionnaire Technique**

Rath and Sircar (1960a) used a questionnaire containing 36 statements in all. All these statements were not given in one list. They were divided into three independent units. One unit containing 18 items was included in one test and administered in one sitting whereas the other two lists containing the rest of the items were administered in a separate sitting after a lapse of a week or so long with other tests. The 36 statements broadly fell into 8 categories: (1) implying strong and aggression, (2) implying revolution and strong determination (3) expressing social distance and antagonism, (4) desiring equality
of social status, (5) implying economic solution, (6) having political implications, (7) pertaining to education, (8) expressing opinions on the prevalent social issues.

Rath and Sircar (1960c) in another study also used a questionnaire containing 10 items of belief mainly connected with caste distances. Nine out of 10 items were directly related to the beliefs associated with the social status of the low caste groups and only one was related to the economic problem which was indirectly connected with the same basic issue. Each of the 10 problems was specified under four definite issues related to it. The subjects were asked to approve or disapprove these statements one by one. The following item may be cited as an example:

1. Is untouchability
   (a) an act against social well being?
   (b) a serious superstition in us?
   (c) an illegal act?
   (d) due to low occupation?

(Km.) Sinha (1968) also used a questionnaire of 86 highly reliable items showing social distance between six important caste groups. Sinha and Sinha (1967) administered to his subjects a questionnaire containing 100 characteristics which they were to rate on a three point scale of desirability. In order to explore the relationship between social distance and preference for association, the ten chosen castes were ranked by responding subjects on the basis of numbers, assigned desirable traits and
average rank position of preferences for association.

Ganguli (1965) used a set of five questions to study the social distance of Indians toward various ethnic groups. The questions were as follows:

(1) I shall be happy if I could marry the national of....
(2) I do not like girls of....
(3) I do not like food habits of....
(4) I dislike to associate with....
(5) I would advise my people to beware of people from...

Hanumantha Rao (1960) studied social distance with reference to major caste groups of coastal track of North Kanada by using a questionnaire prepared on the lines of Bogardus social distance scale and administered to 8 major caste groups. The study was followed by observing and recording the verbal expression of the subjects.

(1) Adaptation of Likert Technique

Roy (1965) used a 5-point likert scale in respect of 24 social relationships characterizing social integration or social distancing. The five points for each social relationship were:
(1) strong agreement, (2) agreement, (3) indifferent, (4) disagreement and (5) strong disagreement. When there was strong agreement with a given relationship the subject expressed his distance-free mind, that he or she could accommodate others unquestionably. Similarly, when there was strong disagreement it expressed that subject was maintaining the greatest social
distance.

(j) **Prejudice Scale**

Sharma (1965) used a Prejudice Scale consisting of eighty items collected from newspapers, discussions and traditional opinions relating to family, sex, morals, etc., placed on a 5-point scale, with ten buffer and ten check items interposed between them. They were classified under four categories: authoritarianism, conventionalism, attitude towards women, and ethnocentricism. Sinha (1966) used a prejudice Scale based on anti-sematism, containing 26 items.

(k) **Check-list Technique**

Ganguli (1965) also used a checklist of adjectives and open-ended questions asking his subjects for the striking characteristics of a particular national group. Kothurkar (1954) used a check list of 124 adjectives to find out the social distance among Maharastrians, the Gujraties and non-Maharastrians and non-Gujraties about themselves and about one another as groups.

(l) **Generalized Distance Coefficient Technique**

Mukherjee and Bandyopadyay (1964) used the Mahalanobis' Generalized Distance Coefficient, $D^2$, technique in a study of the determinants of differences among per capital levels of living in a number of Indian village households. They used five different and presumably correlated indicator variables - per
capital stock of roofing materials, clothing, ordinary domestic utensils. A kind of social distance between various groups of households was calculated in terms of average values of these indicators using Mahalanobis' generalized distance coefficients, $D^2$, which had been described as "the (squared) Euclidean distance in a space defined by set of oblique axes. Both "social" and "economic" classifications were assumed to affect levels of living and were used in analytically defining the "socio-economic groups", among which $D^2$'s were calculated considerable experimentation with different ways of classifying these groupings were directed toward finding meaningful and succinct hierarchies of social and economic status. The authors, even more basically, concerned themselves with classifying social space in terms of which group differences in the levels of living indicators assumed their clearest significance. Accordingly, they constructed a matrix of social distances among seventeen "socio-economic" or caste/class groups.

