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Given that the role of EI has been studied so little there are no studies directly related to the impact of EQ on interpersonal relations especially in the multicultural context of India with Hindu, Muslim and Christians living together for centuries.

However the studies carried out in a different cultural context throw some light with implications for inferential reasoning for the Indian context. The study: “Emotional Intelligence and Interpersonal Relations” (Schuttee, -Nicola-s; and others, pp.523-536) which contains seven studies comes out with the following findings: The participating college students with higher scores for EI had higher scores for empathic perspective-taking and self-monitoring in social situations; they had higher scores for social skills; they displayed more cooperative responses toward partners. Also, the participants with higher scores for EI had higher scores for close and affectionate relationships.

Given the fact that the operational utilization of the concept of EI in research is moving from partial clarity towards comprehensive clarity, the research findings are still scattered over a diversity of books, sub-fields of psychology.

However, attempts have been made to explore the role of emotional intelligence in many areas of human behaviour; the role of EI in facilitating
spiritual formation (Orr, Larry-George, 2001); Emotional intelligence and leadership (Bass, Bernard-M, 2000); Emotional intelligence: Clinical and therapeutic implications (Parker, James D.A, 2000); Emotional intelligence as zeitgeist, as personality, and as a mental ability (Mayer, John D; Salovey, Peter; Caruso, David, 2000); The Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence And Health Habits Of Health Education Students (Joyce Meek, Yates, 2000), Educational policy on emotional intelligence: Does it make sense? (John Mayer and Carey Cabb, 2000); Emotional intelligence and the self-regulation of affect (Peter Salovey, Christopher, Hsee, John D Mayer, 2000); Emotional intelligence and alexithymia (James Parker, Grame Taylor, Michael Bagby, 2000); Emotional intelligence and gender differences (Pudjati, Sutarso), Emotional intelligence and cognitive ability: Predicting performance in job-simulated activities (Graves, Gilbert Jamen, 1999.)

Though the conceptualization of EI (by Daniel Golman, Mayer and Salovey and others) invariably includes a reference to the EI operating as an inter-social dimension leading to increasing empathy and understanding of the interacting partner, there are hardly any studies on the impact of EQ on inter-religious perception. There is a study on the impact of EQ on social and academic success (Woitaszewski, Scot-Alaw, 2000); there are studies on the relationship between EI, intuition, and
responsible risk-taking in organization (Commbell, May Kathrgh, 2001).

Studies on Emotions and leadership: The role of EI; George, Jennifer.

The relationships between EI, Personality, Critical thinking Ability and organizational leadership performance at upper levels of management. (Murensky- Catherine- Lynn, 2000).

In the study on "EI and Empathic Accuracy" Judith Flury and Wilwam Lckes (2000) report that EI increases the accuracy of appraisal and expression of emotion, thoughts and feelings as related to friends and dating partners.

EQ helps in increasing productivity, speeding up adaptation to change, developing leadership skills, stimulating creativity and cooperation, responding effectively to competition, encouraging innovative thinking and improving relation of key employees. It also helps to create an enthusiastic work environment, improve the way the employees feel about themselves and how they relate to others, reduce stress levels and resolve emotional issues, improve health and well-being, improve relationships, heighten success, and enable employees to experience greater fulfillment. (Daniel Golman; 1995, Jeanne Segal, 2000). It is also found to be a stimulant for self-actualization. It is found to be highly correlated with the ability to actualize basic talents and skills. It is
found to be more important than cognitive intelligence for self-actualization (Baron, Rauven).

It is also found that emotional intelligence (EI) is highly correlated with the ability to actualize basic talents and skills, can distinguish between those who are more able and those who are less able to self-actualize, and is more important than cognitive intelligence for self-actualization. (Baron, Reuven, 2000).

