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PREFACE

My interests in social psychology have led me to study intergroup relationships, and especially attitudes, prejudice and discrimination. Certainly, one can understand that prejudice need not be thought of as a negative concept of an "attitude against," but also as an "attitude in favor of" some person or group. In this context, my interest in examining intergroup relationships is an effort to emphasize the positive aspects of prejudice reduction. I have made the study of the dynamics of prejudice reduction my primary goal. With this in view, I planned to study attraction and basic openness of three caste groups to one another in and around Poona, India.

The caste system is foreign to the American way of life, and hence this brief preface is not only to introduce my American friends to the background and development of the caste system, but also to put this study in the proper perspective. To the Indian cultural context, the caste system is as traditional as motherhood and apple pie is to America. The caste system is part and parcel of our way of life and without understanding it, one could not claim to have had an
inking of what it means to be an Indian. First, the 
primary reason for doing this dissertation is to go back to 
my roots, my cultural heritage, in an attempt to unravel the 
dynamics at work within the caste system, which for centur-
ies has held sway among the naive and simple-minded people 
in a predominantly agrarian society. To be an Indian and 
have only superficial and hearsay information about the caste 
system would be tantamount to an American being unlettered 
in the development and history of the democratic principles 
on which his country is founded. Second, this study will 
attempt to examine attraction and openness to social inter-
actions as they touch upon the caste system, and to do this 
in a systematic way, with all the tools that have been made 
available to the modern social researcher.

The word "caste" comes from the Portuguese casta which 
means race, breed or type (Kolenda, 1978). Thus, any group 
of people who claim a common ancestral heritage could be 
called a caste. In a way, the different ethnic groups in 
the U.S.A. are a relatively simple parallel to the caste 
system. However, the caste system unlike ethnicity, is 
anchored in a specific religious tradition. In India, the 
caste system has been the bastion of Hindu religion (Tarka-
teertha Laxmanshastri Joshi, 1978). Woven into religious 
ritual, it has forged a hierarchical structure determined by 
religious scriptures and traditions held sacred by the Hin-
The religious basis of this hierarchical structure permeates the social and economic aspects of Indian life making it impossible to ignore ramifications of the caste system in one's day to day life.

India has been the cradle of Hinduism, a great religious tradition which has taken root and blossomed on its fertile soil. Hinduism with its diverse philosophies and practices has been one of the major forces with which other religions, whether they be indigenous like Buddhism and Jainism, or foreign like Islam and Christianity, have had to contend. For the present, our interest lies in Hinduism, which has cradled and nourished the caste system, in its hierarchical structure of the high and the low, the in and the out. The caste system as we know it today is the product of the religious heritage of Hinduism, with tremendous social and economic implications for the quality of life in India.

The caste system in its pristine form consisted of four Varnas (colored groups) which gradually stratified into the four caste groups (Ghurye, 1957): Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishayyas, and Shudras. The first three groups, which often vied for power and status, were probably descendents of conquering peoples, while the last group, often called Dasyas or Dasyus, was the enslaved one or had the status of servants thrust on it (Betille, 1969). The Brahmins, the
priestly class, occupied a supreme rank with respect to the whole set of castes, and maintained a monopoly over the right to study and interpret the sacred scriptures. Thus, the Brahmins not only were the priestly class, who were constantly needed for the furtherance of the religious rituals that encompassed Hindu life from birth to death, but they were also the only class well-versed in the scriptural traditions of their religion. Learning was a monopoly, to which other caste groups could aspire only with difficulty. The Kshatriyas came second in the caste hierarchy, and were a warrior group whose primary duty was to protect the citizens, but for the most part formed the bulk of the fighting forces who protected the rights and privileges of kings and local chieftains. Often enough, the leaders in this caste were themselves the kings and rulers. The third in this hierarchy were the Vaishyas, who although not highly respected, were basically businessmen, looking after the trade and commerce in an otherwise agrarian economy. The last in this hierarchy were the Shudras, whose task was to serve the superior castes and do the chores which were below the dignity of the higher castes.

One must remember that, although there were only four Varnas, there were many castes and sub-castes which sprang up as a result of inter-marriage between these four groups. There were also the "untouchables" who were ostracized from
this caste hierarchy and relegated to a state of being "out­
castes." Any caste person who did not live up to his Jati­
dharma (caste-duty) could be ex-communicated from his posi-
tion in the caste hierarchy. This state of being an outcaste
was equivalent to being "beyond redemption." These groups
of outcasts were lower than the lowest in the caste hier-
archy, and had to do the dirty menial tasks (Leach, 1969).
They were to live outside the village boundary, and always
do any task the higher castes would impose upon them.

Religious Background

For the religiously orthodox, the caste system was a way
of distinguishing who was close to salvation and who was
not. The higher one's caste status, the closer one was in
his ability to pursue his salvific goal - one of complete
identity with the Paramatman (Supreme Being). The Brahmins,
Kshatriyas and the Vaishyas are the Dvija (twice-born) and
have an exclusive right to study the Vedas. No Shudras may
study the Vedas, although he may read the elementary works
like the Puranas and the Tantras. A Dvija is a person who
is reborn as a result of the Upanayan (thread) ceremony. A
Shudra cannot take part in such a ceremony and hence cannot
be reborn. Revankar (1971) referring to a text from the Manu
Samhita (III, 151, VIII, 1.2) points to the traditional
belief that when God created the castes he made the Brahmins
from his head, the Kshatriyas from his arms, the Vaishyas from his thighs, and the Shudras from his feet. The high and the low in the caste hierarchy is the natural consequence of the inherent distinction between the castes since God created them from different parts of his body.

The innumerable castes and sub-castes within the fold of Hindu religion are not divided merely into these four groups. Any mixture of these four groups or of the already formed sub-castes leads to the formation of new sub-castes. Inter-marriage with persons outside one's caste lowered the high caste person's position in the caste hierarchy. Marrying outside one's caste group was sufficient reason to ostracize one from the caste group and force one to accept a lower caste. Thus, lowering of caste in this life was punitive action taken by society against those who did not abide by the norms and practices that maintained the "status quo."

A caste was normally determined by birth, and neither wealth nor poverty, success nor disaster would help to change one's caste, unless the standards of behavior laid down by the caste system had been violated (Hutton, 1963). One could, of course, hope that by the scrupulous observance of the religious practices of one's caste, one would be reborn into a higher caste. One had to live a good life in order to secure a desirable existence in the next birth. No one whose Karma (collection of merits and demerits) was bad
could hope to be re-born in a higher caste (Basham, 1966).

The hierarchical division of the castes is also founded on a philosophical tradition of the Guna (quality) theory, which provided the basis for the idea and practice of ritual pollution. All reality (including living beings), is composed of a combination of three qualities: The Satvic, which generates goodness and inspires virtue; the Rajasic, which produces egoism, selfishness etc.; and the Tamasic, which engenders all sorts of base and evil behavior (Revankar, 1971). The higher castes considered themselves as possessing mainly Satvic qualities; the lower castes possessed mostly Tamasic qualities; and the middle castes more of the Rajasic. Thus, though every caste possessed all the qualities, the higher castes possessed more of the Satvic, and the lower castes possessed more of the Tamasic. This philosophical tradition provided the basis for discriminatory religious and social practices, which helped to perpetuate the hierarchical structure, not only keeping the Brahmins at the top, but also preventing the lower castes and outcastes from changing their caste.

Social Implications

The religious traditions encouraged and maintained a separation of communities which was a logical consequence of the hierarchical structure and the Guna theory: the purity
of the higher castes would get contaminated by any mixing with the lower castes. If one had to maintain one's position in the caste hierarchy, one could not be negligent about what one ate, where one went, and with whom one associated. Social interactions transmitted degrees of pollution: most serious were transferring of boiled food, touching a water vessel, coming into the cooking area, or touching one's earthenware vessel; least serious were transferring of dry food, and touching one's children (Kolenda, 1978). The seriousness of contamination varied depending on the caste of the contaminator. A person belonging to a higher level in the caste hierarchy was, of course, less polluting than one who was an outcaste. Thus, it came to be that the outcastes were "Untouchables." Any contamination by the outcastes required a Shuddhikaran (purification). Exclusiveness in matters of marriage became the prerogative of the upper castes.