(m) Caste Distance Scales

(i) Indices of degrees of contact: M. Mukerjee (1951) observed that it was possible to present a fairly accurate picture of the social distance scale for various cates by combining the various indices of degrees of contact and preferences in inter-caste relations. The principal indices for a consistent scale of caste distance were stated by him as follows:--
1. Boundaries of Endogamy 25
2. Dimension of Hookah-Pani (offer of drinking water and tobacco from the same receptacle) 12
3. Segregation distances in wards 25
4. Limits to common worship and entry into temple 8
5. Degrees of untouchability 14
6. Discrimination in the use of common wells and tanks 8
7. Minor barriers to social proximity 8

100

(ii) Differential Relationship Scale: Guha and Kaul (1953) conducted a study of social distance between castes in some villages in U.P. They developed a sort of scale with reference to the different types of relationships entered into by the various castes with each other. Thus, marriage was considered to be the closest type of relationship, while having nothing to do with each other signified the least relationship.

(iii) Caste Discrimination Scale: Ganguly (1972) developed a caste discrimination scale to study caste prejudices and its consequences. The nine items on his Scale dealt with different types of inequalities that characterized social distance among Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Harijans, such as social status and prestige inequality, untouchability with respect to dining, entry in homes, recognizing merit, etc., discrimination in employment, discrimination in education with respect to admissions, and attention paid by teachers, discrimination in
public services such as water resources, medical aid, hotel admission, etc., discrimination in religious matters such as temple entry, other forms of discrimination, discrimination in political opportunities, and miscellaneous types of discrimination.

(iv) Caste Prejudice Scale: Paranjpe (1970) developed an eight-item Caste Prejudice Scale, which was administered on Brahmans, Marathas and Harijans. The items included in the Scale were: I have (1) talked with; (2) played with; (3) studied with; (4) went for a picnic with; (5) dined at their place with; (6) dined at my place with; (7) stayed at my place with; and (8) stayed at their place with. The responses were dichotomized between positive and negative.

(v) Caste Ranking Technique: Gough (1939) studied 100 intercaste relationships of nearness and distance with the help of "criteria of caste ranking". In her view castes could be ranked according to relationships of Servitude, and the degree of "onerousness" to Servitor. The type of occupation followed by a caste, the power it gives, the degree of pollution it conveys, and so on gave the caste its ritual status. Marriott (1968) believed, however, that the problem of caste ranking could be best tackled in the context of local and regional structures. He introduced the concept of "laborateness" with reference to caste ranking. It depended on four sets of factors, which he stated as (1) number of local ethnic groups - the greater the number the greater the possibility of elaborateness.
(2) Correlative stratified interaction among ethnic groups, interaction being of crucial importance, (3) Consistency among individuals in stratified interaction - in the absence of consensus as to caste standings there could be no caste ranking at all, (4) separation from inconsistent interaction elsewhere.

(vi) **Acceptance and Rejection Scale** :- Gupta (1956) studied the dynamics of inter-caste relations through the acceptance or rejection of Kachha food, Pakka food, water, the hookka, Physical touch and marriage. He observed that in most spheres of caste relations distances had decreased over time, but distances still continued with reference to marriage and smoking the hookka.