Of the various needs for satisfactory social life, the need for identity is an important need. In the numerous frameworks or social structures, constructs offered for identity, religion assumes a very crucial position and as a matter of fact throughout world history religion has been a very important factor for unifying and mobilizing the people either for constructive purposes or for destructive purposes. History records that many wars have been fought in the name of religions. It has been verily active in creating the necessary socio-cultural atmosphere for violent clashes all over the world; for example, between catholic-protestant tension in Ireland, Israelis and Palestinians in the Middle East, the Shia-Sunni skirmishes in Muslim countries, the Hindu-Muslim conflicts in India.

Communal violence has been going on unabated in India. One of the important causative dimensions for the continuation of this violence-filled
social atmosphere is the nature of social perception. The social perception being shaped by the prejudices, stereotypes, sometimes mistaken interpretations of political-historical events, the present and the past, conjures up a picture of the out-group as the enemy, violent, not to be trusted, that is, in the negative framework which constitutes a sufficient cause for violent clashes between the groups.

The conflict between Hindus and Muslims is a common social event; and also, it is on the increase while clashes involving Christians are occasional. Research in this area has come out with a good number of important observations with implications for evolving strategies to combat this social evil.

One very important dimension of social perception is that in any given social situation perceivers categorize other people into groups. This process is largely automatic, unconscious and involuntary. While categorizing other people into groups cognitive biases operate to simplify the complex world. Ashbum, Voils and Monteilt (2001) conducted experiments using Implicit Association Test and concluded that intergroup bias occurs automatically.

Therefore, we may note, to begin with, that the people involved in social interaction, in the present context, for example, Hindus and Muslims
divide their social world for perception into "ingroup" and "out-group". In the Indian context Majeed and Ghosh (1981) report that, from their study of 150 male students between 13 and 18 years of age, from Uttar Pradesh both the Hindus and Muslims perceived their self-groups positively with strong positive self-identity.

Ghosh, Kumar and Tripathi (1992) report that while Muslims differentiate themselves more from Hindus in terms of the degree of positive identity, Hindus ascribe more power to themselves compared to Muslims. Jayakumari (1989) conducted her study on 503 students of Kerala belonging to seven communal groups, namely, Nairs, Ezhavas, Brahmins, Muslims, Harizans, Catholics and non-Catholics. An important finding was that each group while describing itself used only complementary epithets and in describing other communities used complementary or non-complementary or both epithets. The report also says that all the communities had self-glorifying report.

Muttagi (1979) investigated the cross community attitudes of students of under graduate and postgraduate classes in the University of Bombay. He studied 659 students of different religious and linguistic groups by administering two questionnaires containing anti-democratic and fascist scale, social distance scale, stereotype scale, rejection scale,
prejudice scale, contact scale and discrimination scale. He found that the respondents expressed more prejudice towards out-groups than towards their own group. Kothurkar (1981) reported similar findings in Poona, when he studied graduates and housewives. He found that there was a distinct tendency to enumerate more frequently the undesirable characteristics with respect to the other social groups. This is more pronounced with respect to Muslims.

Male undergraduate and postgraduate students' inter-group attitudes were measured with the help of two identical adjective checklists containing both positive and negative adjectives. The results indicated that Muslim subjects had negative out-group attitudes and positive in-group attitudes. India being a caste-ridden society, it has been found that the caste system significantly influences the perception and attitude of the people. It also evokes strong in-group and out-group feeling. Iqbal and Nabi (1993) found that socially deprived subjects were highly prejudiced than those of non-deprived subjects.

Though there is advancement in science and technology, religion is becoming an all-pervading aspect of our life. Gautham M.L. (1970) studied university students and found that their attitudes towards the central values, belief in God, Karma, the theory of rebirth etc. as well as the
peripheral values of Hindu religion have become rational. He says that though students are secularized under the impact of modern education, the traditions are still honoured albeit with certain modifications. The general trend has been favourable to religion. Kulandaivel and Jacob (1981) studied the attitudes of 400 high school students in Kottayam district and found that their attitudes were quite favourable to religion. Dutt N.K. (1975) reported similar results when he studied the attitudes towards religion of 200 postgraduate students from Punjab University. Tandon (1979) studied students of 9th and 10th standards from Uttar Pradesh and found that in general they have a favourable attitude towards religion.

