



Prejudice and Social Distance among General, Minority and Backward Community

Prof. Rajesh Parmar

Assistant Professor, V.N.S.B Ltd. Arts & Commerce College, Vadnagar, Dist:

Mehsana, Gujarat (r.management111@gmail.com)

Abstract

The Purpose of the Present study was investigating the level of prejudice and social distance of Communities (General, Minority & Backward). The total sample consisted of 600 Peoples (200 General community Male-Female, 200 Minority community Male-Female and 200 Backward community Male-Female) were selected purposeful randomly from Gujarat State. The Prejudice Scale (Pr-Scale) developed by DR. R. L. BHARADWAJ AND DR H. SHARMA(1990; Revised in 2006) was used to measure Prejudice also the Scale of *Social Distance developed by K. Dewedi, Shoba Bhatnagar and Usha Asthana (SDS DAB)* was used to measure Social Distance among the participants. Scoring has been done as per manual. The data were analyzed by using ANOVA test. Result was found that, There is significant difference found in the Prejudice scores may because of their culture influences. People of general community have high level of prejudice in compare to all other community; male have high level of prejudice in compare to female. Group with age of 31 to 40 years have high level of prejudice in compare top other group; Comparatively female of general community have high level of prejudice in compare to all other group; group with 31 to 40 years age of general community have high level of prejudice in compare to all other groups; male with 31 to 40 years of age have high level of prejudice in compare to all other group. Gender and Age interact on Prejudice. Male of general community with age of 21 to 30 years of age have high level of prejudice in compare to all other groups and also there is significant difference is existed among different communities on Social distance. People of backward community have high level of Social distance in compare to all other community; Female have high level of Social distance in compare to male. There is no significant difference is existed among people with different age on Social distance. All the two age level has similar level of Social distance; Comparatively female of general community have high level of Social distance in compare to all other group; Group with 31 to 40 years age of backward community have high level of Social distance in compare to all other groups; There are not significantly interacting each other on level of Social distance. Community, Gender and Age do not interact on Social distance.

Key Words: Prejudice and Social Distance, General, Minority and Backward Community

Prejudice:

Prejudice is an unjustified or incorrect attitude (usually negative) towards an individual based solely on the individual's membership of a social group. For example, a person may hold prejudiced views towards a certain race or gender etc.

(e.g. sexist). Discrimination is the behavior or actions, usually negative, towards an individual or group of people, especially on the basis of sex/race/social class, etc.

What prejudice means?

To understand what causes prejudice, one must first have a grasp of the concept of prejudice. Prejudice has much the same meaning as bias. It is not just an emotion or feeling, a habit or personality trait. It is more an attitude that has been influenced by family, friends, church groups, and first-hand experiences. Humans are not born prejudiced, yet they often cultivate one form of it or another at a very early age. A prejudiced person assumes that one group, usually his own, is superior in some way to another group. A person often forms prejudices in his mind before ever meeting someone representing the group against which the person is prejudiced. In racial prejudice, the groups are defined solely by skin color. In social class prejudice, the groups are defined primarily by the part of town or area in which they live. As the person grows older, the prejudice often becomes a well-established part of his inner psychological self. It becomes an inflexible generalization about others that is difficult to change once established. These generalizations are normally hastily made. Any evidence that the assumptions about another group may be wrong, such as a female college student excelling in engineering studies, is simply considered an isolated exception.

Some of the most well-known types of prejudice include:

- Racism.
- Sexism.
- Classicism.
- Homophobia.
- Nationalism.
- Religious prejudice.
- Ageism.
- Xenophobia.

What are the effects of prejudice and discrimination?

Prejudice makes the victim feel less than fully human. When people are undervalued by others, their self-esteem suffers and they stop trying to improve themselves. Prejudice can often lead to bullying and other forms of discrimination.

These create an atmosphere of fear for what might happen at any moment and fear for what the future might hold. In extreme cases this can lead a person to take their own life.

At its worst extremes, prejudice can lead to genocide, as demonstrated during World War Two, with the extermination of 6 million Jewish people. This is an example of what can happen when prejudice is allowed to develop unchallenged in society.

The consequences of prejudice and discrimination can lead to individuals and entire communities feeling vulnerable, frightened and worthless. At worst, the result can be death.

