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The main findings of the present research are: (1) Hindus and Muslims do not differ with respect to prejudice (2) internally oriented and externally oriented subjects do not differ with respect to prejudice; (3) deprived subjects are found to be more prejudiced than non-deprived subjects (4) insecure subjects are more prejudiced than secure subjects; (5) there is an interactional effect of religion and locus of control on the degree of prejudice; (6) there is an interactional effect of religion and prolonged deprivation on the degree of prejudice; (7) there is no interactional effect of religion and security-insecurity on the degree of prejudice; (8) no interaction exists between locus of control and prolonged deprivation on the degree of prejudice; (9) there is an interactional effect of locus of control and security-insecurity on the degree of prejudice; (10) no interaction exists between prolonged deprivation and security-insecurity on the degree of prejudice (11) no interaction exists among religion, locus of control and prolonged deprivation on the degree of prejudice; (12) no interaction exists among religion, locus of control and security-insecurity on the degree of prejudice; (13) no interaction exists among religion, prolonged deprivation and security-insecurity on the degree of prejudice; (14) no interaction exists among locus of control; prolonged
deprivation and security-insecurity on the degree of prejudice; and (15) no interaction exists among religion, locus of control, prolonged deprivation and security-insecurity on the degree of prejudice.

The first finding of the present study i.e. Hindus and Muslims do not differ with respect to prejudice, is an addition do the existing controversial findings regarding the role of religion in the development of prejudice. It may be recalled that foreign as well as Indian researchers have yielded inconsistent results. Investigators like Allport and Kramer (1946), Bettelheim and Janowitz (1950), Goldsen et al. (1960) and Merton (1940), have reported that religious individuals are more prejudiced than the individuals with no religious affiliation. These findings, are, however, not confirmed by Mackenzie (1948) and Rosenblith (1949). Similarly many investigators have found differences among different religious groups on their prejudices against jews (Aderno et. al. 1950, Campbell, 1947; and Harlen, 1942).

The researches comparing the religious group in the Indian context have also obtained conflicting results. Many investigators have reported that Muslims, as compared to hindus, have more prejudices (Adinarayan, 1953; Chaudhary, 1958; Enayatullah, 1980; Hassan, 1975, 1978; Hassan and Singh, 1973, Singh, 1980). Other investigators, on the other

The contradictions in the findings regarding the role of religion in the development of prejudice may be due to the fact that most of the studies have not controlled factors like religiosity, education, sex and social class. For instance Allport and Ross (1967) have shown that the relation between religiosity and prejudice is influenced by education. However, in the present study these potent factors were fairly controlled and even then the findings of the present research are not in agreement with the findings obtained by numerous researchers like Rama Sharma (1988) and Qamar Jahan (1988). Rama Sharma (1988) has found that Hindus are more prejudiced than Muslims whereas Qamar Jahan (1988) has reported just opposite results i.e. Muslim are more prejudiced than Hindus, though in both these studies factors like religiosity, education and sex were controlled. We, therefore, firmly believe that contradictions between the findings obtained by Rama Sharma (1988, and Qamar Jahan (1988) and those of the present investigation are simply due to the differences in the population from which the samples were drawn in the present study and in the study undertaken by Qamar Jahan. It may be noted that Qamar Jahan selected her sample from undergraduate students of Abdul Islam Inter
College and Kaushalya Inter College Moradabad, where memories of communal riots might still be fresh in the minds of Muslims who were great sufferers in these riots. The magnitude of communal riots in Moradabad might have injected a far reaching dejection in the already demoralized and frustrated minds of the Muslims. Probably their frustration, demoralization and sense of insecurity provided the ground for the growth of communal hatred and prejudice. The sample of the present study, on the other hand, was drawn from the undergraduate students of Aligarh Muslim University and D.S. Degree College, Aligarh. Fortunately Aligarh has not witnessed any communal riot for the last several years and therefore Muslims might have become liberal in their attitudes towards Hindus.