Since religion influences each and every facet of our life inspite of the violence it causes, its relation to psychological and physical adjustment is being increasingly examined. One of the major studies was by Abraham Maslow soon after the Second World War, when he reported that Holocaust survivors tended to be those who held strong religious beliefs, suggesting that it helped people cope in extreme circumstances. Investigations by Humanistic psychologists found that religious or spiritual identity may have correlations with longer lifespan and better health.

Religious training and development of religious identity is part of the socialization process. Khan, H.R (1978, 1979) studied the development of
religious identity and prejudices of Hindu and Muslim children using a sample of 286 children between 4-9 years of age. He used the structural interview technique with a pictorial test. He also obtained data from the parents of these children on authoritarianism, religiosity, religious prejudice and socialization practices. He concluded that religious identity and prejudice are interrelated, where the former develops earlier and both develop with age. He observed no differences in the development of religious identity and prejudice. Children from mixed schools develop religious identity earlier than children from segregated schools dominated by one religion, though no difference was observed in religious prejudice in these two types of schools. The religiosity of the mother influences the development of religious identity of the child. However the religiosity of the father does not have any effect. Religiosity of the parents does not influence the development of religious prejudice in children. The socialization practices of the mother, but not of the father, influence the development of religious identity in children.

The development of religious identity and prejudice in Hindu (L. Chatterjee, 1986), Muslim (Khalique, 1986), Sikh (Jabbi, 1981, 1982) and Christian (R. Vidyarthi, 1986) children were studied. The sample consisted of 480 schoolchildren between 4-15 years from each of the four religious groups. A pictorial test was developed to measure religious preference-
prejudice. All pictures were arranged thematically in sets and were shown together to the subject who was asked to arrange them from the most to the least preferred, indicating preference and prejudice. The results showed that the developmental curves of religious identity in the four religious groups, despite some variations, show a strikingly similar pattern. Religious identity emerges very early in childhood. The majority of the children in the four religious groups had learnt to show maximum preference for their own religion by 4-5 years. The intensity of religious identity reached the peak by 8-9 years. In the case of ethnocentrism, formation of prejudice is also nearly complete by 8-9 years. After 8-9 years the developmental curves of ethnocentrism and prejudice become stable and flatten assuming the shape of a plateau. The minority group status hastens the formation of religious identity and strengthens it. The identity of minority group children is stronger than those of Hindu children. Stronger the religious identity, greater the perception of social distance.

Religious group membership brings about a deep sense of group identification and any attack on the individual's group will be responded to as attack on the self. This was proved by Wallace, Libman and Poser (1960) when they found that any attack on the group is responded to as attacks on the self and this effect is powerful enough to increase the willingness and capacity of the individual to suffer intense pain. Arnold
Buss and Norman Portnoy (1971) replicated this design with certain modifications. They selected subjects for the experiment after scaling them for strength of identification. These men were tested for tolerance of pain induced by electric shock. Between the first and second pain tolerance trials they were given false norms about the pain tolerated by their reference group. The false norms increased pain tolerance, the greater the strength of identification to one's group the greater the increase in pain tolerance. Such strong group identification is usually accompanied by strong emotions. Cooper (1959) in his study used 20 college students who displayed either extremely favourable or unfavourable attitudes toward 20 ethnic groups as subjects. They were attached to a galvanic skin response apparatus and read out derogatory statements about their most liked groups and complimentary statements about their most disliked groups. Results showed that GSR was greater for complimentary statements about their most disliked groups and also for derogatory statements about their most liked groups. When group identification is so strong it leads to ethnocentrism.

