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Since independence various parts of the country have witnessed the occurrences of communal riots. These riots have not only taken numerous innocent lives, damaged national and private properties but also have brought bad name to the country. Such reoccurrences remain a threat to national integration and international relations. Consequently politicians as well as social scientists are burning midnight lamp to identify the causes of communal riots and to suggest ways and means to control them. Though politicians and social scientists are working on different lines but they, at least, agree on one contributing factor i.e. communal prejudice.

Prejudice is a very important aspect of inter-group relations and the study of inter-group relations has become a major scientific enterprise of the day. An operational meaning of prejudice has been given in the Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary (1965) which can be summarized as a sort of prior unfavourable judgement or opinion of the members of a race or religion or the occupations of any other significant social role (towards the members of another social group) held in disregard of facts that contradict it."
The most consistent point of agreement in various definitions of prejudice is that it is a sort of negative attitude towards a particular group or its members. Thus, Singh and Khan (1979) have commented:

"Prejudice is a negative attitude formed in the individual without proper rationality, justice, or tolerance towards a socially defined group and toward any person perceived to a member of that group."

A careful perusal of various explanations of prejudice reveals the fact that prejudices are widely held complex phenomena which are learnt in course of life, are multicasually determined. Numerous theories have been advanced to provide positive explanations of prejudice. However, following Ashmore (1970) different theoretical explanations of prejudice may be classified into two categories on the basis of their level of analysis - societal and individual level of analysis. As far as the analysis at societal level is concerned, it has advanced two theories of prejudice (a) economic exploitation theory and (b) economic group conflict theory. The analysis of prejudice at individual level has produced two families of theory (a) symptoms theory and (b) socio-cultural theory. Under symptoms theories, we have scapegoat theory of prejudice and authoritarian personality theory. Another theory of
prejudice, generated by the analysis at individual level is socio-cultural theory. The theory is based on socio-cultural learning processes (MacIver, 1948; Long 1951; Merden 1952; Sarnoff and Kartz, 1954 and Pettigrew 1959).

The study of prejudice, particularly that of religious prejudice in India, is very important because of our national ideals of democracy and secularism. Indian society is plagued with the problem of religious prejudice resulting into frequent outbreak of communal riots between Hindus and Muslims. Hence, study of religious prejudice constitutes one of the most sacred duties for the Indian social scientists. In the extent of increasing tension and social conflicts all over the world, it has become increasingly necessary to investigate into the personality organization of the individual which helps in the development of prejudice in them. Studies of prejudice, therefore, have achieved a central place in the domain of Social Psychology. A number of studies have focused their attention on exploring the relationship between prejudice and authoritarianism (Luchins, 1956; Campbell and McCandless, 1951; Block and Block, 1951; Evans, 1952; Scodeland Mussan, 1953; Scotland and Patchen, 1961; and Diab, 1959).

Some researchers studied the relationship between religion and prejudice and found that religious people as compared to non-religious people were more prejudiced or
conservative (Parry, 1949; Adorno et al. 1950; Blum and Man, 1960; and Allport and Ross, 1967). Many investigators have reported that Muslims as compared to Hindus have more prejudices and traditional socio-political attitudes (Adinarayan, 1953; Chaudhary, 1958; Hassan and Singh, 1973; Hassan, 1974; Hassan, 1975, 1978; Singh, 1979; Khan 1979; and Singh, 1980).

A number of studies reported positive correlation between parental prejudices and those of children (Frankel, Brunswick and Sandford, 1945, Radke, Yarrow, Trager and Davis, 1949; Bind et al 1952; Radka, yarrow, Trager and Miller, 1952; Frankel, Brunswick and Havel, 1953; Mashler and Scodel, 1960, Anisfeld et al, 1963; Goodman, 1964; Epstein and Komorita, 1966; and Troll et al 1969). Other studies indicating the similarity between the attitudes of parents and children are provided by Harowitz and Harowitz (1938); Allport and Kramer, (1946); Weltman and Remmers (1946); Remmers and Weltman (1947); Rosenblith (1949); Gough et al (1950); Campbell and his associates (1954); Hayman (1959). Lewin (1961), Dodge and Uyeki (1962); Lane and Seares (1964); Wrightsman (1964); Hess and Torney (1964); Jennings and Nieme (1968); Sears (1969); Vyas (1973); Hassan (1974, 1976, 1977); Khan (1977); Enayatullah (1980); Khan (1980); Rai (1980); Singh (1980) and Hassan (1983).
There have been relatively fewer studies on the relationship between personality variables and prejudice. Allport's view on prejudice suggests that personality variables may contribute significantly in the development of prejudice. For that matter, a highly significant question is why does a person develop prejudice and the other does not? There is obviously something within the individual that predisposes them to develop prejudice. For instance, anxiety ridden person tends to develop prejudice by attributing the cause of his anxiety to some person or a group.