A matter of fact both Hinduism and Islam are the religions that teach brotherhood, honesty, equality and respect to all other religions. Thus a "true Hindu" and a "true Muslim" are not expected to develop prejudices towards the member of any religion, caste, and creed. The finding of the present study is in accordance to this expectations. Both Hindu and Muslim subjects in the present research have shown a very low degree of prejudice as is indicated by the fact that majority of them have scored much lower than the mid point of the prejudice scale.
Allport (1954) has carefully studied the role of religion in prejudice. According to him, "the role of religion" is paradoxical, it makes prejudice and it unmakes prejudice. He has argued that there are two types of religiosity namely "institutionalized" and "interiorized". Persons with institutionalized religious outlook are influenced more by political and social aspect of religiosity. They adhere to religion because it is a safe, powerful and superior in group. Such type of religiosity tends to be associated with prejudice; persons with interiorized outlook, on the other hand, are personally absorbed in their religion. They adhere to religion because its basic creed of brotherhood expresses the ideals one sincerely believe in. Persons with such religious outlook tend to be more tolerant and less prejudiced. These observations of Allport may be used to interpret present finding. It appears that Hindu and Muslim subjects of present study adhere to religion because they sincerely believe in the noble ideals of their religions rather than to gain some immediate practical advantages. They have developed what Allport has called interiorized religious outlook and therefore they are not influenced by political and social aspects of religiosity and consequently they have not developed prejudiced attitude.
The first finding of the present investigation may also be explained in terms of amount of correct religious information possessed by the members of different religions. A large number of studies have reported a negative correlation between religious information and prejudice (Closson, 1930; Murphy & Likert, 1938, Netler, 1946; Reckless and Bringen, 1933; Singh, 1972; Watson, 1929). These researchers have reported that prejudiced persons have very little correct information about their own and other religions whereas unprejudiced persons have more correct information not only of their own religion but also of other religions. The sample of the present study consists of college students where one should reasonably expect that the subjects irrespective of their religion would be well informed not only of their own religion but also of other religions. Thus religious information along with education might have liberalized attitudes of hindus and muslims subjects towards each other. The finding of the present research in a sense provides empirical support to the findings obtained by numerous researchers who have shown an inverse correlation between prejudice and religious information (Allport, 1954; Jha, 1972; Photiadis, 1962, Prasad, 1972; Rose, 1948; Stember, 1961; Tumin, 1961, Williams, 1964).
The second finding of the present research i.e. internally oriented and externally oriented subjects do not differ with respect to prejudice, is contrary to our expectations. Numerous investigators have reported that externally oriented subjects are more anxious, self centered, exhibit little concern for the needs and interests of others, have stereotyped thinking, lack self discipline, are hostile and aggressive than internally oriented subjects (Watson, 1967; Huntras and Scharf, 1970; Sadowski and Wenzel, 1982; Chaudhary, 1986). Since these characteristics found in externally oriented subjects are positively related to prejudice (Siegal, 1954; Rokeach, 1960) it may be, therefore, expected that externally oriented subjects should be more prejudiced than internally oriented subjects. The finding is not only contrary to our expectations but is also indirectly contrary to the findings obtained by Watson, 1967; Huntras and Scharf (1970). Sadowaski & Wenzel (1982) and Chaudhary (1986), who have found externally oriented subjects more anxious, more aggressive, self centered and exhibit little concern for the needs and interests of others. The finding, however may be explained in the light of the findings which have demonstrated that people may change their locus of control. As advocated by Lefcourt (1976), locus of control is not a characteristic to be discovered within individuals. It is a construct, a working tool in social learning theory
which allows for an interpretation of remarks made by people in response to questions about causality. People do change their minds or constructions about many things though they as often revert to prior positions, or remains steadfast in their positions despite some times overwhelming reasons for changing. It is easier to comprehend both the stability in changes of our construction if they are regarded as constructions rather than as traits, or other less variable internal attributes.

A large number of researches have shown their interests in the process which can alter one's locus of control. Harvey (1971), Gorman (1968) and McArthur (1970), for instance, have studied the processes which bring about a change in one's locus of control. These studies demonstrated that locus of control scores shift with relevant environmental events. Other investigations have made deliberate attempts to alter locus of control among students of different age groups. Thus Reimanis (1971) and Decharms (1972) designed their studies in which deliberate attempts were made to alter locus of control of the subjects. Both the researchers have shown that locus of control can be altered by training programme.