O'Driscoll and Feather (1982) reported that ethnocentrism is the most potent determinant of social distance and perception of ethnic groups. Mohsin (1984) used Ethnic Attitudes Checklist with 50 adjectives to measure ethnocentricity and ethnic prejudice. Data was collected on
several occasions between 1973 and 1983 from Hindu and Muslim students of Patna and Utkal universities. Analysis showed strong ethnocentrism and prejudice in both Hindu and Muslim students as reflected in the stereotypes. He concluded that the prejudiced attitude of Hindus and Muslims towards each other has become a part of the social norm as most members of the respective communities share it.

Categorizing other people into groups, loosely based on gender, age, religion etc. we form certain impressions about them and attribute certain traits to them. In the process we develop certain attitudes towards them. If the attitude is positive and in the event of no conflicting information, it is reinforced every time we interact with the group. But if the attitude developed is negative then there is a high chance that behaviour towards it will be hostile and antagonistic. Group antagonism has three inter-related but distinguishable elements namely, stereotypes, prejudice and discrimination.

Stereotypes are beliefs about the typical characteristics of group members. Prejudice is negative feelings toward an out-group or simply put it is negative attitude. Discrimination refers to behaviour that disadvantages individuals simply because of their group membership. These three elements characterize the three components of attitudes,
namely, cognitive (beliefs), affective (feelings) and behaviour (action). Stereotypes, which are the cognitive component of group antagonism, are beliefs about the personal attributes shared by people in a particular group or social category. For example, stereotypes regarding race and ethnicity are common in America. Kluegel (1990) found that white subjects attributed lower income levels among African Americans to a lower level of motivation or basic skills. India too has her share of stereotypes. Panchbai (1977) conducted a study on provincial and religious stereotypes of the undergraduate and postgraduate students of Calcutta University. He studied 310 college students using the Katz and Braly checklist and found that stereotypes are more definite towards in-groups and the group with whom their own people are or have been in conflicts. It is less definite for distant and unfamiliar groups or with whom their interests are not thwarted. He reported that all groups had evaluated their self-group more favourably than the out-groups.

The tendency to stereotype others and to think about them in terms of stereotypes stems partly from the fact that this strategy saves us cognitive effort (Macrae, Milne, and Bodenhausen, 1994). This supposition is based on the logic that we have only limited capacity to perform various tasks covering different aspects of social cognition. To perform these tasks we often adopt various cognitive shortcuts in our efforts to make sense of the
social world. Usually we resort to stereotypes when our capacity for handling social information is pushed to the limits. As Gilbert and Hixon (1991) put it, stereotypes are tools that "jump out" of our cognitive toolbox when we realize that we are being exposed to more information than we can readily handle (Baron and Byrne, 2000).