Siegal (1954) and Rokeach (1960) found that anxious type persons are more close minded or prejudiced than non-anxious persons. A number of studies reviewed above have shown that prejudiced persons are significantly high in anxiety, depression, aggression, frustration, neuroticism and hostility. Thus individual with higher level of anxiety, depression, aggression, frustration and hostility display higher levels of prejudice.

The concept of locus of control developed within the frame work of Rotter's (1954, 1966) social learning theory, has been the focus of considerable research interest in recent years. A number of investigators have reported that externally oriented individuals are more anxious than internally oriented individuals (Hountras and Scharf, 1970;
Mandlar and Watson, 1966; Watson, 1967; Phares 1976). Other researchers studied locus of control in relation to certain aspects of social behaviour. Thus Sadowaski and Wenzil (1982) found that externally oriented subjects were more hostile and aggressive than internally oriented subjects. Silverman and Shrauger (1971) reported that internality attraction toward other increased as they perceived other to be less self-centered. Doherty and Ryder (1979) found positive association between internality and inter-personal trust.

The above discussion reveals that locus of control as a personality variable influences certain social behaviour. More specifically, it has been demonstrated that externally oriented subjects are more anxious, more hostile and aggressive, more suspicious, maladjusted, have irrational beliefs, have less tendency to help other as compared to internally oriented subjects. These characteristics of externally oriented subjects suggest that they should be more prone to develop communal prejudice than internally oriented subjects, since it has been observed that prejudiced persons are more anxious, hostile, aggressive, maladjusted, suspicious and have poor inter-personal relationship than non-prejudiced individuals. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that they should be more prejudiced than internally oriented individuals.
An important consideration which also influenced the thinking of the present investigation to undertake the present research is the substantial body of evidence to suggest a correlation between prejudice and feelings of security-insecurity.

According to Maslow (1942) the security feelings are syndrome. In other words, the term security is a generalized label for many more specific feelings which overlap and intertwins and which are all function of one another. The word security or insecurity is intended as a label for this peculiar aspects of wholeness that may be discerned in the multiplicity of particular symptoms with which the concept is used in psychological flavour.

The concept of security-insecurity is classified into two kinds - objective or social security and subjective or psychic security. These two states, though closely inter-related, are not inter-dependent. 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 and it may exist despite the substantial lack of almost every thing that constitutes a secure environment. Conversely, subjective insecurity implies unsatisfactory social contacts and lack of satisfaction of bodily needs and instable social
order. Subjective or psychic insecurity denotes mental discomfort or mental instability.

The examination of numerous specific characteristics of insecure individuals together with all the other observations and clinical data available reveals that insecure persons perceive the world has 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 conflict, tend to 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. Moreover, while discussing the dynamic reactions of insecure individual, Maslow observed. (1) insecure individuals also always have a continued, never dying, longing for security, (2) show revenge reactions, i.e. they hate every one and develop antagonistic attitude towards others, (3) show attack reactions i.e. they attack upon the situations which bring about the insecurity. The 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 insecurity.

The foregoing discussion reveals that insecure individuals have such personality characteristics that may
make them susceptible to develop prejudiced attitudes. Thus numerous researches conducted abroad have found positive correlation between prejudice and personal insecurity (Gough, 1951a, 1951b, 1951c, Morse and Allport, 1952; Miller and Bugelski, 1948, Lindzey 1950; Fishback and Singer, 1957). According to these researchers, person with feelings of insecurity tend to develop prejudice more than those who have feeling of security. As the review of literature reveals no such study has been conducted in India. The present research therefore, attempts to explore how feelings of security-insecurity are related to prejudice in Indian society.