The consequences of this selective association wrought havoc on the untouchables. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, a leader and pioneer in the untouchables' struggle for respectability and acceptance, in a scathing critique of the caste system called it a a veritable chamber of horrors (Lynch, 1969):

The sanctity and infallibility of the Vedas, Smritis and the Shastra, the iron law of caste, the heartless Karma and the senseless law of status by birth are to the Untouchable veritable instruments of torture which Hinduism has forged against the Untouchables (p. 133).
This remark was made in 1946 in a speech expressing his strong opposition to Gandhism, which pleaded for a tolerant acceptance of the caste system without its logical consequence of untouchability.

Not all scholars will agree that the iron law of the caste system was as rigid as it is made out to be. Srinivas (1956) for instance, holds that there always was a process of sanskritization at work, by which a lower Hindu caste raises itself by changing its customs, ritual ideology and way of life in the direction of a higher, frequently, Dvija caste. This was only possible when a whole caste group became politically and economically powerful to exert pressure on the rest of society to make itself more reputable and acceptable. It often took two or more generations before such a claim to a higher position would be accepted by other caste groups. However, by and large, such changes were the exception rather than the rule.

**Economic Implications**

From the economic point of view, the caste system has prevented mobility. The upper castes maintained their monopoly over the different professions and prevented the lower castes from moving up higher by making these occupations hereditary. The dirty work had to be done only by certain groups in perpetuity. The Brahmins with all their
training in the religious traditions provided for the cultic and ritual aspects, the Kshatriyas supported them in return for their official sanctioning and acceptance of their political sovereignty. The Vaishyas by their trading and the Shudras by their work as laborers, "kept their place" in society, pleasing both their priests and rulers, assuring themselves of their spiritual and their material well-being.

In ancient India there were a variety of occupations but, initially, these had no stigmas attached to them. However, they did anticipate specializations and division of labor that ultimately led to the formation of the caste system. As tribal society started to settle down and develop into a regular agrarian economy, the need to enforce discipline and order among various people of different occupations hardened the social relationships among different groups. Thus, occupations became hereditary and the caste system in its embryonic stage began to take shape. De jure, the Brahmins became the highest caste, but de facto, the Kshatriyas wielded more political power. The Brahmins supported those in power in return for status, patronage, and sustenance. The distinctions between the Vaishyas and the Shudras were not always very clear. The status of the Vaishyas fluctuated, and from time to time many rich Shudras took their place as traders and merchants. The other castes outside these four classical groups also proliferated due to the
assimilation of new tribes and the creation of new occupations in an expanding economy.

The growth of castes and sub-castes, which today number many thousands, had gradually made change in occupational status increasingly difficult. The occupation-bound castes may be likened to guilds of Europe with added restrictions on commensality and endogamy. Each caste group provided goods and services which they and they alone could best provide. O'Malley (1932), quoting Meredith Townsend, writes:

I firmly believe caste to be a marvellous discovery, a form of socialism, which through the ages protected Hindu society from anarchy and from the worst evils of industrial and competitive life – it is an automatic poor-law to begin with and the strongest form of trade union (pp. vii-viii).

Thus, the caste system did have some redeeming features in that it provided a framework within which the social and economic interactions were regulated for the good of society. Most impartial observers, however, will disagree that the caste system provided this framework for economic interactions which redounded to the "good of society." According to them, that "good of society" was only the good of the upper castes, and for many, many simple folk it spelled a lifetime of hard labor only to be terminated by the peace of the grave (Leach, 1969). The caste system was a gigantic mechanism for cold-blooded repression from which the lower castes had no respite or hope of termination.
Conclusion

During the latter part of the 19th century, Hindu reformers denounced the caste system from both political and social points of view. The caste system obstructed the growth of nationalism, because the British skillfully used it to strengthen their grip on India through a policy of divide and rule. It also prevented any concerted political action, because caste feelings were strongly tied to religious traditions which could not easily be shaken. From the social point of view, it perpetuated an hierarchy with its intrinsic denial of the rights of every man and woman to liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The new reformist movement fostered a spirit of service especially among the educated, who challenged the traditions of their ancestors, and did not hesitate to do things which formerly would have been regarded with horror. Referring to one of the bastions of orthodoxy, Poona, where priests and pundits frequently excommunicated men who had been to England, or had married widows, or drunk tea with Englishmen, Ketkar (1911) writes that the "excommunication by the assemblies of priests and pundits has become a joke," because no one takes notice of their fiat outside their own circle.

However, one must make a distinction between the city and the villages. The village community, although exposed to
many modern ideas, has not been modernized like the cities. In rural India, where over 80% of the people still live and work, the situation has not changed very much. To the vast majority of people, the village is their world, and village opinion is far from liberal. In social matters, women would hold on to old ways and cherish family honor, which depends on adherence to the caste system. Quite a few of the men folk go to the cities in search of jobs, and there they throw off the restraints which rural life imposes on them (Singer, 1972). Hence, in the big industrial cities like Bombay and Calcutta, one finds a steady erosion of caste values. The lower castes are steadily endeavoring to enhance their social prestige by abandoning their own customs and adopting those of the higher castes. This process of sanskritization is too slow to bring about any dramatic changes (Srinivas, 1956). If the caste system is to completely disappear, a substantial shift in population from the rural to the city might have to take place.

Before I end this preface, I would like to make two concluding comments. First, although this presentation of the caste system seems to imply that the religious traditions were prior to the social and economic implications of the caste system, the actual chronological ordering was probably exactly the opposite. It seems much more realistic to hold that the social and economic exigencies brought about the...
hierarchical structure, which was later sanctioned and rationalized by Hindu priests and pundits. Second, it must be stated that, in the attempt to clarify and explain the complexity of the caste system, this presentation suffers from the common error of over-simplification. I do not expect this to be a detailed treatise on the caste system, and hence, I would have to be satisfied with this brief, but hopefully adequate, presentation.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The most consequential attitudes are those defining how individuals and groups relate to one another. Whether we are aware of it or not, the past history among us or between us intrudes into the give and take of the moment through our attitudes. The "we" and "they" distinction is basic to our way of thinking (Tajfel, 1967): the "we-ness" gives us a sense of belonging, a feeling that we are wanted and liked; and the "they-ness" separates us from others. The basis for this sense of belonging or liking could be almost anything: same sex, race, language, place of residence, common culture, beliefs or ideology. It makes a great deal of difference whether other persons are described as "my kind of people" or "that other kind of people" (Sherif and Sherif, 1969). Interpersonal relations between those who belong to the "we" group are often close and intimate: there is positive fellow feeling and acceptance. The opposite is true between persons who do not belong to the "we" group: one finds negative attitudes and often rejection.

In India, as in any part of the world, people have been divided and subdivided into smaller and smaller groups.

1
Based on religion, ethnicity, class or caste barriers, these divisions have made it difficult for the country to function effectively as one unit. Moreover, when these divisions emphasize a hierarchical structure — with some groups claiming superiority and higher status — then it strikes at the very roots of all democratic nation-building processes. The caste system as it is found in India, does exactly this: it pigeon-holes people into high and low, great and small.

The traditional understanding of Hindu religion (Tarkateertha Laxmanshastri Joshi, 1978) and even the erroneous interpretation of their scriptural texts (D’Sa, 1980) have supported and stratified functional groups into the rigid hierarchical caste groups. Regardless of the history of the caste system, India can make progress in its democratic ideals only if the equality of all is accepted both in principle and practice. De jure the Indian constitution assures equal status to all its citizens: no one can claim to be better or greater, and all are equal before the law. But de facto, the vested interests of those in power make it difficult to make this assurance a reality. The spectre of religious and caste rivalries often raises its ugly head to destroy efforts at making democracy truly functional. Indians need to feel that they belong to the same "we" group in spite of our diverse religious and ethnic heritage. Since the Hindus form the largest single religious group (82% of
the total population), the hierarchical caste system, which has flourished within Hinduism, is an important factor to be closely studied in the search for a more egalitarian India.

In the search for commonalities, which make for a better society, in which the sense of belonging, liking and acceptance flourish, emphasis on common attitudes/beliefs and group membership seems to be specially important. In India, with all its diversity, efforts must be made to increase common attitudes/beliefs and make people more aware of their common nationality (Hunt and Walker, 1974). The vastness of the Indian sub-continent is a barrier to giving everyone a common group identity, primarily because past history and religious tradition have kept small groups separated from one another. Rather than merely look at what separates and keeps apart, this study will mainly examine some of the factors that attract and unify. Hence, it will explore what leads to attraction, and also look at some of the barriers that keep people apart.