In India it has been found that the Hindus harbour negative stereotypes about Muslims and Muslims about Hindus. In a study on communal stereotypes in Kerala, George and Mathew George (1977) studied 300 professional and non-professional course students in Kerala. They found that favourable qualities were attributed to their own community than to other communities. Christians and high caste Hindus were attributed with desirable qualities while unfavourable traits like cruel, religious and fanatic were attributed to Muslims. Jayakumari (1991) studied 500 graduate teachers in Triyandrum city belonging to seven communal groups. She reports that each community expressed first preference to its own community. All the five communities except the Harijans and Muslims expressed last but one preference toward Muslims. Anant Santosh (1972) reported that out of six religious groups presented, Hindu subjects were unfavourably oriented towards Muslims only. He reported this finding after studying 300 subjects from Agra, Delhi and Varanasi and administering a stereotype checklist of 88 traits. Panchbhai
(1977) reported similar results when he studied 975 subjects with the help of the Katz and Braly checklist. He found that in general the non-Muslim south Indian population had the most unfavourable opinion about Muslims while the non-Christians had the least prejudice towards Christians. Prejudice is the affective component of group antagonism. It is an attitude, usually negative, toward the members of some group, based solely on their membership in that group. In other words, a person who is prejudiced toward some social group tends to evaluate its members in a specific manner, usually negative, merely because they belong to that group. Their individual traits or behaviours play little role; they are disliked or in very few cases liked, simply because of their membership in the group (Baron and Byrne, 2000). It is a pattern of hostility in interpersonal relations, which is directed against the whole group or against a member of a group fulfilling a specific irrational function for its bearer (Ackerman and Jahoda, 1950). Singh et al (1981) compared Hindu and Muslim students of mixed and segregated secondary schools in Bhavnagar and found that Muslim students both in mixed or segregated schools were more prejudiced than the Hindu students. Khan Nusrat (1990) reported that Hindus and Muslims, were more or less equally prejudiced. Khalique (1982) studied the effect of religious prejudice on religious images and religious and caste stereotypes of Muslim school
students using a religious prejudice scale. He found that high religious prejudice group attributed more unfavourable stereotypes to other religions as compared to their own religion than the low prejudice group. In another study Khalique (1982) reported that rural Muslim school children were more prejudiced than their urban counterparts. Allport and Rose (1967) found that churchgoers were more prejudiced than non-church goers. Strommen (1961) reported that most of the orthodox Dutch expressed agreement with prejudiced statements. Bhushan and Sinha (1975) found that religious subjects tended to be more conservative and prejudiced than non-religious subjects. Hassan (1975, 1978, 1981) and Jayaswal (1985) have concluded on the basis of their studies on students that Muslim subjects were more prejudiced than Hindu subjects.

Ghufran (1992) found religion to be a non-influential factor for prejudice but social tension and education were found to be potent factors, which influence prejudice in significant ways. The subjects from riot-prone areas were found to be more prejudiced than subjects from riot-free area. Hasnain (1997) found that caste Hindu and scheduled caste subjects were more prejudiced to Muslims than Sunni and Shia subjects to Hindus. However, inter-religious prejudice was greater in both Hindus and Muslims than intra-religious prejudice. But contradictory findings were reported by Adinarayana (1953), Hassan (1975, 1978) and Enayatullah
(1980) when they found that Muslim subjects have more religious prejudice than Hindu subjects. On the other hand, Natraj (1962), Chatterjee (1967), Sarkar and Hassan (1973) failed to obtain any significant difference between the prejudice scores of Hindu and Muslim subjects. Residence and living experiences may also influence the development of prejudice. Kagitcibasi (1978) studied young Turkish students spending one year in the United States of America and found a considerable change in their attitude because of favourable nature of their sojourn experience. It resulted in decrease in authoritarianism and religiosity and increase in world mindedness of the subjects. But Hasnain and Shehia (2001) reported that Hindu and Muslim students of South Delhi did not differ significantly so far as their prejudice was concerned. They also found that there was a relation between religious dominance and prejudice. They report that Hindu females of Hindu dominated area were more prejudiced than Hindu males of the same area. Hindu females seem to have more lopsided and unrealistic views regarding Muslims, which may be attributed to the rearing practices followed in childhood or it maybe due to the lack of opportunity to interact, share and live with Muslims. An increasing trend of prejudice in Muslim males of Muslim dominated area than their counterpart females, and in Muslim females of Hindu dominated area than their counterpart males was found.
Prejudice develops early in human beings. Singh (1985) concluded on the basis of several studies on religious identity and prejudice that the Indian children show maximum preference for their own religion by the age of 4 or 5 years. The intensity of religious identity reaches its peak by 8 to 9 years and prejudice is also nearly complete by this age. Vyas (1973) showed that group prejudice increases with age. He studied "the origin of prejudice in children" on a sample of 700 school students in Tamil Nadu, using a modification of the dolls test, where the dolls represented various religious, caste, linguistic and class groups. He reached the conclusion that prejudice increases with age, and that religious, caste and class prejudices begin by the age of 3, whereas linguistic prejudice emerges later. Similar findings have been reported by Sharma (1978), Tiwari and Misra (1980, 1985).