In view of the findings mentioned above, it is suggested that absence of difference between internal and externals with respect to prejudice may be due to the operations of the processes which might have altered the
locus of control of the sample of subjects used in the present study. By the time prejudice scale was administered on internal and external groups of subjects a shift might have taken place from external to internal end of the continuum and consequently no significant difference between internal and external with respect of prejudice might have been found.

The third finding of the present research i.e. deprived subjects are more prejudiced than non-deprived subjects, is in consonance with our expectations. It may be recalled here that members of a particular social group or community are not subjected to identical interactions with identical intensity and extent, nor live in identical habitat. In fact, socio-cultural life in any setting can be conceptualized as a continuum at one end of which lie those who have all the physical, social, economic and other facilities for the fulfilment of their biogenic as well socio-genic needs leading to varying experiences in life, while on the other end lie those who are materialistically, socially and psychologically handicapped for fulfilment of these needs and acquisition of diverse experiences. The persons lying on the first end of socio-cultural continuum are considered as non-deprived persons and those on the other end are deprived persons. During the past three decades there has been tremendous spurt in psychological research on
culturally deprived and impoverished communities and social
groups in United States of America (Deutsche, 1960; Hess and
Shipman, 1965; Vera John, 1963; Keller, 1963); in Israel
(Smilansky, 1964), in England (Bernstien, 1960), in Latin
American countries (Lewis, 1965), in Czeschoslovakia
(Matezeck and Langmeier, 1965) and in Mexico (Lewis, 1961).
These studies have been initiated as a consequence of growing
awareness that there is a pressing need for improving the lot
of deprived people on the one hand and as an outcome of
growing curiosity among social scientists for understanding
the effects of deprivational environment on behavioural and
social processes. In India attempts have been made at
studying the relationship between socio-economic factors and
personality traits (Joshi and Singh, 1966; Lal, 1968),
between socio-economic factors and intelligence (Chopra,
1970; Sewall, Shah, 1967; Mathur and Hundal, 1972), between
socio-economic factors and character-traits, anxiety and
hostility (Mouhanty, 1967), effects of caste and social class
have been explored in relation to achievement and
intelligence (Sharma, 1972; Gokulnathan, 1970; Pandey, 1970),
in relation to attitude (Anant, 1972; Toha and Srivastava,
1971) and in relation to motivation (Meade and Singh, 1970;
Srivastava & Tiwari 1967; Muthayya 1971). Among the various
findings of these studies, the most important and relevant
findings are that deprived subjects are more anxious and
hostile and are more prone to develop unfavourable attitudes than non-deprived subjects. Moreover deprived subjects are likely to develop feelings of inadequacy, inferiority and insecurity and unnecessary apprehensions and self de-evaluation. As a matter of fact any individual who has these personality characteristics is highly unlikely to react adequately to social realities, situations and relations. Moreover, he is unlikely to respect the rights of other persons, to learn to get along with them, to develop friendship, to participate in social activities and to learn to respect the values and integrity of social customs and traditions. To hide or to justify these weakness, the person is likely to develop certain defense mechanisms. He may project all his incapacibilities on others and consequently may develop prejudiced attitudes toward certain group and community. Thus we may draw a logical conclusion that deprived individuals are more prejudiced than non-deprived individuals because (i) they are more anxious, (ii) they develop feelings of adequacy, inferiority and insecurity and (iii) they develop unnecessary apprehension and self de-evaluation which in turn adversely affect their self perception. It is also interesting to note that even one personality correlate of deprived person i.e. anxiety, is sufficient to explain why deprived persons are more prejudiced than non-deprived persons, for it has been established by a number of researchers that there is a
positive correlation between anxiety and prejudice (e.g. Rokeach, 1960; Chatterjee et al., 1972; Hassan, 1975 and 1978; Enayatullah, 1980; and Singh, 1980).