Literature Review

This dissertation is concerned with some of the roots of caste prejudice in India. Prejudice literally means to "pre-judge" a person on the basis of minimal information, i.e., knowledge of the caste to which the target of prejudice belongs. As such, prejudice can be either positive or
negative, that is, liking or disliking a person. In the vocabulary of social psychologists, prejudice can be referred to as the direction and degree of attraction toward a target, a topic that has been studied rather extensively by Byrne and his colleagues.

Similarity is one of the important factors which has been repeatedly researched in an effort to find out what kind of similarities lead to attraction. Considerable research has been done to investigate the relationship between belief similarity and interpersonal attraction. The procedure utilized consisted of presenting a subject with beliefs of a stranger, such that, attitude similarity was manipulated by either increasing or decreasing the number of agreements between the two. First, Byrne (1961) found the mean attraction response to the similar attitude group significantly higher than the mean attraction response to the dissimilar attitude group. Later, Byrne (1962) found support for a linear relationship between the two variables, such that the level of attraction toward a stimulus person with a set of attitudes could be predicted if the subject's own response to these attitude items were known. Still later, the stimulus was identified as a person with a specific proportion of similar attitudes and attraction was measured by the Byrne Interpersonal Judgment Scale (IJS). Byrne (1961) developed the IJS, the last items of which ("Do you feel that you
would probably like this person?" and "Would you like to work with this person on the same job?") were found to be a reliable measure of attraction toward a stranger. This measure of attraction, which yielded a split-half reliability of .85 (Byrne and Nelson, 1965), has been widely used by Byrne and his colleagues. The Byrne and Nelson (1965) study was used as the basis for stating the relationship between attitudinal similarity-dissimilarity and attraction as:

"Attraction toward a stranger is a positive linear function of the proportion of similar attitudes." This "empirical law" was found to hold its ground using a variety of stimulus modes (Byrne and Clore, 1966; McWhirter and Jecker, 1967) and among different types of subjects (Krauss, 1966; Byrne and Griffitt, 1966; Byrne, Young, and Griffitt, 1966). Several other studies support this relationship (Byrne, Nelson and Reeves, 1965; Clore and Baldridge, 1968; Byrne, 1971; Griffitt, 1971; Batchelor and Tesser, 1971).

This well-documented relationship - often called the "Law of Attraction" - is said to begin with a drive to interact with the environment. When faced with an ambiguous situation or issue, individuals will look to others for confirmation of their opinions (Byrne and Nelson, 1965, Festinger, 1954). As Byrne, et al. (1966) suggest, a consensual validation of a person's attitudes, opinions and beliefs is a major source of reward associated with the
drive to be logical, consistent and accurate in interpreting the stimulus world. Stimulus persons who provide proportionately greater rewards in the form of similar beliefs are liked more. Thus, it has been quite consistently established that similar beliefs do indeed help in increasing attraction toward a stranger due to the fact that a stranger with similar beliefs is a source of reward.

Several studies have gone beyond the "Law of Attraction," and have coupled belief similarity with group membership to determine their relative influence on attraction. Byrne and Wong (1962), for instance, compared race with belief similarity to learn which had the greater impact on attraction, and found that belief similarity dominated. This was consistent with Newcomb (1956), who had earlier found that similarity of attitudes accounted for more variance than any other single factor. Rokeach, Smith and Evans (1960), reported results that led to the same conclusion as Newcomb. Basically the prejudiced person does not reject a person of another race, religion or nationality because of his ethnic membership per se but rather because he perceives the other as being different from himself in important beliefs and values. Thus, low ratings of attraction toward another race may be due to the assumption that one's beliefs will be different from those of members belonging to this race (Stein, Hardyck and Smith, 1965).
Triandis and Davis (1965), however, found that race did have an impact on attraction, when behaviors used to measure attraction were more demanding in terms of intimacy than those employed by Byrne. Byrne (1961) had utilized liking and working with a stimulus person as an operational definition of attraction. Triandis (1964) included acceptance into the neighborhood, acceptance as a close kin in marriage, and acceptance for dating as typical intimate behaviors. Although the behaviors utilized by both are along a common dimension of friendship and openness, the two items used by Byrne are not as intimate or close to home as the behaviors used by Triandis. One could like someone in general, but that one would also want to develop and maintain a close intimate friendship with everybody one likes is not necessary implied in the idea of liking. Norms of behavior are more clearly specified in the direction of rejecting persons who are racially different when it comes to intimate behaviors.

Triandis and Davis (1965) and Insko and Robinson (1967), in a series of cross-cultural replications, found belief similarity to be the significant determinant of attraction in North India, Mexico and Japan. Triandis and Davis (1965) found occupation in Germany, and race and occupation in Japan to be significant determinants of attraction. Bergeron and Zanna (1973) found that group membership accounted
for a significant amount of the variance in interpersonal attraction in Peru. Bergeron and Zanna also found strong group norms in their study. Banfield (1958) and Pye (1968) explain how families and social groups in pre-industrial societies have explicit norms that are very well defined across attitudes and behaviors. All behaviors take place in a web of social relations in which expectations are clearly stated so as to serve as reliable guides (Simon, 1965).

Many of the above studies which compared belief similarity and group memberships did not yield consistent results about the strength of one over the other. Hence, one conclusion that can be drawn from studies done in the past is that both belief and race affect attraction and that the abstract question of the relative power of the two variables is contingent on the way attraction is operationalized or the situational differences specific to each study.

Despite the extensive research on belief and group membership similarity using the Byrne paradigm, no study examining belief and caste similarity effects on attraction has been done in India. While most studies have examined "race" as a valid operationalization of group membership, in India, "caste" membership seems to be the logical choice. Although race and caste may be somewhat analogous (Berraman, 1960), the effect of caste on attraction may not be the same as that of race. The specific and different situational con-
texts must be taken into account. As Byrne (1966) himself pointed out:

It seems that the relative influence of belief and race is a function of the specific operations used in defining race and belief, and the specific way in which the dependent variable is measured, and the specific population from which the subjects are drawn (p. 65).

The caste system with its long and rigid history has a completely different context than race, because it is not only embedded in a very strong religious tradition, but also subscribes to an inherent inequality among the various castes. Hence, the exploration of caste together with belief similarity is all the more exciting. Moreover, it also affords new avenues to explore the existence of caste prejudice, its strength and factors associated with it.

As suggested above, the Byrne IJS is not the only way in which attraction has been measured. Attraction or liking has also been examined in terms of willingness to engage in a variety of behaviors with other racial or ethnic groups. Park (1924) found that status and role expectation influenced the kind of behaviors engaged in by persons of different ethnic groups. Bogardus (1925) developed a scale of seven behaviors ranging from the most intimate to the very public to examine the social distance that various ethnic groups maintain between themselves. Mahar (1958) also examined similar social distance behaviors among different caste groups, assuming that they maintained these distances on
religious grounds. Vaughan (1962) studied social distance attitudes of New Zealand students towards Maoris and 15 other national groups. Triandis and Triandis (1960, 1962) studied social distance between Greek and American students in a study which was later extended by Triandis, Davis and Takezawa (1965) to German and Japanese students as well. They concluded that subjects would or would not undertake particular behaviors owing to insecurity they felt toward others not like themselves. In another study, Triandis (1964) utilized items similar to the Bogardus Social Distance Scale and added several other behaviors ranging from formal social acceptance to close intimate friendship and marriage to demonstrate the multi-dimensionality of social distance measures. Stein, et al. (1965) examined several other behaviors that would be applicable within a school context. Sherif (1966) in his robbers cave study found the type of behaviors engaged in by young campers was a function of their group membership and the group membership of the stimulus person. The above studies basically point to: (a) a continuum of behaviors ranging from the very public and formal to the private and intimate, and (b) that group membership is a critical factor in the type of behaviors one is willing to engage in with some stimulus person.

In summary, the literature reviewed here shows that the degree of liking or disliking depends on many factors, par-
particularly similarity of beliefs and group membership, and that this degree of attraction is manifested differently according to the way it is measured in terms of some dimension of distance/intimacy. The following section explains how these conclusions pertain to the present study on attraction in the Indian context.

**Main Goals of the Study**

This study was aimed at examining the effects of belief and caste similarity on interpersonal attraction. Attraction was operationalized both by the Byrne IJS and by social distance (SD) ratings, and studied in the Indian context by using the Byrne paradigm. Thus this study was carried out by asking subjects of various castes to indicate their degree of attraction toward a stranger described to them as belonging to a certain caste and holding certain beliefs. Since some belief dimensions are relevant to caste, they are likely to be confounded with the caste of the subjects participating in the study. Therefore, the belief factor was broken down into two sub-factors: beliefs relevant to caste and more general beliefs, each taking on two different levels. This was intended to help the experimenter to look at the relative effects of both kinds of belief similarity.