Education is a powerful instrument of social change and is a well-acknowledged index of its modernization and social progress. It broadens one's outlook and reduces conservative attitude and prejudices (Newcomb, 1943; Rose, 1948) and authoritarianism (Bhushan, 1967). Laucer (1975) has shown positive relationship between educational attainment and mobility streams. Most of the longitudinal studies have indicated that altitudes and prejudices change in a favourable direction with the number of years spent in educational institutions (Coursey, 1971; Helen, 1961; Robert, 1965). But
certain studies show little or no impact of higher education on liberalization of social attitudes (Gurupada, 1962; Paul, 1966). In fact, Upreti (1975) and Prem Kirpal (1977) have observed that education has helped in increasing social distances between the ethnic groups.

Economic inequality is one of the major factors, which promotes prejudice. Dollard et al (1939) suggested in their book 'Frustration and Aggression' that aggression often stems from frustration i.e., aggression often occurs in situations where people are blocked or prevented from getting what they want. When this hypothesis is applied in the social framework, it denotes that when groups are competing with each other for scarce resources, they come to view one another as potential or actual sources of frustration. After all it is reasoned, if "they" get the jobs, the housing, and other benefits, which are, always in short supply, then "we" don't. This results not just in negative attitudes toward opposing groups but also strong tendencies to aggress against them. This fact serves as the foundation for what is perhaps the oldest explanation of prejudice called the realistic conflict theory (Bobo, 1983). This theory suggests that with the increase in competition the members of the groups involved come to view each other in increasingly negative terms, whereby they label each other as "enemies", view their own group as morally superior, and draw the boundaries between themselves and their opponents more and more
firmly. Eventually what starts out as simple competition relatively free from hatred gradually develops into full scale, emotion-laden prejudice that often leads to direct, and sometimes-violent conflict. Harding, et al, (1969) have shown that the history of American Immigration is full of riots against the immigrant groups. The people who felt economically threatened by immigrants were the most prejudiced people. Hovland and Sears (1940) reported an association between racial violence and economic hard times. Reviewing information on fourteen southern states of United States of America, from 1882 to 1930, they found strong negative correlations between the number of lynchings of black men and economic indicators such as the acre value of cotton. As the price of cotton fell, more lynchings occurred. Subsequent studies have confirmed the relationship between economic distress and racial violence (Beck and Tolnay, 1990; Hepworth and West, 1988). Campbell (1947) found that anti-Semitism was most common among such people who were not satisfied with their economic position.

In India, Singh (1988) observes that poverty and economic inequality produce economic competitions and inter group rivalries. This is accentuated by the growing political consciousness in the hitherto exploited and discriminated groups. Several writers have emphasized the importance of economic factors in communal riots between Hindus and
Muslims. It has been noted that communal riots have occurred in recent years in such towns where a new group of Muslims has emerged as a potential economic competitor of the Hindus. As Rustomji (1980) wrote "A riot does not occur in a sleepy little village of Uttar Pradesh where all suffer equally, nor in a tribal village of Madhya Pradesh where all live safely in the poverty. It occurs in Moradabad where the metal workers have built up a good industry; it occurs in Aligarh where lock makers have made good; it occurs in Bhiwandi where power-loom rivalries are poisonous; it occurs in Hatia and Ahmedabad and Hyderabad and Jamshedpur where there are jobs to get, contracts to secure, houses and shops to capture, it occurs in Agra and Ferozabad and in all other towns where economic rivalries are serious and have to be covered with cloak of communalism. Greater economic prosperity among Muslims has increased economic competition between them and Hindus. Tripathi and Srivastava (1981) found that Muslims who feel highly deprived have more negative out group attitude than Hindus who do not feel so much deprived. Ansari (1981) observed that Muslims higher on fraternal relative deprivation used "forcing" as a style of Hindu-Muslim conflict resolution more than their less deprived counterparts.