Another consideration which also influenced the thinking of the present investigator to undertake the present research is the observation made by Cowen, Landir and Schaet. They observed that subjective feelings of deprivation indicated more intense level of prejudice than the actual experience of objective deprivation. These observations suggest a correlation between prejudice and prolonged deprivation. Moreover deprived persons are those who could not have opportunity for the fulfilment of their biogenic and sociogenic needs. There is substantial amount of evidence to suggest that such persons (i.e. deprived persons) are likely to develop feelings of insecurity that leads to the development of prejudiced attitude.
Generally speaking, deprivation is a state of organism or environment. If deprivation is a state of organism, it refers to a condition which is responsible for the lack or loss of fulfilment of needs and desires of the organism and leads to tissue deficits. It may be assumed that tissue deficit is a noxious state and derives the organism to take appropriate steps to reduce it. Under this category would fall food/nutrition, water, sex and sleep deprivation. The locus of deprivation, on the other hand, may also be environmental. The environmental deprivation refers to poorness of environment that leads to environmental deficit in terms of level of living conditions (eg. housing, employment, education etc.) or in terms of the absence of objects and persons (e.g. parents) which should be present in the normal course of life. More often than not the two types of deprivation are treated as belonging to mutually exclusive sets and no effort is made to relate appropriate variables in these realms or even to see how they influence psychological process in interaction with each other.

The concept of prolonged deprivation was initially used by Tripathi and Misra (1977). Accordingly to them, prolonged deprivation is a multi-dimensional psycho-social construct embracing a wide range of environmental and organismic variables and refers to dispossesssion or loss of privileges, opportunities, material goods and like relatively for a long
period. While developing a standardized scale to measure the prolonged deprivation, Misra and Tripathi (1977) have identified 15 components or areas of prolonged 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. During the past three decades there has been tremendous spurt in psychological research on culturally deprived, impoverished communities and social group in the United State of America (Wentch, 1960. Hess and Shipman, 1965; Vera John, 1963; Keller, 1963); in Latin American countries (Lewis, 1965), in Czechoslovakia (Matezeck and Langmuier, 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 one hand, and as an outcome of growing curiosity among social scientists of understanding the effect of deprivational environment on behavioural and social processes. Thus researchers like Bander (1944), Bander and Yarnell (1941), Goldfarb (1944), Bander and Yarnell (1941), Goldfarb (1943a, 1945b, 1949) and Lowrey (1940) found that institutionalized
individuals were unable to establish close warm personal relationship.

In India several attempts have been made to study the relationship between various types of deprivation and personality traits. For instance, Mohanti (1967) investigated the relationship between socio-economic factors and anxiety and hostility. He found that socio-economically deprived subjects were more anxious and hostile than non-deprived subjects. Comparing six groups on measures of neuroticism and insecurity, Rath (1974b) found higher incident of neuroticism among low caste groups than in upper caste groups. Furthermore, lower caste groups manifested greater sense of insecurity than upper caste group. Tripathi and Misra (1976) examined the effect of prolonged deprivation on some cognitive processes. They observed that deprivation experienced by the individual in various spheres of life restricts the growth of cognitive skill. Thus, they found negative relationship between deprivation and cognitive efficiency. Sinha and Misra (1980), on the other hand, have observed that deprived subjects manifest high degree of anxiety, neuroticism, insecurity and maladjustment. They were also found to be more rigid, conforming alienated and less extrovert. Khan (1982) attempted to explore the effect of parental deprivation on personality adjustment. Among numerous findings, the most important finding was that
deprived subjects were maladjusted whereas non-deprived were adjusted subjects. Somewhat recently Tripathi (1983) studied the differential influence of prolonged deprivation, approval motive and locus of control reinforcement on dependence. He found that low deprived subjects showed more field independence than highly deprived subjects. Moreover internally oriented subjects were found field dependent whereas externally oriented subjects were field independent.

The foregoing discussion reveals that deprived individuals develop such personality characteristics as anxiety, hostility, neuroticism, maladjustment, external orientation and a sense of insecurity. Since it has been observed that individual having these personality characteristics are more prone to develop communal prejudice, it is reasonable to assume that deprived individuals should be more susceptible to develop communal prejudice than non-deprived individuals. Present research is also designed to test this assumption.