(vii) **Inclusion and Exclusion Scale** :- Pocock (1957) suggested a method of inclusion and exclusion for studying caste distances in India. He observed that each caste tried to arrogate to itself a higher status by immitating the caste above it, and it including itself with all castes higher than itself. At the same time it excluded all castes below it. Inclusion and exclusion also operated between different levels with a large caste as when the higher levels refused to give daughters to lower levels, and thus excluded them. These levels were in the nature of recognized marriage circles. Within the circle there might be an informally recognized hierarchy of preferred marriages. Inclusion and exclusion might even operate between families in the same village. The idea of caste distance in India could be seen in the concept of dominant caste. The
concept of the dominant caste, as opposed to the concept of interdependent castes, each equally necessary to society, was developed by Mayer (1956). The dominant caste in an area maintained distance from other castes, for reasons of their political and economic dominance. About the Rajputs of rural central Indian, Mayer found that this dominant caste, in respect of ritual position, placed itself next only to the Brahmins and maintained distances with all others. The meat eating castes were closely allied to the Rajputs. The vegetarian castes would drink and smoke with them but would not eat with them.

(viii) **Differential Treatment Scale**: Some studies were also made regarding caste distance among Muslims. For example, D'Souza (1954) observed about the plants on the South West coast of India that caste distance were expressed by differential treatment used of certain articles of distinction, segregation and Mahar, which by custom, was larger, for the higher caste, but which might not actually be paid at marriage. Gupta (1956) also studied caste distance among the Muslims of a village in North Western U.P. He observed that in Muslim hierarchy Arabic and other Muslim caste of foreign origin were placed at the top, ruling caste second and, the occupational and other castes third. Occupational castes were ranked according to cleanliness or otherwise of the occupation.

(n) **Social Distance Scale**

Sharma and Hallen (1974) developed a 10-item Social Distance Scale with five degrees of intensities. The ten-
items were concerned with ten relationships, viz., (i) choosing a marriage partner; (ii) inviting for lunch or dinner; (iii) inviting on family functions; (iv) keeping a cook; (v) choosing a friend; (vi) donating money; (vii) selecting a business partner; (viii) voting in an election; (ix) choice about neighbourhood; and (x) choosing a tenant. These items were scaled on a 5-point intensity scale, like the Likert technique, from the most positive degree to the most negative degree. This social distance scale consisted of three sub-scales, namely, Caste Distance, Religious Distance and Regional Distance subscales. While the items and intensities remained the same, the subscales varied in terms of caste, religion and region categories. Each item represented a life situation, some real and some imaginary. The respondents were required, in each of the subscales, to match response categories against the three different groups, viz., caste, religion, and regional.

(ix) An Overview & Evaluation: The foregoing review of social distance studies in India indicated a diversified interest of scholars. Quite contrary to foreign scholars, especially Park and Bogardus, social distance in this study has been conceptualized in terms of symbols, values and beliefs and in terms of social relationships pertaining to them. It was considered as overt behaviour and characterized the sympathy and antipathy feelings of an untouchable group toward other untouchable groups on the horizontal plane. These feelings were seen as generating from social and economic power and prestige rather than from inter-group prejudices and stereotypes. The
social distance feelings manifested in the degrees of acceptance and rejection, and inclusion and exclusion.

The various social distance studies devoted their primary attention to inter-caste relations, social tensions, communal tensions, group prejudices, stereotypes, regional differences, ethnocentricism, etc. Secondarily, these studies related to group image identification, kinship, social integration, self-perception, social attitudes, personality structures, religious differences, conflict and cooperation, neighbourhood relations, national identification, etc. Still another category of social distance studies concerned themselves with considering various aspects of social distance, patterns of social distance, factors of social distance, reduction of social distance, international social distance, and methodological aspects and measurement of social distance.

It may be further observed that in all these studies the types of social distance considered were: religious, linguistic, psychological, group, provincial or regional, racial, communal, caste, occupational, international, etc. The relationships mostly examined were stereotypes and social distance, temperament and social distance, caste ranking and social distance, education and inter-caste distance, social tensions and social distance, group dynamics and social distance, religion and caste group vs. social distance, prejudice and social distance, rituals and social distance, social integration and social distance, length of stay and social distance, kinship and social distance, etc.
The sample size of subjects studied was not larger than that studied by foreign scholars, and like the latter, the tendency among Indian scholars was to study students, school children and teachers. Interrelationships between Hindus and Muslims were also studied, while other non-Hindu groups were sheerly neglected. Caste groups were most frequently studied. Keeping in view the cultural diversities in the Indian society, it may be said that a good many cultural groups were not subjected to social distance studies. Some of the states were completely neglected and no social distance data were collected from Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Arunachal, Meghaland, Nagaland, Manipur, Himachal Pradesh, Haryana, Punjab, Jammu and Kashmir and Tamil Nadu.