It has come to be believed that parental attitudes and child rearing practices are the main sources through which a child acquires attitudes,
prejudices, values etc. A number of studies have reported positive correlations between parental prejudice and those of children (Anisfeld et al, 1963; Epstein and Komorita, 1966; Goodman, 1964; Troll et al, 1969). Vyas (1973) reported that generally children of highly prejudiced parents show greater prejudice than children of low prejudice parents. He also found that children of high and low prejudiced parents differ significantly in the development of prejudice. Dewan and Hassan (1990) reported after a longitudinal study of the development of prejudice in Hindu children that prejudice developed faster in children of prejudiced parents. Studies by Hyman (1959) Wrightsman (1969) indicate the similarity between the attitudes of parents and children. Nijhawan (1976) and Ojha and Sah (1990) have reported that conservative parents have children high in conservatism. In two complementary studies, Hindu (Rai, 1981) and Muslim (H.Khan, 1981) children, having prejudiced and unprejudiced parents, were compared. In both Hindu and Muslim samples, children of prejudiced parents showed more prejudice than children of unprejudiced parents. Hassan (1983) examined the role of parents in the development of a child's prejudice by comparing children of parents grouped into four categories: 1) prejudiced parents, (2) prejudiced father unprejudiced mother, (3) prejudiced mother unprejudiced father, and (4) unprejudiced parents. The sample consisted of 400 pairs of Hindu and Muslim parents.
from Bihar. The results showed that parents tend to produce definite effects on the development of children's prejudice, as was evident from the fact that children whose parents were prejudiced showed the highest degree of prejudice and were brought up under restriction and authoritarian parental discipline. Conversely, children having unprejudiced parents were least prejudiced. There seemed to be no differential impact of father's and mother's prejudice on the male child, but the female child tended to be influenced by the prejudice of her mother.

Given the negative perceptions of each other the cleavage between the different religious groups seems to be deepening with no let-up. This has caused a social distance between the various religious groups, especially between Hindus and Muslims. Several studies have been conducted on this aspect. Natraj (1965) studied the social distance within and between castes and religious groups of college students. He found that social distance was more marked among religious groups than among caste groups. Studies conducted by Saraswathi and Dutta (1980) confirmed the social distance between the Hindu and Muslim adolescents. Anwar Ansari (1956) conducted a study on Hindus and Muslims in Aligarh, which showed that there was positive and high correlation between the number of stereotypes used, and the scores on the social distance scale. Hindus and Muslims tended to place each other at a greater distance and
use greater number of stereotypes for them. It was also found that when there was a lack of social contact with the member of the other communal groups the prejudices were stronger, the social distance greater and the perceptions of the characteristics of members of the other group more distorted. Naqvi (1982) investigated the relationship between relative deprivation and the attribution of blame in communal riots as mediated by social distance and locus of control. The sample consisted of 100 Muslims from riot-prone and another 100 from non-riot areas. Data demonstrated that the relatively deprived Muslims attributed maximum blame for riots on the Hindus. This tendency was more pronounced among Muslims from riot-prone areas. The relatively deprived Muslims' maintained more social distance with Hindus. They had external locus of control. The difference in the attribution of blame in riots was also found to be a function of income.

From the studies reviewed here it is clear that social perception with its implicit bases in prejudice, stereotypes founded on the ingroup-outgroup divide inculcated as part of the socialization process, would be greatly influenced by the separating, dividing, self-glorifying and out-group devaluing dimensions. It is hypothetically implied in the present study that operating along side this process of social perception is the Emotional Quotient which to some extent would deter the unconscious operation of the prejudices and negative stereotypes regarding the
outgroups. However, while assessing the role of Emotional Quotient in influencing the social perception, the role of the social atmosphere reinforcing the prejudices etc., be taken into account.

The present study attempts to assess the role of Emotional Quotient in influencing the social perception.