Subjects in this study belonged to one of three castes as did the stranger whom they judged. The inclusion of the
three castes chosen for this study was considered necessary because, besides looking at one of the highest castes (Brahmins) and one of the lowest castes (Mahars), the inclusion of a fairly numerous and politically powerful caste (Marathas) would make the study more interesting. The Brahmins are the highest of the three castes in social status and belong to the priestly class. They have dominated the field of learning for several centuries. The Marathas are also a relatively high caste, but lower than the Brahmins in their hierarchical status. They have been the warrior class and presently dominate the political scene. The Mahars, who had been ostracized from the caste system, are the "outcastes" and currently hold the lowest status of the three castes. Moreover, each of these three castes are found in relatively high numbers (10%, 50%, and 8%, respectively) in and around Poona, India, which has been one of the strongholds of the Hindu casteist tradition (Ketkar, 1911).

Another goal was to examine the city-rural differences with regard to interpersonal attraction and social distance ratings. The inclusion of the city and rural groups was considered important because the rural Sitz im Leben, as opposed to that of the city, not only has a very rigid caste structure which is not easily open to outside influences (Srinivas, 1962), but also tends to keep its people more prejudiced than the urban (Simon, 1965). The impact of edu-
cation, science, industry, mechanization and mass media have not made any noticeable in-roads into the caste system in the rural areas. Both Srinivas and Simon, in speaking about rural environments, have emphasized the strong ingroup-outgroup mentality, close kinship ties, and the ways in which these factors distort the ability of rural people to learn about or associate with those outside their social group. This ingroup mentality often excludes open dialogue with the modern literate world and prevents people from taking any steps toward a more egalitarian and democratic way of life.

The city-rural differences might be summarized by saying that the former are more "modern" than the latter. Modernity has been examined by several authors (Doob, 1967; Guthrie, 1970; Kahl, 1968; Smith and Inkeles, 1966), who have developed scales to measure this phenomenon. These scales have been tested in several developing countries: Doob's scale in Africa, Guthrie's in the Philippines, Kahl's in Brazil and Mexico, and Smith and Inkeles' in Argentina, Bangladesh, Chile, India, Israel, and Nigeria.

The problems with developing a good modernity scale revolve around how to understand modernity. According to Amer and Schnaiberg (1978), Berry (1980), and Jones (1977), tradition-modernity is not a unidimensional concept as assumed by Smith and Inkeles (1966). Godwin (1974, 1976) would like to include personality variables, assuming at the
same time, that there are multiple individual modernities. Delacroix and Ragin (1978) would much prefer to include modernizing institutions and economic development of the people in their idea of modernity, while Smith and Inkeles (1966) would rather measure the individual's attitudes toward modernity. Of all these scales, the Overall Modernity Scale (Smith and Inkeles, 1966; Inkeles and Smith 1974; Inkeles, 1977) is one of the simplest and has been abbreviated after several tests in developing countries. More than the simplicity and brevity, the advantage it has over other scales is that it has been tested and validated in India (Inkeles, 1973; Inkeles, 1977; Smith and Inkeles, 1974). Hence, the Overall Modernity Scale (OM-12) was selected to examine city-rural differences in the present research.

Another way of approaching the problem of tradition and modernity was to measure how much the subjects endorse and support the caste system as an index of their adherence to traditional values (Dumont, 1970; Simon, 1965; Srinivas, 1965). Since some caste-related beliefs included in this study were indicators of the degree of accepting caste-endorsing beliefs, this measure (called casteism) would also be indicative of the extent to which participants were modernized. Casteism, founded on and maintained by the religious tradition of Hinduism, was expected to covary with religious "orthodoxy." Hence, together with casteism, the
religious beliefs of the subjects were considered an important factor which would influence attraction. Therefore, a scale to measure the religious beliefs of the subjects was also included in the study. Since Delacroix and Ragin (1978) held economic development as one of the final goals of modernization, the socio-economic status of the persons was also measured as an indirect way of getting to know how modernized they were.

The three measures of modernity, casteism, and the socio-economic status of the subjects were used as covariates to tease out any variance which may be due to them. If after controlling for the effects of these covariates, one still found sizable effects of the main factors, i.e., belief similarity, caste of subject, caste of the stranger, and the city-rural dimension, then this would indicate the presence of strong cause-effect relationships between these factors and the measure of attraction. Unfortunately, the religious beliefs scale could not be included as a fourth covariate, since it was administered only after the interviewing for the study had already begun.

The Byrne IJS was utilized as one of the dependent measures, since two of the items from it have been widely used indicators of interpersonal attraction between individuals. In addition to the Byrne IJS, attraction was also studied in terms of willingness to engage in various behaviors indica-
tive of openness to other caste groups. First, the Bogardus Social Distance Scale was utilized because the behaviors included in it were not only relevant to the caste system, but also dealt with both public and intimate behaviors. Moreover, Dumont (1970), Kolenda (1978) and Mahar (1958) have consistently made references to the social distance kept between various caste groups, and have suggested that this is not due merely to social barriers, but rather due to deep religious convictions. Traditional Hindu religion aims at preventing the ritual pollution of its higher castes by less "holy" matter (including of course, other caste groups). Second, Mahar (1958) developed a thirteen item pollution scale which was also used as an alternative way of measuring social distance. This scale—especially prepared by Mahar to study relationships in a caste-ridden North India—combined with the Bogardus Social Distance Scale was expected to provide a more thorough way to study interpersonal distance. Hence, the aims of this study were to examine how attraction, as measured by the Byrne IJS and the SD ratings, was influenced by: (a) belief similarity (general and caste-related belief similarity), (b) caste of the participants and caste of the stranger (yielding similarity or dissimilarity), and (c) the city-rural dimension. The effect of the above mentioned factors on attraction was examined with and without the presence of the covariates of modernity, casteism and socio-economic status. Given the
foregoing reviews of past findings, and the goals and variables involved in this study, the following hypotheses are proposed.

Main Hypotheses

First, according to Byrne's "Law of Attraction," attraction as measured by the last two items of the Byrne's IJS is a positive linear function of the proportion of beliefs purportedly held by the stimulus person that are similar to those of the subject. The several studies done by Byrne and his colleagues, and several other authors, all show that belief similarity influences attraction.

Second, caste similarity, like belief similarity, also influences interpersonal attraction. Several studies have shown group membership to be more important than belief similarity, while other studies have shown belief similarity to be more important. In keeping with the Byrne's findings belief similarity is expected to exert a generally greater influence on attraction than caste similarity.

Third, in the rural areas, however, caste similarity is expected to have a greater impact on attraction than belief similarity. This is because the rural context with its relative lack of exposure to modernization and modern ideas will still be under the influence of traditional structures and ways of thinking.
Fourth, caste similarity is expected to be more important for intimate behaviors than for public behaviors. The research done by Triandis and his colleagues lends ample support to this expectation. Hence, one will find a lower level of openness to members of "other" stimulus castes, especially on the question of intimate behaviors.

Fifth, in rural areas, caste belief similarity is expected to be more important than general belief similarity in influencing attraction and social distance (SD) ratings; but in urban areas, caste belief similarity and general belief similarity are expected to be equally important. This again ties in with the third hypothesis which predicted caste similarity to be more important than belief similarity. Here for the same reasons mentioned above, of the two kinds of beliefs one would expect caste belief similarity to be more important than general belief similarity in the rural areas. In the urban areas, however, rather than finding both to be equally important, one may find that caste belief similarity is more important for intimate behaviors, while general belief similarity is more important for public behaviors.

Sixth, the rural sample is expected to be more traditional in holding to the caste system and "orthodox" religious beliefs; it is also expected to be less modern and more prejudiced in terms of the SD ratings.
Related Goals and Hypothesis

Since this study deals primarily with factors influencing attraction and touches on different levels of prejudice, and consequently utilizes various measures of attitudes between the caste groups, it was considered convenient to examine some issues related to the principal goals of this study. Some of the related issues examined here were: (a) attitude-behavior consistency, (b) the contact theory of prejudice reduction, and (c) the nature of attributions consequent to "blameworthy" or "praiseworthy" behavior.