Social distance

According to Sherif and Sherif (1969) **“Social distance is a dimension of interaction between members of different groups ranging from intimacy to complete separation (no contact). It is defined by norms governing the situation in which**

interaction with members of the outgroups is permissible". Social distance particularly increases in times of social change and due to intergroup behaviour.

The concept of "distance" as applied to human, as distinguished from spatial relations, has come into use among sociologists, in an attempt to reduce to something like measurable terms the grades and degrees of understanding and intimacy which characterize personal and social relations generally.

How does social distance influence the affective content of social relations? More specifically, what different affective orientations might the members of a group display toward groups they consider as distant from their own? At least according to one frequently adopted perspective in the literature, such a question is essentially superfluous. From this point of view, strong affective bonds are a sign of social proximity and relatedness. When social distance increases, relationships tend to lose their affective content or, worse, negative affections dominate the relationship.³ In short, it is suggested that there is a linear relation between distance and affectivity; social distance is more or less identical to affective distance. There have, of course, been other conceptions of social distance that do not reduce it to affective distance. Beginning with Simmel's (1950) and Park's (1924) writings, sociologists have emphasized other—normative, interactive, and cultural—aspects of the concept (more on this in the next section). But even those scholars who view social distance as a complex category consisting of multiple dimensions tend to subscribe to a linear model when it comes to analyzing the relationships between its different dimensions. We can trace this linearity assumption all the way back to one of the first users of the concept, Gabriel Tarde (1962), who suggested that as the degree of imitation between two groups increases, there builds up more cultural similarity and, therefore, more social proximity between them. Several decades later, echoing Tarde, Homans (1950) argued that positive affections between people would increase with increased interaction. Applying the same logic to the closely affiliated concept of social ties, Granovetter (1973:1361) states that "the strength of a tie is a (probably linear) combination of the amount of time, the emotional intensity, the intimacy (mutual confiding) and the reciprocal services which characterize the tie." In short, in the sociological literature, it is a widespread expectation that while in the short run there might be some discrepancy between the dimensions of social distance, "[o]ver the long run," these dimensions are likely to "cluster so that there is but one dimension of social distance" (Kadushin, 1962:520).

Determinants of Social Distance:

1. Prejudice manifests towards social distance:
2. Beliefs attitudes and preconceived notions usually manifest in social distance.
3. Avoidance:
4. Discrimination:

Social distance as a theoretical lens

Our practice of Critical Psychology begins by taking social distance into account. We consider social distance as an extension of self-reflexivity, a topic central to classical Anthropology since it first interrogated the implication of the researcher in the analysis and the construction data collected amongst out-groups. Indeed, the work of Malinowski (1967/1985), Adam *et al.* (1980), Van Maanen (1988), Kilani (1994) among others, highlight research topics from objectivity to participatory observation

that question the way in which field-based data is collected and produced. For example, the necessity to understand the point of view of the research participant through their own socio-cultural codes and references is a classic point made in research manuals, soliciting the researcher to be reflexive about their own codes and references (De Sardan, 2008). Self-reflexivity, rather than simply describing the field (Pottier *et al.*, 2003) requires taking the conditions of the field into account (Agier, 2005, Fassin, 2005). Furthermore, self-reflexivity includes exploring the negotiations at play within the dialogues that preclude and include the production of data (Berger & Luckman, 1966). Finally, self-reflexivity can even be extended to analyse the disciplinary stakes that are expressed in the production of research data (Hacking 1999, Shinn & Ragouet, 2005; Dafermos & Marvakis, 2006). Therefore, reflecting upon social codes and references can be constituted as an operational tool for elaborating and questioning the construction of them process. By characterizing the relation to the research participant, reflexivity can also be used to analyse the relationship that the researcher has with neighbouring disciplines and their use in the theoretical production and the methodology in Critical Psychology.

1.2.4 DIMENSIONS OF SOCIAL DISTANCE

- **Social Distance as Interactive Distance**
- **Social Distance as Cultural and Habitual Distance**

1.2.5 Application of Social Distance to Age Groups

Studies suggest that it is reasonable to assume that the relationship between age groups is characterized by social distance. Indications of social distance revealed by prior research include: perceptual barriers to interaction between age groups; age categories relegated to the status of a minority group, and extensive age group stereotyping.