The third finding of the present study provides empirical support to the observations made by Cowen, Lande and Sachaet (1959) who observed that subjective feelings of deprivation were more indicated of intense level of prejudice than the actual experiences of objective deprivation. The finding also provide indirect support to numerous research findings obtained by Indian as well as foreign researchers who have reported a negative correlation between prejudice and education (Allport, 1954; Phatiadis, 1962; Ross, 1948b; Tumin, 1961; Williams, 1964; Robert, 1965; Jha, 1972; Sinha and Sinha, 1960; Prasad, 1972). These researchers have demonstrated that education tends to lesser prejudice and liberalize socio-political attitudes. Here it may be recalled that construct of prolonged deprivation is multidimensional psycho-social construct embracing a wide range of environmental and organismic variables and refers to dispossession or loss of privileges, opportunities, material goods relatively for a long period and it identified 15 areas of deprivation, namely (1) housing condition (2) home environment (3) economic sufficiency (4) food (5) clothing (6) formal educational experiences (7) childhood experiences (8) rearing experiences (9)Parental characteristics (10)
interaction with parents (11) motivational experiences (12)
emotional experiences (13) religious experiences (14)
travelling and recreation and (15) Miscellaneous socio-
cultural experiences. Though it was beyond the scope of the
present research to identify in which areas of life the
subjects of our study are deprived of; we have used deprived
and non-deprived subjects taken into account the total
deprivation score. Thus it is possible that deprived subjects
might also be deprived in the area of education and economic
sufficiency which in turn contributed in the development of
prejudice attitude.

The final possible explanation of the higher degree of
prejudice shown by deprived subjects may be due to the fact
that deprivation of various kinds may inculcate a sense of
insecurity among the deprived subjects. This sense of insecu-
rity may cultivate the ground for the growth of prejudice
attitude. This contention gains strength from the observation
made by Stagner (1948), who remarked "as the child encounters
a majority of pleasant experiences, he tends to evolve a
picture of himself in a warm friendly environment, where he
is loved and cared for. By contrast, the child who
experiences a great deal of frustration, pain, discomfort and
uncertainty may be described as developing a picture of
himself surrounded by dangers, threats and impending
catastrophe. The two extremes of this dimension are called
security and insecurity respectively". In other words, if an individual encounters pleasant experiences, he develops a sense of security whereas when he is deprived of these pleasant experiences he develops a sense of insecurity. Moreover there is sufficient body of evidence to the effect that there is positive correlation between prejudice and insecurity (Gough 1951a, 1951b, 1951c; Morse and Allport 1952; Miller and Bugelski 1948; Lindzey 1950; Fishback and Singer 1957). In the light of observations made by Stagnar and empirical findings obtained by numerous researchers it is reasonable to assume that deprivation of any kind may induce feelings of insecurity which in turn contribute in the development of prejudices. The third findings of our research provides empirical support to this assumption.

The fourth finding of the present research i.e. insecure subjects are more prejudiced than secure, provides empirical support to the dynamic reactions of insecure individuals as observed by Maslow (1942). According to Maslow the main reactions are (1) insecure individuals always have continued, never dying longing for security; (2) show revenge reaction i.e. they hate every one and develop antagonistic attitudes towards others (3) show attack reactions i.e. they attack upon the situations which bring about the insecurity. This attack may be literal e.g. a physical attack upon a person or it may be more general, e.g. social radicalism to
change the factor in society that bring about the insecurity. In other words, the person with these personality traits are more susceptible to develop prejudice and the finding of the present study conform it.

To the best knowledge of the present investigator, no study except one by the author himself (Rama Sharma, 1988) has been undertaken in India to investigate the relationship between security-insecurity and communal prejudice. The fourth finding of our research is totally in agreement with the finding obtained by foreign researchers who have found positive correlation between prejudice and personal insecurity (Gough 1951a, 1951b, 1915c, Morse and Allport, 1952; Miller and Bugelski, 1948; Lindzey, 1950; Fishback and Singer, 1957).