First, many studies point to a lack of consistency in the attitude-behavior relationship. Wicker's (1969, 1971) review of literature relating to attitude-behavior consistency found that attitudes are often only slightly related to overt behaviors. According to Wicker, little evidence was found to support the postulated existence of stable, underlying attitudes within the individual which influence both his verbal expressions and his actions. Kelman (1974) on the other hand, points out that there is evidence (mainly through survey studies) to demonstrate the existence of a strong relationship between attitudes and behavior. Thus, there is conflicting evidence for and against the existence of this relationship. According to Ajzen and Fishbein, (1977, 1980), there are many reasons for this lack of consistency in the findings. One important reason is the lack
of correspondence of attitudes with behavioral measurements. Studies have also dealt with different kinds of attitudes, overt behaviors, methodology and subjects. Hence, it is not quite reasonable to expect a consistent pattern in the attitude-behavior relationship from all these studies.

To examine the attitude-behavior relationship in the Indian context, self-report measures of actual contact (AC) were taken and correlated with interpersonal attraction and SD ratings. Thus, if the above researched attitude-behavior consistency were supported, one would expect the reported measure of AC to covary with the degree of interpersonal attraction and SD ratings.

Second, this study also investigated the conditions of self-reported AC to learn if these conditions covaried with self-reported AC and with interpersonal attraction. Amir (1969) in a review of the literature on the contact hypothesis, found that contact did help to reduce prejudice and increase acceptance, but only under certain conditions. However, these conditions such as superordinate goals (Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood and Sherif, 1961; Sherif, 1966), equal status (Mann, 1959; Yarrow, Campbell and Yarrow, 1958), proximity (Hamilton and Bishop, 1976; Segal, 1974; Wilner, Walkley and Cook, 1955) prolonged intimate acquaintance (Saenger, 1953), and positive feelings associated with outgroup contact (Clore, Bray, Itkin and Murphy,
1978) are not so easily found in real life situations. These conditions are also very difficult to maintain over a long period of time. Since this study dealt with caste groups strongly imbued with an ingroup/outgroup mentality, it was considered worthwhile to focus on both the degree of contact and the conditions under which it actually took place. This focus will also be useful in order to find ways of establishing the optimum conditions for increasing acceptance among the various stimulus castes. Measures of self-reported AC were taken to give the experimenter an indication of the degree of contact the subjects thought they maintained with the stimulus caste. The subjects were also presented with the different conditions of AC, and were asked to recollect and report to what extent these conditions were present in the situations where self-reported AC occurred. In the context of this study, conditions of reported AC are expected to covary with self-reported AC and interpersonal attraction.

Finally, this study also explored the kind of attributions made by subjects regarding their attraction scores on the SD ratings. Man, being the intuitive psychologist that he is, likes to infer the causes of his behavior (Heider, 1958). Several new approaches have been developed (Jones and Davis, 1965; Jones, Kanouse, Kelley, Nisbett, Valins and Weiner, 1971; Jones and Nisbett, 1971; Kelley, 1967; and
Weiner, 1974), since Heider first brought attribution theory to light. One such development deals with the nature of attributions made by actors and observers (Jones and Nisbett, 1971). The latter have tried to show that actors' and observers' perceptions lead them to divergent causes of behavior:

There is a pervasive tendency for actors to attribute the same actions to situational requirements, whereas observers tend to attribute the same actions to stable personal dispositions (p. 80).

This tendency stems from the actor's need to justify blameworthy action, or it may reflect the need to maintain self-esteem. When the actor behaves in a socially desirable way he takes credit for his "good" actions; and when he acts in an undesirable way he tends to escape responsibility for his "blameworthy" behavior by making situational attributions. Actors normally defend their "ego" by attributing "failure" (blameworthy behavior) to external situations, and boost their "ego" by attributing "success" (praiseworthy behavior) to their own internal traits (Jones and Davis, 1965; Kelley, 1967). Subjects who accept the hierarchical caste system were expected to consider their behavior as socially undesirable, and consequently "blameworthy." On the other hand, those who rejected the caste system would consider their actions as "praiseworthy," because it would imply their acceptance of the equality of all, irrespective of caste membership. Hence, it was predicted that those more open on
the SD ratings would make internal attributions about greater openness, while those who are less open would make external attributions about their lack of openness. The subjects' perceptions about the social desirability of their Byrne IJS and SD ratings were examined by asking them: (a) whether society would approve of their responses (social desirability), and (b) if an "average" person from their caste would feel threatened (normative threat) by the questions in this study (Bradburn, Sudman, Blair and Stocking, 1978). These questions were expected to help the experimenter identify what was considered socially desirable or undesirable by the subjects. This was utilized to analyse the attributions made by subjects. In addition, it was felt that some information about these attributions will be useful to attempt change in attitude or behavior.

In summary, this study will utilize the Byrne paradigm of presenting subjects with stimuli "low" or "high" in belief similarity, and either "same" or "other" group membership, and examine: (a) attraction as measured by the last two items of the Byrne IJS, and (b) the level of openness to various stimulus castes as measured by the Bogardus Social Distance Scale and the Mahar Ritual Pollution Scale. These dependent variables will be studied for the three caste groups: Brahmins, Marathas, and Mahars in both rural and urban settings.
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Overview

The main study consisted of having subjects from three different castes (Brahmin, Maratha, and Mahar) fill out a questionnaire. The first part of this questionnaire, prepared from a pilot study, consisted of a belief scale with two sets of beliefs: general beliefs and caste beliefs. On the basis of their responses to this belief scale, a similar scale purportedly filled out by another person was prepared in such a way that the subject and the "hypothetical stranger" were: (a) similar to each other on both sets of beliefs, or (b) similar on general beliefs and dissimilar on the caste beliefs, or (c) dissimilar on general beliefs and similar on caste beliefs, or (d) dissimilar on both sets of beliefs. This hypothetical stranger was described as a member of one of the three subject castes, and thus was also similar or dissimilar in that respect. After reviewing the beliefs and caste of the hypothetical stranger, the subjects rated their reactions to the stimulus to register their degree of liking and willingness to interact with the hypothetical person in a whole array of varied behaviors. This
Byrne paradigm was utilized to examine the influence of belief (general and caste) similarity and caste similarity in leading to interpersonal attraction for subjects from both rural and urban areas. The rural and urban experiments of this study each employed a 2x2x3x3 factorial design with two levels of general belief similarity, two levels of caste belief similarity, three levels of subject caste and three levels of stimulus caste. Questions on other related aspects responded to by the subjects were: (a) nature of attributions, (b) normative threat, (c) self-reported actual contact (AC), (d) conditions of self-reported AC (e) OM-12 (Overall Modernity Scale), and (f) manipulation checks.

Subjects

First, 199 volunteers were asked to fill out a pilot study questionnaire (Appendix A), in order to obtain mean ratings of controversiality and relevance to Indian context of the belief statements to be utilized in the study. The three subject castes included in this study had at least 30 subjects each from the rural and urban areas.

Second, 432 subjects were interviewed for the main study. They were volunteers solicited through: (a) contacts of personal friends or gate-keepers, and (b) special meetings arranged for the explicit purpose of explaining this study. Some doubts about the proper manipulations led to dropping
69 subjects, who were subsequently replaced. One-half of the subjects were from the rural areas, while the other one-half were from the city of Poona, India. Each subgroup contained 72 subjects of either sex from each of the following three castes: Brahmins, Marathas, and Mahars. All subjects were asked to respond to a questionnaire (Appendix B) using the interview method. The interview method was selected because many of the subjects from the rural areas were not able to read or write.

Finally, 702 subjects were asked to fill out a religious beliefs scale, which was prepared from a content analysis of responses to the pilot study questionnaire. These subjects were also volunteers. Almost 90% of the 432 subjects utilized in the principal study formed part of this sample.

Materials

Prescaling Questionnaire

First, from a careful review of the various opinion scales in Robinson and Shaver (1973) and personal consultation with some experts in sociology, fifty belief statements were selected (Appendix A, I A.), and translated into the local vernacular (Marathi). These statements were to be rated by the first group of 199 subjects for both their controversiality and relevance to Indian society. They were also asked to circle those belief statements which according
to them were relevant to caste (Appendix A, I B.). Second, the Bogardus Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1925) was combined with Mahar's Ritual Pollution Scale (Mahar, 1958) and prescaled by the same set of 199 judges representing all the three subject castes (Appendix A, II.). A new item about "allowing a stimulus caste person to be one's boss" was included in the scale for its topical applicability to the Indian context. The mean ratings of the items were to serve as weights for scoring the SD ratings filled out by the subjects in the study. Thus, the questionnaire contained not only the belief statements which were to be used in the manipulation of belief similarity in the main study, but also the Bogardus Social Distance Scale combined with the Mahar Ritual Pollution Scale, the latter being shortened and standardized for the Indian context. Last of all, the prescaling questionnaire contained a set of demographic questions combined with three open-ended questions about: (a) Hindu religious beliefs, (b) reasons for the existence of the caste system, and (c) reasons for doing away with the caste system (Appendix A, III.). The responses to (a) were content analysed to prepare the religious beliefs scale.