Review of Literature:

Pamela J. Sawyer, Brenda Major, PhD, Bettina J. Casad, Sarah S.M. Townsend and Wendy Berry Mendes(2012), "Discrimination and the Stress Response: Psychological and Physiological Consequences of Anticipating Prejudice in Interethnic Interactions"

Objectives. We sought to demonstrate that individuals who anticipate interacting with a prejudiced cross-race/ethnicity partner show an exacerbated stress response, as measured through both self-report and hemodynamic and vascular responses, compared with individuals anticipating interacting with a nonprejudiced cross-race/ethnicity partner.

Methods. Through a questionnaire exchange with a White interaction partner (a confederate) Latina participants learned that their partner had racial/ethnic biased or egalitarian attitudes. Latina participants reported their cognitive and emotional states, and cardiovascular responses were measured while participants prepared and delivered a speech to the White confederate.

Results. Participants who believed that their interaction partner held prejudiced attitudes reported greater concern and more threat emotions before the interaction, and more stress after the interaction, and showed greater cardiovascular response than did participants who believed that their partner had egalitarian attitudes.

Conclusions. This study shows that merely anticipating prejudice leads to both psychological and cardiovascular stress responses. These results are consistent with the conceptualization of anticipated discrimination as a stressor and suggest that vigilance for prejudice may be a contributing factor to racial/ethnic health disparities in the United States.

Nanda (2001) conducted a comparative study on the mental health of SC, ST, first generational learners and general category's adolescents and found that categories in descending order according to mental health were general, SC, ST and FGL group. FGL group was also found to be poorer in mental-health status in urban as well as rural schools.

B.S.Parimal May_2014; "A Comparative Study of Value, Personality and Mental Health among Scheduled Caste and Non-Scheduled Caste College Students"

1. Caste: Significant difference is not found between Scheduled caste and Non-scheduled caste college students on theoretical value. Caste had no effect on theoretical value.
2. Gender: Significant difference is observed between Male and Female college students on theoretical value.
3. The mean score of female is higher than Male college students. It means females have high theoretical value.

Economic value

Cast: Significant difference is reported between Scheduled caste and Non-scheduled caste college students on economic value. Non-Scheduled caste college students are better than scheduled caste college students on economic value.

Madhumita et al (2012) reported that Value pattern of B.Ed. trainees on the basis of their caste shows that general caste trainees fall under high category for theoretical, aesthetic, social and political value whereas only for economic value reserved caste trainees are under high category. Comparison pattern of the B.Ed. trainees from urban and rural background shows that more number of trainees with rural background belongs to the high category for theoretical and political value than trainees residing in urban areas but for economic, aesthetic and social value more number of urban trainees are under high category.

Method

Participates:

The total sample consisted of 600 Peoples (200 General community Male-Female, 200 Minority community Male-Female and 200 Backward community Male-Female) were selected purposeful randomly from Gujarat State.

Variables:

In this study independent variables are **A) Communities** A1: General, A2: Minority, A3: Backward; **B) Gender** B1: Male, B2 Female; **C) Age** C1: 21 to 30 Years, C2: 31 to 40 Years.

Instruments:

(1) Prejudice Scale (Pr-Scale)

Prejudice Scale (Pr-Scale) developed by **DR. R. L. BHARADWAJ AND DR H. SHARMA(1990; Revised in 2006)** was used to measure Prejudice among the participants. It contains **36 items** measuring **three dimensions** (subscales) of

prejudice i.e. **Caste, Religion and Community**. Each subscale has 12 items, each item with the five-point response category ranging from Higher to Lower. Thus the scale provides scores on five dimensions/subscales, in addition to a score on the total Prejudice. High score indicates high Prejudice. For the total Prejudice score.

Reliability

The coefficient of reliability has been determined by using the following two methods:

1. The test-retest method (N=100) has been employed to determine the temporal stability of the scale. The product moment correlation between test and retest scores has been found to be .69.
2. By applying the split-half method (Gutman Formula), the reliability coefficient of the scale has been found to be .94 (N = 100).

Thus, results obtained by both these methods ensure a very high reliability of the scale.

Validity

1. Theoretical validity of the scale, has been found to be .83 (under root of reliability Coefficient).
2. construct validity of the scale has been estimated with the prejudice scale of Jahan, a. et. al., (1988) and that comes to .66.