In short present research is undertaken to study communal prejudice in relation to locus of control, feelings of security-insecurity and prolonged deprivation. The findings of the present study would not only provide us useful information about communal prejudice but would also help us to suggest certain ways and means by which communal prejudice may be reduced if not completely eliminated. As a
matter of fact communal prejudice is not only a serious obstacle in the national development and in the advancement of the nation but also remains a threat to national integration. The findings of the present research, therefore, may be useful in removing such obstacles and hence may contribute in speedy development of the nation as well as in enhancing national integration.

A 2x2x2x2 factorial design in which three personality variables (i.e. locus of control, feelings of security-insecurity and prolonged deprivation) and one sociological variable (i.e. religion), each variable varying in two ways, was used in the present study. Locus of control was varied by selecting internally oriented and externally oriented subjects and security-insecurity variable was varied by selecting those who had feelings of security and those who had feelings of insecurity. The two values of prolonged deprivation were (a) deprived (b) non-deprived and two types of religion were (a) Hinduism and (b) Islam. Thus there were sixteen groups of subjects namely, internal secure deprived Hindu subjects, internal secure non-deprived Hindu subjects, internal insecure deprived Hindu subjects, internal insecure non-deprived Hindu subjects, external secure deprived Hindu subjects, external secure non-deprived Hindu subjects, external insecure deprived Hindu subjects, external insecure non-deprived Hindu subjects, internal secure deprived Muslim
subjects, internal secure non-deprived Muslim subjects, internal insecure deprived Muslim subjects, internal insecure non-deprived Muslim subjects, external secure deprived Muslim subjects, external secure non-deprived Muslim subjects, external insecure deprived Muslim subjects and external insecure non-deprived Muslim subjects. Each group consisted of 25 subjects.

In order to form 16 groups of subjects, Hindi version of Rotter I.E. scale was administered on 600 (300 Hindus and 300 Muslims) under graduate students of Muslim University and D.S. College, Aligarh. They all belonged to upper-Middle and lower upper socio-economic status group. The age of subjects ranged from 15 years to 18 years.

On the basis of their scores on the Hindi version of Rotter's I.E. scale, two groups were formed. The subjects whose score on I-E scale fell on or above 3rd quartile were considered as externally oriented subjects. The subjects whose score on the I-E scale fell on or below 1st quartile were considered as internally oriented subjects. The first and third quartile were 7.29 and 11.6 respectively. Each group, then, was subdivided on the basis of religion to form four groups namely externally oriented Hindu subjects, internally oriented Hindu subjects, externally oriented Muslim subjects and internally oriented Muslim subjects.
Hindi version of the adapted form of Maslow (1952) security-insecurity test was administered on these four groups of subject. In each group, the subjects whose score on S-I inventory fell on or below 1st quartile were considered as secure subjects and the subjects whose score fell on or above 3rd quartile were considered as insecure subjects. Thus, on the basis of their scores on S-I inventory each group was divided into two groups to form eight groups of subjects.

Prolonged deprivation scale, developed and standardized by Misra and Tripathi (1977), was administered on these eight groups of subjects. In each group, the subjects whose scores on PDS fell on or below 1st quartile were considered as non-deprived subjects and the subjects whose score fell on or above 3rd quartile were considered as deprived subjects. Thus on the basis of their scores on PDS, each group was divided into two groups to form sixteen groups of subjects as mentioned above.

Prejudice scale developed by Qamar Jahan, Bhardwaj and Saeeduzzafar (1986) was administered on all the sixteen groups of subjects to assess the magnitude of communal prejudice.

The data, thus, obtained were tabulated group-wise and were statistically analyzed to draw necessary inferences.
2x2x2x2 analysis of variance was used in which F-ratio were calculated for the variation of each independent variable and also for any possible interaction. The main findings of the present research were:

1. Hindus and Muslim did not differ with respect to prejudice.
2. Internally oriented and externally oriented subjects did not differ with respect to prejudice.
3. Deprived subjects were found to be more prejudiced than non-deprived subjects.
4. Secure subjects were found to be less prejudiced than insecure subjects.
5. There was an interactional effect of religion and locus of control on the degree of prejudice.
6. There was an interactional effect of religion and prolonged deprivation on the degree of communal prejudice.
7. There was no interactional effect of religion and security-insecurity on the degree of communal prejudice.
8. There was no interactional effect of locus of control and prolonged deprivation on the degree of communal prejudice.
9. There was an interactional effect of locus of control and security-insecurity on the degree of communal prejudice.
10. No interactional effect was found between prolonged deprivation and security-insecurity on the degree of communal prejudice.
(11) There was no interactional effect among religion, locus of control, and prolonged deprivation on the degree of communal prejudice.