**Final Questionnaire**

The final questionnaire which was administered to 432 subjects, contained several different scales and subscales. First, on the basis of the ratings given by the pilot study
subjects, twenty of the most controversial statements were chosen: ten relevant to caste, and ten of a more general nature (Appendix B, I.). This set of belief statements was utilized to obtain the subjects' own ratings, which were later used to manipulate belief similarity of the stimulus person. Second, some demographic questions relevant to the study were included (Appendix B, II.).

Third, the above set of beliefs were presented again with the necessary variations for each of the belief similarity and caste similarity conditions (Appendix B, III.). Then, the Byrne Interpersonal Judgment Scale (Byrne IJS) was utilized, since two of those items have been extensively used as a measure of interpersonal attraction (Appendix B, III A.). The next section of the questionnaire consisted of the combined SD scale (Bogardus, 1925; Mahar, 1958) which was modified according to the ratings of the pilot study subjects. After the prescaling, some of the items (items 7, 18, 19 and 20 from Appendix A, II.) from the combined SD scale were dropped, since they were either not relevant to the Indian context or were too repugnant from the point of view of personal hygiene. Furthermore, a small set of questions (Appendix B, III C.) was included to investigate the nature of the attributions made by the subjects for the type of choices they made in III A and III B of the questionnaire. Toward the end of this section, the subjects were
also presented with two questions (Appendix B, III D), which assessed: (a) the normative threat these questions posed to the average person of the subject's caste (Bradburn, et al., 1978), and (b) the social approval the subject's responses would get from his own caste group. The responses to these items were utilized to estimate the degree of bias due to social desirability. This was intended to assist not only in determining whether the person considered his responses "blameworthy" but also in relating them to the nature of attributions made by the subject.

The fourth part of the questionnaire was a seven-item scale to estimate the degree of actual contact the subject has had with a person of the stimulus caste (Appendix B, IV A). These items covered a few normal behaviors which one would expect to take place in rural or city settings. The likelihood of these behaviors in an urban setting was intended to be equal if not higher than in the rural. Together with this measure of Actual Contact (AC), some of the conditions under which these actual contacts took place were also explored (Appendix C, IV B).

Fifth, in order to examine whether the rural and urban populations are really different, the OM-12 (Inkeles, 1977; Smith and Inkeles, 1974), which is the abbreviated and modified form of the Overall Modernity Scale, was utilized (Appendix B, V.). Although not all authors agree as to its
value as a measure of modernization (Kahl, 1968; Jones, 1977), this scale even in its abbreviated form had been validated across six developing countries. The OM-12 served as a manipulation check to determine whether the urban and rural groups were in fact different from one another, as assumed for the purposes of this study.

Last of all, manipulation checks were included immediately after the SD ratings to find out if the subjects had really noticed: (a) the degree of belief similarity along the caste-relevant and the more general belief dimensions, and (b) the caste of the stimulus person (Appendix B, VI.). At the end of the questionnaire two items were included to gauge the truthfulness and degree of fear or nervousness of the subject. These questions were filled out by the interviewer after the completion of each interview (See end of Appendix B).

Religious Beliefs Scale

Based on question III 6 from the prescaling questionnaire, a content analysis was conducted, and the most frequently mentioned ideas were put together to produce a religious beliefs scale (Appendix C). If one were to ask some experts in Hinduism, they would probably suggest another set of beliefs which are vital to the religious thought and practice of the Hindus. Although the beliefs
actually utilized in this scale may not form the core of Hindu religious beliefs according to the Priests and Pundits of Hinduism, they did come from the 702 subjects, among whom were about 90% of those who took part in the principal study, and therefore definitely represent their perceptions of Hindu beliefs. This scale was used to examine the subjects' religious "orthodoxy," and was used as an indicator of the traditional mentality prevalent in the city/rural area, or among the various subject groups.

**Procedure**

**Pilot Study**

The pilot study consisted of administering the prescaling questionnaire to a minimum of 30 subjects from each of the three caste groups, both in the urban and rural areas. The first task was to get the prescaling questionnaire translated into the vernacular Marathi. Three independent translations were made by three different Marathi scholars, and the simplest version of each item was used to make it comprehensible to the rural subjects. Translations of item 9 seemed ambiguous, hence two versions of that item were included in the pilot study. The questionnaire was professionally typed and mimeographed. Getting the prescaling questionnaire translated, mimeographed, and administered took about three months.
There were five different hired interviewers. They were carefully selected for their known honesty and hard work. Two of the five interviewers were unwilling to approach subjects from the Mahar caste, and so interviewed only Brahmins and Marathas. Two of the interviewers were graduate students from Poona University, and although reliable, were slow in getting the questionnaires filled out. The last interviewer was a school teacher from a rural area who was most effective in getting the prescaling questionnaire filled out by all three subject castes, because of the respect and acceptance he had as a teacher. They were orally instructed: (a) to keep to the format of the questionnaire, (b) to be polite yet persuasive, and (c) never to create opinions if none existed. The interviewers were paid 6 Rupees per completed questionnaire, and were asked to get volunteers belonging to each of the three subject castes from both urban and rural areas. Initially, the interviewers were free to get as many people as they could from each subject caste, but after a couple of weeks, they were directed to look for subjects of a specific caste either from the rural or urban area.

The question of paying the interviewees was discussed with several others, especially those involved in education and research. Almost everyone advised against it, for they felt that subjects should donate their time to a student who
is pursuing his educational objectives. Those involved in doing educational research were not in favor of setting a precedent by paying subjects and making it more difficult for other research scholars. Hence, no monies were paid to any of the interviewees.

After the pilot study questionnaires were collected, the means and standard deviations were calculated for both the degree of controversiality and the relevance to Indian context of each of the belief statements. Those belief statements judged to be caste relevant by the subjects were also noted. With this information, 20 of the most controversial beliefs were chosen: 10 relevant to caste, and 10 of a more general nature. Any belief similar to one which had already been chosen was replaced by the next most controversial belief. Similarly, when two beliefs were rated to be more or less equally controversial, the more relevant of the two was selected.

It was hoped that this prescaling would help to pin-point the cultural variation due to the local context in the Bogardus Social Distance Scale and the Mahar Ritual Pollution Scale. However, the items (except for marriage) were not rated significantly different from each other by the pilot judges of the three subject castes. Hence, the yes response was coded as 1, and the sum of the yeses on the various items was used as an indicator of "openness" to the
stimulus caste person. Thus, although the combined SD ratings were collected, the means of these ratings were not utilized in the analysis. The collection of this information was useful in eliminating some of the items which were either not relevant to the Indian context or were not responded to by the subjects for reasons of hygiene. The items excluded after this stage were 7, 18, 19 and 20 (Appendix A, II.).

Unfortunately, the content analysis of the question related to Hindu beliefs required more time than was initially expected, and hence, the final questionnaire was prepared without the religious beliefs scale. This is why the religious beliefs scale was administered after the interviewing for the principal study had already begun.

Main Study

The main study consisted of administering the final questionnaire to 72 subjects from each of the three subject castes, in both rural and urban areas. A total of 432 subjects were interviewed: 216 from the rural and 216 from the urban area. The interviews were conducted by only two interviewers: the experimenter and one of the graduate students, who was not only quite reliable, but also very enthusiastic about helping in the study. Since the graduate student was unable to go to the rural areas because of the
limitations his student life implied, the experimenter did all the rural interviews, and the urban interviews were left to the graduate student. The graduate student was paid 10 Rupees for every completed interview and was paid all travel expenses.

The final questionnaire was prepared based on the information collected in the prescaling questionnaire. Several parts of the questionnaire had already been translated before. The rest was translated by one of the three earlier translators, who had the ability to make the translation as simple as possible for the rural population. The final questionnaire was then typed and mimeographed for use. A total of 700 copies were prepared - many more than the required 432 - to compensate for copies lost due to incomplete questionnaires and rejected subjects.

a) Pilot Tests

Although efforts were made to make the vernacular version as simple as possible, nineteen of the first rural interviews were used as pilot-tests to examine how well the subjects understood the questionnaire and whether the manipulations did take place as planned. This was done because it was hypothesized that if the rural subjects found the questionnaire intelligible, a fortiori, it would also be understood by the urban subjects. The rural subjects did find it
easy to understand, and the manipulations were 100 percent effective. In order to keep the flow of the interview uninterrupted, the manipulation checks were moved to the end of the questionnaire. However, special effort had to be made to make the manipulations more salient, since the subjects sometimes missed identifying the stimulus caste, and often misreported general or caste belief similarity. Hence the interviewers were asked to remind the subjects again and again about both the caste of the stimulus person as well as the degree of belief similarity between them and the stimulus person.