2) Social Distance:

Social Distance Scale: K. Dewedi, Shoba Bhatnagar and Usha Asthana (SDS DAB), **Social Distance Scale (Pr-Scale)** developed by K. Dewedi, ShobaBhatnagar and UshaAsthana was used to measure Social Distance among the participants. The scale has contains of 12 items. Thus the scale provides scores on the total Social Distance. High score indicates high Social Distance.

Validity

The Scale is based on Bogardus Scale as well as Crespi's Social Rejection. Thermometer, therefore, its validity is accepted on a priori basis.

The Scale has construct validity which can be seen from the scale value of item/statements. The Order of items from the viewpoint of Intimacy and Distance value is completely reverse and the coefficient of Correlation (ρ) is -1.00

Reliability

The scale was administrated by saxena (1966) to 200 boys and girls (100 each). The scale was divided in two values: item 1 to 8 including decreasing degree of Distance.

Procedure:

After finalizing the instruments, establish rapport and receiving the consent of the various community peoples choose were requested to fill the two Scales without Omitting and item. All the data analysis using statistical measures such as ANOVA test.

Research Design:

The aim of present research was to a study Prejudice and social distance of the total sample consisted of 600 Peoples (200 General community Male-Female, 200 Minority community Male-Female and 200 Backward community Male-Female) were selected purposeful randomly from Gujarat State. Selection for sample random

method was used. To check the differences between groups ‘F’ test (ANOVA) was used.

Result and Discussion:

1) Result and Discussion of Prejudice:

Table A: Showing Results of ANOVA of Prejudice:

Source of Variation	Sum of Square	df	Mean sum of Square	F	Level of Significant
Ass	56308.63	2	28154.32	392.76	0.01
Bss	530.16	1	530.16	7.40	0.01
Css	5605.93	1	5605.93	78.20	0.01
A x B	1225.57	2	612.79	8.55	0.01
A x C	3649.92	2	1824.96	25.46	0.01
B x C	511.53	1	511.53	7.14	0.01
A x B x C	1738.82	2	869.41	12.13	0.01
Error	42149.60	588	71.68		
Total	2302066.00	600			

Significant level of ‘F’ value: 0.05 level 3.86 (df=1), 0.01 level 6.68(df=1)
 0.05 level 3.01 (df=2), 0.01 level 4.64 (df=2)

2) Result and Discussion of Social Distance:

Table B: Showing Results of ANOVA of Social distance:

Source of Variation	Sum of Square	df	Mean sum of Square	F	Level of Significant
Ass	713986.56	2	356993.28	368.23	0.01
Bss	5821.94	1	5821.94	60.05	0.01
Css	0.74	1	0.74	0.01	NS
A x B	2241.61	2	1120.81	11.56	0.01
A x C	676.99	2	338.49	3.49	0.05
B x C	0.38	1	0.38	0.01	NS
A x B x C	402.69	2	201.35	2.08	NS
Error	57003.82	588	96.95		
Total	4405151.00	600			

Significant level of ‘F’ value: 0.05 level 3.86 (df=1), 0.01 level 6.68(df=1)
 0.05 level 3.01 (df=2), 0.01 level 4.64 (df=2)

Discussion: Result of Prejudice

Table A – consulted results of ANOVA including main and interaction effect of Prejudice of different communities. It is found that the F ratio for Ass (Gender) is 392.76, which is significant at 0.01 level. It means there is significant difference in level of prejudice of different community. By the same point of view Table show

mean score of prejudice for general community is 72.15, mean score of prejudice for minority community is 60.69 and mean score of prejudice for backward community is 48.43; So, It is clear that there is significant difference is existed among different communities on Prejudice. There is difference found in the Prejudice scores may because of their culture influences. People of general community have high level of prejudice in compare to all other community. The result shows that Ho is rejected.

F ratio for Bss (Gender) is 7.40, which is significant at 0.01 levels. It means male and female differ significantly on Prejudice. By the same point of view Table show mean score of prejudice for male is 61.36, and mean score of prejudice for female is 59.48, it can be clearly said that significant difference is existed between male and female on Prejudice. Different gender have different level of prejudice. Male have high level of prejudice in compare to female.

F ratio for C_{ss} (Age) is 78.20, which is significant at 0.01 levels. It means community who have age of 21 to 30 years and age of 31 to 40 years differ significantly on Prejudice. By the same point of view Table show the mean score of prejudice for age of 21 to 30 years is 57.36, and mean score of prejudice for age of 31 to 40 years is 63.48. It can be clearly said that significant difference is existed among people with different age on Prejudice. All the two age level have different on Prejudice. Group with age of 31 to 40 years have high level of prejudice in compare to other group.