Moreover our previous finding (Rama Sharma, 1988) that insecure subjects are more prejudiced than secure subjects is, further, strengthened by the findings of the present study.

As mentioned earlier, it has been demonstrated by several investigators that prejudiced persons are anxious and maladjusted (Atlus and Tefejian, 1953; Siegal, 1954; Cooper, 1956; Rokeach, 1960; Qamar Jahan, 1988). In other words anxious and mal-adjusted persons are more likely to develop prejudice attitude than non-anxious and adjusted people. It
has also been demonstrated by numerous investigators that insecure persons are more anxious and mal-adjusted than secure persons. For instance, Khalique (1961) found that insecure persons were more anxious than secure persons and Ahmad (1965-66) and Naqvi (1980), demonstrated that secure subjects were adjusted whereas insecure subjects were maladjusted. Since insecure subjects are found to be anxious and maladjusted, it is highly reasonable to assume that insecure subjects should be more prejudiced than secure subjects. The finding of our investigation provides empirical evidence to this assumption.

Our investigation also provides indirect support to the findings obtained by Ahmad (1968-69), Hanfi (1974) who have found that insecure subjects show indisciplined behaviour whereas secure subjects show disciplined behaviour. As a matter of common sense prejudiced persons are not expected to be as disciplined in their behaviour as unprejudiced persons. Since insecure persons are found to indisciplined in their behaviour, they are likely to develop prejudiced attitude more readily than secure individuals.

The final possible explanation of the higher degree of prejudice shown by insecure subjects may be inherent in the very nature of insecure individuals. The examination of numerous specific characteristics of insecure individuals together with all the other observations and the clinical
data available reveal that insecure persons perceive the world as a threatening jungle and most human beings as dangerous and selfish. They feel rejected and isolated. They are generally anxious, hostile and pessimistic and unhappy. They show sign of tension and conflicts, tend to turn inward, are troubled by guilt feelings. They have one or other disturbance of self esteem. They tend to be or actually are neurotic and are generally ego centric or selfish. In the light of these characteristics of insecure individuals it is not surprising to find that they are more prejudiced than secure individuals.

Turning our attention to other findings of the present research, we find that all the interactional effect except three i.e., interaction between religion and security-insecurity, between locus of control and prolonged deprivation; between prolonged deprivation and security insecurity among religion, locus of control and prolonged deprivation; among religion, locus of control and security-insecurity; among religion, prolonged deprivation and security-insecurity; among locus of control, prolonged deprivation and security-insecurity are insignificant.

The first insignificant interactional effect of locus of control and prolonged deprivation suggests that the prejudice scores of internally oriented-externally oriented
subjects are independent of their experience of deprivation. The finding reveal that though prolonged deprivation influences the degree of prejudice in a significant way when considered separately but when it is combined with locus of control, its interaction become insignificant. Like the first insignificant interaction effects, the remaining insignificant interaction effects may also be explained.

So far as significant interactional effect of religion and locus of control is concerned, it suggests that the prejudice scores of Hindu and Muslim subjects are not independent of their type of orientations rather the prejudice score of the subjects are the product of religion and locus of control. In other words neither religion nor locus of control alone contributes in the development of prejudiced attitudes i.e. both religion and locus of control play equally important role in the development of prejudiced attitudes. Like the first interactional, the remaining three significant interactional effects may also be explained.