The pilot testing also indicated that subjects were reluctant to respond to a "real" person, either because they did not want to evaluate others negatively, or because they were afraid that the persons they evaluated may be too close for comfort. This difficulty was found to be greater among the rural subjects than among the city subjects. Hence, the subjects were subsequently asked to evaluate an "imaginary person" so as to relieve them of any feeling of guilt or responsibility for being negative in their evaluations of the stimulus person.

Since some of the rural subjects would find it difficult to understand the rating scales, it had been decided to explain agreement and disagreement using the familiar monetary units. This was possible because the local vernacular
idiom lends itself to speaking of agreement and disagreement as fractions of the Indian Rupee. Thus a value of "0" on the rating scale was used to indicate no agreement, and a value of "5" to indicate complete agreement. It was also considered important to keep this "0" to "5" rating method for most of the questionnaire.

These 19 interviews also served as training for the experimenter, while six of the first urban interviews were used as training sessions for the graduate student. At the end of this session the graduate student interviewed the experimenter himself to demonstrate his skills.

b) Finding Subjects

A total of 17 different villages from a rural area approximately two hours drive from Poona city were visited and volunteers were interviewed until the required number of rural subjects were reached. The experimenter made several visits to these villages, often living there for three to four days, explaining the purpose of the study and persuading them to agree to be interviewed. Only those villages where all three subject castes under study lived, were selected. As far as possible, efforts were made to meet the Sarpanch (the village headman), and live in the office of the Sarpanch rather than in somebody's house. Living in the house of any specific caste person made the other caste per-
sons wary and unwilling to be interviewed. However, when for the lack of adequate facilities it was not possible to live in the office of the Sarpanch, care was taken to interview as far as possible only those who belonged to the caste of the host. Toward the end this latter technique was found to be most effective in getting both ready subjects and unbiased information. Initially it was difficult to get the rural interviewees, since most of the village folk were involved in looking after and harvesting their crops and were available only before 9 a.m. and after 5 p.m. But as the harvest season came to an end, it was relatively easy to get them.

The urban subjects were also volunteers contacted through some friends and acquaintances. The urban contacts did not prove as productive as the rural ones, primarily because most of the urban subjects were employed and not so easily available to be interviewed. Often they would readily agree to be interviewed, and later find that some family or other business would prevent them from keeping their appointments. Because of this, the graduate student was almost despairing of getting the required subjects. The experimenter had to make a couple of visits to an English medium high school; the good offices of the Principal of the school were instrumental in getting the graduate student to meet students, whose parents were requested to volunteer as subjects and
help to complete the study.

Of the 432 subjects who were interviewed for this study, a total of 69 cases were eliminated either because the manipulations did not work or because the responses were incomplete and did not contain some of the critical data. New interviews were conducted to make up for subject mortality. The main part of this study took approximately eight months until all the subjects were interviewed, two months more than anticipated, because of the delay in interviewing urban subjects.

c) Interview

The interview was conducted in the following way. The set of twenty belief statements was read to the subject for his/her ratings. As mentioned earlier, 10 of these statements were general beliefs and 10 were caste-relevant beliefs. The caste-relevant beliefs were chosen on the basis of the ratings given by subjects in the prescaling stage. These two sets of belief statements were presented in two different orders "A" and "B": the first sequence of the 10 beliefs within each group was called order "A"; and this was reverse ordered to create order "B." Moreover, for one-half of the subjects, the general beliefs were followed by the caste-relevant beliefs and for the other one-half the caste-relevant beliefs were followed by the general beliefs.
The subjects were randomly assigned to receive the questionnaire in one of the four possible orders. After the subject's ratings were collected, he/she was asked to provide some demographic data relevant to the study.

Immediately after this, a questionnaire was filled out as if by a "hypothetical" subject whose belief similarity (both general and caste-related) varied in one of four ways: (i) general beliefs were 80% similar and caste beliefs were 80% similar, (ii) general beliefs were 20% similar and caste beliefs were 80% similar, (iii) general beliefs were 80% similar and caste beliefs were 20% similar, and (iv) general beliefs were 20% similar and caste beliefs were 20% similar (Illustration 1). Thus, both general belief similarity (GBS) and caste belief similarity (CBS) were manipulated with "low" and "high" levels of similarity for each factor. This manipulation was considered important not only to look into the effect of Overall belief similarity, but also to examine the relative strength of general vs. caste belief similarity. The caste of these "hypothetical" subjects was also manipulated by entering one of the three stimulus castes above the belief ratings. Each subject rated only one other person and within each subject group, 24 stimulus persons of each caste were rated. The beliefs of the stimulus caste person were read out to the subject, after which the subject was interviewed on the relevant dependent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Belief Similarity</th>
<th>Low (Agreement on only 2 items)</th>
<th>High (Agreement on 8 items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Agreement on only 2 items)</td>
<td>20% Similarity</td>
<td>50% Similarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Agreement on 8 items)</td>
<td>50% Similarity</td>
<td>80% Similarity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ILLUSTRATION 1: A 2x2 Design for the Manipulation of Belief Similarity. Each Cell contains Total Number and Percentage of Belief Statements on which Subject and Stimulus are Similar.
measures. The manipulation checks were recorded at the end of every interview.

Thus, the independent variables were: (a) location (City-rural), (b) belief similarity along a general (unrelated to caste) dimension, (c) belief similarity along a caste relevant dimension, (d) subject caste, and (e) stimulus caste. The dependent measures were: (a) a modified Byrne IJS, (b) the combined SD scale, (c) attributions, and (d) measure of actual contact with persons from the stimulus caste. The covariates included in the study were: (a) the OM-12, (b) casteism scale, and (c) socio-economic status.

Religious Beliefs Study

The religious beliefs scale consisted of 10 items prepared after the content analysis was completed on the prescaling questionnaire. Since the preparation of this scale took place only after the interviewing had already begun, about 10% of the subjects from the main study did not fill it out. In order to make up for this loss of subjects, two undergraduate students were employed to distribute the scale and have it filled out by persons of the three subject castes. Since these students were unaware of the number of the main study subjects who had filled out this scale, they managed to get as many subjects as they could. The students were also paid some remuneration for every completed ques-
tionnaire. As a result, each caste group had more than 200 subjects with at least 100 from the rural or city areas. The total number of subjects in this "post-study" questionnaire was 702, including 90% of the 432 subjects from the main study.
CHAPTER III

PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

Since this study utilized several different scales and subscales, it was considered appropriate to first report how the scales were constructed and what their reliabilities were, before proceeding with the analysis proper. All the variables of interest in this study are grouped into four subsections: (a) independent variables, (b) dependent variables, (c) covariates, and (d) other scales.

Independent Variables

The interviews were conducted in the urban and rural areas with the city-rural dimension serving as one factor. The two principal independent variables which were manipulated for the purpose of this study were: (a) belief similarity, and (b) caste similarity.

City-rural Dimension

A total of 216 subjects were interviewed from both the rural and urban samples. The rural sample was chosen from 17 different villages near Poona, while the city interviewees were all from within the city of Poona and its adjacent
suburbs. The city-rural difference is not merely geographic or demographic, but carries with it many psychological differences, e.g., modernity. The discriminant analysis on the OM-12 showed that the city and rural populations were indeed different. The discriminant function yielded a Wilks lambda (df = 11) = .544 (p < .001). With the aid of this discriminant function one could predict accurately in 83.10% of the cases whether a person belonged to the city or rural sample. Only one of the OM-12 items (i.e., item 9: "Do you think that the progress made by science in industry and medicine has been beneficial to society?") failed to discriminate between the two samples. A discriminant analysis done on the OM-12 items together with the variables indicative of the socio-economic status of the subjects yielded a Wilks lambda (df = 13) = .386 (p < .001). This latter discriminant function improved predictability up to 90.97%. The city and rural means for OM-12 were 42.42 and 36.92, respectively. However, the reader should recall the possible confound that the two samples were interviewed by two different interviewers.