F ratio for A x B_{ss} (Community x Gender) is 8.55, which is significant at 0.01 levels. It means Community and gender differ significantly on Prejudice. By the same point of view Table show the mean score of prejudice for male of general community is 74.95, mean score of prejudice for male of minority community is 60.10, mean score of prejudice for male of backward community is 48.12, mean score of prejudice for female of general community is 69.35, mean score of prejudice for female of minority community is 61.36 and mean score of prejudice for female of backward community is 47.73; which are differently interacting each other significantly on level of Prejudice. Comparatively female of general community have high level of prejudice in compare to all other group.

F ratio for A x C_{ss} (Community x Age) is 25.46, which is significant at 0.01 levels. It means Community and age differ significantly on Prejudice. By the same point of view Table show the mean score of prejudice for general community with 21 to 30 years of age is 69.17, mean score of prejudice for minority community with 21 to 30 years of age is 60.61, mean score of prejudice for backward community with 21 to 30 years of age is 42.31, mean score of prejudice for general community with 31 to 40 years of age is 75.13, mean score of prejudice for minority community with 31 to 40 years of age is 60.76 and mean score of prejudice for backward community with 31 to 40 years of age is 64.54; which are differently interacting each other significantly on Prejudice. Group with 31 to 40 years age of general community have high level of prejudice in compare to all other groups.

F ratio for B x C_{ss} (Gender x Age) is 7.14, which is significant at 0.01 level. It means different Gender and different group of age significantly differ on Prejudice. By the same point of view Table shows the mean score of prejudice for male with 21 to 30 years of age is 59.23, mean score of prejudice for female with 21 to 30 years of age is 55.50, mean score of prejudice for male with 31 to 40 years of age is 63.49 and

mean score of prejudice for female with 31 to 40 years of age is 63.46; which are differently interacting each other significantly on Prejudice. That male with 31 to 40 years of age have high level of prejudice in compare to all other group.

F ratio for A x B x C_{ss} (Community x Gender x Age) is 12.13, which is significant at 0.01 level. It means Community, Gender and Age interact significantly each other on scores of Prejudice. By the same point of view, table shows the mean scores of prejudice for male of general community with age of 21 to 30 years is 75.30, mean scores of prejudice for female of general community with age of 21 to 30 years is 63.04 teacher, mean scores of prejudice for male of minority community with age of 21 to 30 years is 59.60, mean scores of prejudice for female of minority community with age of 21 to 30 years is 61.62, mean scores of prejudice for male of backward community with age of 21 to 30 years is 42.78, mean scores of prejudice for female of backward community with age of 21 to 30 years is 41.84, mean scores of prejudice for male of general community with age of 31 to 40 years is 74.60, mean scores of prejudice for female of general community with age of 31 to 40 years is 75.66 teacher, mean scores of prejudice for male of minority community with age of 31 to 40 years is 60.42, mean scores of prejudice for female of minority community with age of 31 to 40 years is 61.10, mean scores of prejudice for male of backward community with age of 31 to 40 years is 55.46 and mean scores of prejudice for female of backward community with age of 31 to 40 years is 53.62; which are significantly interacting each other on level of Prejudice. Community, Gender and Age interact on Prejudice. Male of general community with age of 21 to 30 years of age have high level of prejudice in compare to all other groups.

Discussion: Result of Social Distance:

Table B - Consulted results of ANOVA including main and interaction effect of Social distance of different communities. It is found that the F ratio for Ass (Gender) is 368.23, which is significant at 0.01 level. It means there is significant difference in level of Social distance of different community. By the same point of view Table show mean score of Social distance for general community is 29.98, mean score of Social distance for minority community is 92.94 and mean score of Social distance for backward community is 110.27; So, It is clear that there is significant difference is existed among different communities on Social distance. People of backward community have high level of Social distance in compare to all other community. The result shows that H₀ is rejected.

F ratio for B_{ss} (Gender) is 60.05, which is significant at 0.01 levels. It means male and female differ significantly on Social distance. By the same point of view Table show mean score of Social distance for male is 74.61, and mean score of Social distance for female is 80.84, it can be clearly said that significant difference is existed between male and female on Social distance. Different gender has different level of Social distance. Female have high level of Social distance in compare to male.