Stimulus characteristics mostly subjected to investigations were sex, caste, religion, education, and age. Besides, such other stimulus characteristics were also examined as occupation, socio-economic status, language, locality, length of stay, nationality, neighbourhood, region, etc.

Attempts made to measure social distance attitudes usually adapted the Bogardus technique. Besides, some scholars adapted the Campbell and Levine technique, Triandis technique, Katz and Barly technique, and Likert technique. Other technique used by them were : Percentage population Scale, Projective Test, Semantic Perception Test, Questionnaire and Interviews, Prejudice Scale, Check-list technique, etc. To measure inter-caste distances, Mukherjee used a scale of indices of degree of contact and preferences, Guha and Kaul developed a scale with reference
to the different types of inter-caste relationships, Gough and Marriot used the criterion of caste ranking technique, Gupta used the criterion for acceptance and rejection of certain specified relationships, Pocock used the method of inclusion and exclusion, Mayer used the dominant caste criterion, D'Souza used the differential treatment test, and Sharma and Hallen used an intensity scale.

In respect of these scaling and measurement techniques it might be observed that such techniques necessarily involved the assignment of weights to the different attributes, and weights could only be assigned legitimately to quantifiable attributes. In all cases they involved subjectivism. Again, there was a great diversity in the caste observances of different regions - and even within a region - that it rendered very difficult to make any but the broadest comparisons. If the purpose was only to systematize caste rank within a scheme for purposes of analysis, it would appear that the sheer fact of reducing data to a form that fitted into a scale would slur over all the finer distinctions that made a full analysis possible. For one thing, it would not provide a proper idea of either the "attributes" or the "interactions" of caste that Marriott spoke of. The items on the scale pertained to behaviour in relation to other castes. Thus there was hardly any scale that could substitute for the actual study of what one might call the total complex of interactions between castes? or between scheduled castes?
The grouping together of items on a scale might be accidental, and might not represent items which were actually interrelated in the system. If the items were decided upon after an extensive preliminary investigation, the knowledge gained thereby would obviate the need for any further investigation. Even if a scale could be quickly and easily prepared, it was hard to believe that it could avoid the defects of any method that tailored data to fit into some form, and could not therefore take account of what appeared to be relatively trivial data. Even here, a scale for ritual distance might involve hierarchy, the rules of which were agreed upon by all concerned. But when items in a secular hierarchy were to be evaluated, and weighted, it was extremely unlikely that consistency would be found. Not all forms of wealth, for example, had the same value. Then what were relative values of land, gold and caste? Did wealth acquired from land give a status different from that conferred by wealth acquired from trade? Which was the more status determinant, a man's education or the occupation he followed? Where a scale was based on the values of the people who were the subject of the study, not only would there be differences between one area and another which might make inter-regional comparisons extremely difficult, but also the criteria chosen might have no applicability outside an area. Thus the sharing of a hookkah and the mode of sitting on a cot were definitely North Indian traits which were not found in peninsular India.

Finally, it might be said that all social distance studies
reported above not only lacked in proper measurements but also were not representative and hardly provided any composite picture of social distances in India in all castes, sub-castes and communities. However, it may be added that all social distance or social aloofness or social studies that have been conducted in India pertain to inter-caste and intra-caste distances. But in the present day Indian society due to the explosion of education, power and prestige positions attained by various scheduled castes and political manoeuvrings some scheduled castes have acquired better social status and made prestigious positions than other social groups of their stock. This has resulted in social discriminations and social distance among the untouchables also. Lamentably, studies have hardly been conducted of social distance in social relationships among and between the scheduled castes.