The overall findings of the present research identify three important variables namely religion, prolonged deprivation and feelings of security-insecurity which play crucial role in the development of communal prejudice in India. One's the causes of any disease are discovered than it becomes rather easier to search its remedy. Communal
prejudice, like any physical disease, may also be cured by attacking its causative agents. Thus once the causes of prejudice— a social disease, are discovered then remains a matter of time to find out the ways and means by which communal prejudice may be eliminated. Keeping the four causative agents of communal prejudice in mind, four remedies may be suggested to control communal prejudice. Thus communal prejudice may at least be reduced to a greater extent (i) if people of different religions are educated to develop what Allport (1954) had called interiorized or intrinsic religious outlook. According to Allport, persons with interiorized religious outlook are personally absorbed in their religion. They adhere to religion because its basic creed of brotherhood expresses the ideals they sincerely believe in. Persons with such religious outlook tend to be more tolerant and less prejudiced. Furthermore communal prejudice may also be reduced if people of different walks of life are encouraged to participate in social gathering organized by different religious group and to express their doubts and suspicion in a friendly manner. Moreover, the good values and ideals of each religion should be propagated by the government agencies, (ii) some mechanisms should be evolved to control deprivation particularly economic, educational and social deprivation. In other words, every citizen of the nation irrespective of numerical values, religion, caste and
creed should get more or less equal facilities for the fulfilment of his/her biogenic as well as sociogenic needs. If we are able to achieve this goal, then we can control deprivation to a great extent and consequently communal prejudice may at least be reduced. A glance at the post-independent events and developments points out the step taken by the government to control or at least to minimize deprivation. For instance, after winning the freedom, government exploited all the resources at its command to protect the interests and to uplift the weaker sections of the society. Keeping in view the interest, needs and requirements of weaker sections including disadvantage group, backward classes, schedule caste and scheduled tribes, constitutional amendments were introduced and policy of reservation of seats was adopted. As a matter of fact, from admission to different services, a reasonable percentage of seats are reserved for these weaker segments of societies. Moreover recently, central government has introduced different schemes and projects for the benefit of weaker sections of society. In this connection special reference may be made to the introduction of Jawahar Rozgar Yojna (Employment News, Weekly, New Delhi, Saturday, 13th May, 1989) and Panchayati Raj Bill (Hindustan Times 13th, 14th, 16th and 17th May 1989). Despite of all these efforts the government has failed to provide equal opportunities to the masses for the upliftment of biogenic and sociogenic needs
partly due to the fact that all the government schemes and projects have not been implemented honestly and faithfully and partly because these schemes and projects are insufficient to cover large section of the society. It is, therefore, emphasized that sincere efforts should be made to evolve such mechanisms by which deprivation among the masses may be eliminated. If deprivation is removed then prejudice may also be reduced to a greater extent (iii) communal prejudice may also be reduced to a greater extent if feelings of insecurity is eradicated from the minds of the insecure individuals. As mentioned somewhere else the concept of security-insecurity is classified into two kinds: social or objective security and subjective or psychic security. Social security implies the provision of bodily needs, satisfactory social contacts and a stable social order. Subjective or psychic security, on the other hand, may be defined as mental easeness or stability. As far as social security is concerned, government and political and social organisations should leave no stone unturned to maintain a sense of social security among the masses by providing opportunities for the fulfilment of biogenic as well as sociogenic needs of the individuals. Social scientists, on the other hand, may contribute significantly in the maintenance of subjective or psychic security among the masses. These collective efforts of Government and social scientists may certainly help in
eradicating a sense of insecurity from the minds of the masses and consequently may help in reducing prejudices.

Moreover the parents should be educated to have favourable and accepting attitude toward their children, since it has been reported that parents' restrictive, rejecting and neglecting attitudes give rise to insecurity while permissive attitudes reduce insecurity (Ahmed 1965-66; Zuberi, 1972; Hanfi, 1974; Khan, 1975; Siddiqui 1976-77; Ojha and Singh 1988). The subjects who are high on parental acceptance also have high feelings of security and are unlikely to develop prejudiced attitudes. Thus a national programme should be chalked out in which specially younger parents should be given training regarding the child-rearing practices, emphasizing the importance of favourable and permissive attitudes towards children. If such programme is implemented with sincerity, the children will not develop feelings of insecurity and consequently will not develop prejudiced attitudes.

Further researches are, however, required to explore the ways and means by which people may be made to develop interiorized religious outlook. Moreover, it is suggested that it should be a greater contribution if psychologists, sociologists, and economist start an interdisciplinary research to evolve such mechanisms that may help in
controlling the deprivation of any sorts and in eradicating feelings of insecurity from the minds of individual.

By putting these suggestions outlined above into practice, if communal prejudice is eliminated or at least reduced, it would not only accelerate the economic development of the country but would also accelerate the processes of national integration.