F ratio for C_{ss} (Age) is 0.01, which is not significant. It means community who have age of 21 to 30 years and age of 31 to 40 years do not differ significantly on Social distance. By the same point of view Table show the mean score of Social distance for age of 21 to 30 years is 77.69, and mean score of Social distance for age of 31 to 40 years is 77.76. It can be clearly said that no significant difference is

existed among people with different age on Social distance. All the two age level has similar level of Social distance.

F ratio for A x Bss (Community x Gender) is 11.56, which is significant at 0.01 levels. It means Community and gender differ significantly on Social distance. By the same point of view Table show the mean score of Social distance for male of general community is 24.44, mean score of Social distance for male of minority community is 92.13, mean score of Social distance for male of backward community is 107.27, mean score of Social distance for female of general community is 35.52, mean score of Social distance for female of minority community is 93.75 and mean score of Social distance for female of backward community is 113.26; which are differently interacting each other significantly on level of Social distance.

F ratio for A x C_{ss} (Community x Age) is 3.49, which is significant at 0.05 levels. It means Community and age differ significantly on Social distance. By the same point of view Table show the mean score of Social distance for general community with 21 to 30 years of age is 30.33, mean score of Social distance for minority community with 21 to 30 years of age is 93.97, mean score of Social distance for backward community with 21 to 30 years of age is 108.78, mean score of Social distance for general community with 31 to 40 years of age is 29.63, mean score of Social distance for minority community with 31 to 40 years of age is 91.91 and mean score of Social distance for backward community with 31 to 40 years of age is 111.75; which are differently interacting each other significantly on Social distance. Group with 31 to 40 years age of backward community have high level of Social distance in compare to all other groups.

F ratio for B x C_{ss} (Gender x Age) is 0.01, which is not significant. It means driftnet Gender and different group of age do not differ significantly on Social distance. By the same point of view Table shows the mean score of Social distance for male with 21 to 30 years of age is 74.55, mean score of Social distance for female with 21 to 30 years of age is 80.83, mean score of Social distance for male with 31 to 40 years of age is 74.67 and mean score of Social distance for female with 31 to 40 years of age is 80.85; which are not interacting each other significantly on Social distance.

F ratio for A x B x C_{ss} (Community x Gender x Age) is 2.08, which is not significant. It means Community, Gender and Age do not interact significantly each other on scores of Social distance. By the same point of view, table shows the mean scores of Social distance for male of general community with age of 21 to 30 years is 24.64, mean scores of Social distance for female of general community with age of 21 to 30 years is 36.02 teacher, mean scores of Social distance for male of minority community with age of 21 to 30 years is 92.20, mean scores of Social distance for female of minority community with age of 21 to 30 years is 95.74, mean scores of Social distance for male of backward community with age of 21 to 30 years is 106.82, mean scores of Social distance for female of backward community with age of 21 to 30 years is 110.74, mean scores of Social distance for male of general community with age of 31 to 40 years is 24.24, mean scores of Social distance for female of general community with age of 31 to 40 years is 35.02 teacher, mean scores of Social distance for male of minority community with age of 31 to 40 years is 92.06, mean scores of Social distance for female of minority community with age of 31 to 40 years

is 91.76, mean scores of Social distance for male of backward community with age of 31 to 40 years is 107.72 and mean scores of Social distance for female of backward community with age of 31 to 40 years is 115.78; which are not significantly interacting each other on level of Social distance. Community, Gender and Age do not interact on Social distance. Almost all the group have similar level of Social distance.

Summary of the Finding:

1. There is significant difference found in the Prejudice scores may because of their culture influences. People of general community have high level of prejudice in compare to all other community.
2. There is significant difference is existed between male and female on Prejudice. Different gender have different level of prejudice. Male have high level of prejudice in compare to female.
3. There is significant difference is existed among people with different age on Prejudice. 4.3. All the two age level have different on Prejudice. Group with age of 31 to 40 years have high level of prejudice in compare top other group. The result is that H_{03} is rejected.
4. There is significant difference is existed. Comparatively female of general community have high level of prejudice in compare to all other group.
5. There is significant difference found in Group with 31 to 40 years age of general community have high level of prejudice in compare to all other groups.
6. There is significant difference is existed. Male with 31 to 40 years of age have high level of prejudice in compare to all other group. The result is that H_{06} is rejected.
7. There is significant difference found in Community, Gender and Age interact on Prejudice. Male of general community with age of 21 to 30 years of age have high level of prejudice in compare to all other groups.
8. There is significant difference is existed among different communities on Social distance. People of backward community have high level of Social distance in compare to all other community.
9. There is significant difference is existed between male and female on Social distance. Different gender has different level of Social distance. Female have high level of Social distance in compare to male.
10. There is no significant difference is existed among people with different age on Social distance. All the two age level has similar level of Social distance.
11. There are differently interacting each other significantly on level of Social distance. Comparatively female of general community have high level of Social distance in compare to all other group.
12. There are differently interacting each other significantly on Social distance. Group with 31 to 40 years age of backward community have high level of Social distance in compare to all other groups.
13. There are not interacting each other significantly on Social distance. The entire group have similar level of social distance.

14. There are not significantly interacting each other on level of Social distance. Community, Gender and Age do not interact on Social distance. Almost all the group have similar level of Social distance.

Suggestions

To solve the problems and to direct the research of posterity in the same direction following suggestions are asserted.

- A similar Research can be done on sample taken from other state of India and results can be compared with those the present Research.
- A similar study can be done on urban and Community person also.
- To Attempt for study you can be take more than 600 samples.
- In the future study researcher collect inventory data getting some other personal information for research samples, researcher contact with and meet to samples relative and family members.

Limitations

The present investigation has certain limitations. The forthcoming researchers should try to avoid these limitations.

- Reliable and valid information can be obtained through selecting a large sample from population for findings.
- Sample selected was from only Gujarat.
- In the present study only three communities were selected.
- In the study, only selected dependent variables were choose like as Prejudice, Social

Distance, Psychological Wellbeing, Aggression& Life Satisfaction. But we included some others dependents variables (e.g. mental health, Self actualization, Emotional Maturity, social adjustment, family adjustment etc.)

References

- Abraham Maslow(2008) A Brief Reminiscence Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 48 (4), pg. 443-444 Tom Greening Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi, India, pp. 510.
- Abramson, L.Y., Seligman, M.E.P., Teasdale, J.D. (1978) "Learned helplessness in humans: Critique and reformulation". Journal of Abnormal Psychology 87 (1): 49-74.
- Acharya,T. &Behera, D. K.(2005) Factors Influencing the Educational Achievements of theScheduled Caste and General Caste Students of Cuttack Municipality Corporation, Journal of Social Sciences, 10(3): 215-222.
- Adler, A.(1929) The Science of living, Garden city, New York: Doubleday.
- Adler, A.(1956) The individual psychology of Alfred Adler: A systematic presentation from selection of his writings. New York: Basic Books.
- Adsul, R.K. and Kamble, V.(2008) Achievement Motivation as a Function of Gender, Economic Background and Caste Differences in College Students, Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, July 2008, Vol. 34, No.2, 323-327.

- Agarwal, Roma and Kumkum Singh (2008) Personality traits as a function of caste and gender. *Psycho-lingua*, 38(1):83-86.
- Agarwal, Y.P.(1975) A study of locus of control and general intelligence among Scheduled caste and Non-Scheduled castes students. UGC Project. Kurukshetra University: Kurukshetra.
- Allport G (1961) *Pattern and Growth in personality*. Holt, Reinhart and Winston, New York.
- Allport, G. W. Vernon, P. E. & Lindzey, G.(1960b) *Test booklet: Study of values* (3rded.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Allport, G. W., Odbert, H. S.(1936) Trait names: a psycho-lexical study. *Psychol. Monogr.* 47, No. 211.
- B.S.Parimal May_2014; "A Comparative Study of Value, Personality and Mental Health among Scheduled Caste and Non-Scheduled Caste College Students"
- Bajpai, Sunil, (2001) *Caste and belongingness and adjustment of high school girls*. Ind. *Pschy.Rev.*, 56(1): 46-50.
- Boby Xavier Thaiparambil, Basel, Switzerland(2017), "Influence of Caste System On Self Esteem And School Performance"
- Bandura, A. (1977) *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bhupinder Singh and Rakhi Udainiya(2009) *Self-Efficacy and Well-Being of Adolescents*.