(12) There was no interactional effect among religion, locus of control, and security-insecurity on the degree of communal prejudice.

(13) No interactional effect was found among religion, prolonged deprivation and security-insecurity on the degree of communal prejudice.

(14) There was no interactional effect of locus of control, prolonged deprivation and security-insecurity on the degree of communal prejudice.

(15) There was no interactional effect among religion, locus of control, prolonged deprivation and security— in insecurity on the degree of communal prejudice.

The first finding of the present study i.e. Hindus and Muslims do not differ with respect to prejudice, was an addition to 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. 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) whereas other investigators have failed to conform these findings (Natraj, 1965; Sarkar and Hassan, 1973; 1974-75; Chatterji et al., 1967; Qamar Jahan, 1986, 1987-88).

Thus the first finding of the present study was explained on several grounds. The first explanation was based on the fact that there are still conflicting results regarding the role of religion on the development of prejudice. The second explanation was based on the place from where sample of subjects was drawn in different studies. The third explanation was based on the type of religiosity namely, "institutionalized" and "interiorized" as proposed by Allport (1954) followed by Hindu and Muslim subjects.

The second finding of the present research i.e. internally oriented and externally oriented subjects did not differ with respect to prejudice, was contrary to our expectations as well as to the findings obtained by numerous investigators. However, the findings were explained in the light of empirical evidences provided by numerous researchers who have demonstrated that people may change their locus of control (Harvey, 1971; Gorman, 1968; McArthur, 1970). It was, therefore, suggested that absence of difference between internals and externals with respect to prejudice might be due to the operations of process which might have altered the locus of control of the subjects.
The third finding of the present research i.e. deprived subjects were more prejudiced than non-deprived subjects, was in consonance with our expectations and provided indirect empirical evidence to the findings obtained by numerous investigators. It has been generally observed that deprived subjects are more anxious, hostile, highly susceptible to develop unfavourable attitudes, feelings of inadequacy and insecurity than non-deprived subjects (Joshi and Singh, 1966, Lal, 1968; Mohanty, 1967; Anand, 1972; Toha and Srivastva 1971). The finding of the present study provided indirect support to these findings.

The third finding of the present investigation also provided empirical support to the observation made by Cowen, Landir and Schaet (1959) who observed that subjective feeling of deprivation were more indicated of intense level of prejudice than the actual experiences of objective deprivation. Finally, the finding under consideration was interpreted in terms of the development of feelings of security-insecurity. It was argued that deprivation of various kinds might have inculcated a sense of insecurity among the deprived subjects and this sense of insecurity might have cultivated the ground for the development of prejudiced attitudes.

The fourth finding of the present study i.e. insecure subjects were more prejudiced than secure subjects, was too
obvious to need any explanation. However, the finding was explained in the light of the dynamic reactions and personality characteristics of the insecure individuals as observed by Maslow (1942).

To the best knowledge of the present investigator no attempt has been made by Indian researchers to explore the relationship between security-insecurity and prejudice. However, the finding of our study was in agreement with the findings of the studies conducted abroad (Gough, 1951a, 1951b, 1951c; Morse and Allport, 1952; Miller and Bugleski, 1948; Lindzey, 1950; Fishback and Singer, 1957). The finding in discussion also provided indirect support to the findings obtained to many Indian researchers (Khalique, 1961; Ahmad, 1965, 1966, 1968, 1969; Hanifi, 1974).

Turning our attention to other findings of the present research, we find that all the interactional effects except three, were insignificant more specifically; the 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 and insecurity and among religion, 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 and externally
oriented subjects are independent of their experience of deprivation. The finding reveals 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 score 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 the prejudiced attitudes. Like the first interactional, the remaining two significant interactional effects may also be explained.

On the basis of all these findings of the present research some suggestions were made about the ways and means by which communal prejudice may be reduced, if not completely eliminated. Moreover new areas of research were also pointed out.