Belief Similarity

In order to make the manipulation of belief similarity highly plausible, some 51 belief statements (belief statement 9 was introduced in two versions) from the pilot study were rated both for their controversiality and relevance to
the Indian context. Those belief statements which were controversial were often considered to be "Not at all relevant" (in the sense of foreign) to the Indian cultural context. Thus, it was not possible to select belief statements which were both controversial and relevant to the Indian context. Hence, the relevant/irrelevant dimension was set aside for the most part; the controversiality dimension was given prominence to make the manipulations of belief dissimilarity more plausible. The belief statements which were most controversial were selected first. If a belief similar in content had already been selected, it was dropped in favor of the next most controversial belief. However, if two belief statements were more or less equally controversial, the more relevant one was selected.

Special care was also taken to see that one-half of the beliefs chosen were caste-related as rated by the pilot test subjects. The other one-half of the beliefs selected were grouped together as general beliefs. Thus, the overall belief factor (OBS) was further broken down into two sub-factors: caste related beliefs (CBS) and general beliefs (GBS). Each of these sub-factors had been manipulated in such a way as to make the stimulus person similar to the subject on either 20% (low) or 80% (high) of the beliefs. These two sub-factors when combined give three levels of OBS: 20% similarity with both CBS and GBS = low, 50% simi-
larity with CBS = low and GBS = high or CBS = high and GBS = low, and finally 80% similarity with both CBS and GBS = high. For the purpose of analysis, a five-factor ANOVA was performed consisting of city-rural, GBS, CBS, subject caste, and stimulus caste. A variety of contrasts were planned to examine the effect of OBS and the relative strength of the two sub-factors of GBS and CBS.

**Caste Similarity.**

Caste similarity was manipulated: (a) by interviewing an equal number of subjects from each of the three predominant castes (Brahmins, Marathas, and Mahars), and (b) by presenting each of these caste groups with an equal number of stimuli from each of the three castes. The subjects of any given caste who were presented with a stimulus from their own caste were in the "same" caste similarity condition, and those who were presented with a stimulus from a caste other than their own were in the "other" caste similarity condition. Thus, 72 subjects from each of the three castes were interviewed, and each subject caste group was presented with 24 stimuli from each of the three castes. However, each subject was presented with one and only one stimulus caste person, so that their responses to only one stimulus caste were measured. The idea that the subject's responses to one stimulus caste would be compared with other subjects' responses to other stimulus castes was not allowed to become
salient. The five-factor ANOVA performed had a variety of contrasts planned to examine the effects of caste similarity by combining the two factors of subject caste and stimulus caste. The differential ratings given by all the subjects and by each subject caste to those who were in the "same" caste and "other" caste conditions were also examined. This provided the "main effect" of caste similarity for attraction and the SD ratings.

Manipulation Checks

An initial perusal of the manipulation checks showed that 69 subjects either did not remember the caste of the stimulus person or proportion of GBS/CBS. These subjects were rejected and new interviews conducted to replace them. After a closer look at these rejected cases, it was found that only two of these subjects missed recalling the identity of the stimulus caste, 17 (nine from the 20% belief similarity and eight from the 80% belief similarity) were wrong in identifying the proportion of belief similarity, and the remaining 50 cases belonged to the medium similarity condition. This suggests that most of the problem arose from confusion in assigning the correct proportion of similarity to the GBS/CBS stimuli.

Moreover, there is reason to believe that the manipulations were understood by the subjects as they were origi-
nally intended, because 19 subjects who were used as pilot interviews to see if the manipulations worked as intended did yield 100 percent accuracy. However, one must note that in these pilot interviews, the manipulation checks were introduced immediately after the responses of the subject to the stimulus person, and before the measures of actual contact and OM-12. A comparison of the mean scores between the rejected cases and the good data showed that the differences were too small to be significant. Table 1 reports the t values for the test of differences between the means. Hence, one could conclude that even among the 69 rejected cases the manipulations must have been effective when subjects reported their judgments of attraction but had been forgotten by the time the manipulation check questions were asked. However, the experimenter felt more confident using only those cases where the subjects reported perceiving the manipulations of caste and belief similarity.

A 2x2x2x3x3 ANOVA for perceived OBS (See Manipulation Checks in Appendix B, VI, 2), with two levels of city-rural, GBS and CBS, and three levels of subject caste and caste of stimulus yielded a 3-way interaction of city-rural by CBS by GBS (F (1,360) = 19.16, p < .001). This interaction showed that the pattern of the GBS by CBS interaction was slightly different for the urban and rural sample. The ANOVA also yielded a significant 2-way interaction of CBS by GBS (F
TABLE 1

Comparison of Means of Rejected and Good Data, and their t Values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Means for the Entire Population</th>
<th>Rejected Cases (N = 69)</th>
<th>All Good Cases (N = 432)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Distance (SD) Home</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Distance (SD) Public</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Distance (SD) Marriage</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction (items 5 and 6 from the Byrne IJS).</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Non-significant will be abbreviated as NS. See page 51 for an explanation of the three social distance (SD) subscales.
(1,360) = 55.99, p < .001), and two extremely strong main effects of CBS (F (1,360) = 2003.15, p < .001), and GBS (F (1,360) = 1977.96, p < .001).

Similarly, a five-factor ANOVA for CBS (See Manipulation Checks in Appendix B, VI, 3), yielded a main effect of CBS (F (1,360) = 933.39, p < .001), without yielding a main effect of GBS. The five factor ANOVA for GBS (See Manipulation Checks in Appendix B, VI, 4), yielded a main effect of GBS (F (1,360) = 895.56, p < .001), without yielding a main effect of CBS. This demonstrated that the manipulation of CBS had a greater impact on perceived caste belief similarity, but had no influence on perceived GBS, and vice versa. This reassured the experimenter that the manipulations did work as planned for all the subjects used in the analysis.

**Dependent Variables**

**Measure of Attraction**

One of the principal scales used in this study was the Byrne Interpersonal Judgment Scale (Byrne IJS). The last two items on this scale provided the basis for the assessment of attraction. A reliability test on these two items gave a relatively high alpha value = .796. The inclusion of all the other items on the Byrne IJS in an overall evaluation scale did not increase the alpha considerably. All six items yielded an alpha value = .835. Thus, although the
overall evaluation of the stimulus person could have been utilized for the analysis, it was not done for two reasons: first, it would have meant a departure from an already tested measure of attraction, and second, the overall evaluation did not provide a substantially higher alpha from the one given by the measure of attraction. Hence, the last two items of the Byrne IJS were utilized to measure the principal dependent variable, attraction.

Combined Social Distance Scale

The combined social distance (SD) scale (this scale was a combination of the Mahar Ritual Pollution Scale and the Bogardus Social Distance Scale), which yielded an alpha = .892, was considered too general, and was broken up into several scales. However, in order to see if any of the Byrne IJS items could be combined with the items on the combined SD scale, a factor analysis was done on these two sets of items. The Byrne IJS items clustered together and so were not included with the social distance ratings (SD ratings). Using the factor loadings, the combined SD scale was broken down into three different subscales: (a) The near home factor (SD home), which included behaviors in and around the home; (b) the far from home factor (SD public), which consisted of public behaviors, normally engaged in far from home; and (c) the marriage item (SD marriage) which loaded more or less equally on the two previous factors and
was considered not to belong to either. Hence, it was left alone. The alpha value for the SD home was a very high .910, and the alpha value for the SD public was an acceptable .676. Since the SD marriage item was alone, no alpha value could be calculated. Thus, the analyses of SD ratings included three dependent measures: SD home, SD public, and SD marriage.

\section*{Covariates}

\textbf{Overall Modernity Scale}

The Overall Modernity Scale (OM-12) used by Smith and Inkeles (1966) was used as a manipulation check to confirm differences between the urban and rural samples. This scale was somewhat simplified and reduced to 12 items from the original 14 items. The two deleted items related to their knowledge of the capital of the U.S.S.R., and their acceptance of the research done by doctors in efforts to pre-determine the sex of unborn babies. This scale was scored to give the experimenter an idea of how open the subjects were to modern ideas. This shortened and modified scale yielded a Cronbach's alpha value = .680 indicating an acceptable level of reliability. This value improved somewhat to .716 by dropping item 5 ("Do you think man can be really good without having any religion at all?"). The possible range of the OM-12 as used in the analyses was 0 to 55, since it
finally contained only 11 items.

A 2x3 ANOVA for OM-12 (without item 5) with two levels of city-rural and three levels of subject caste yielded a 2-way interaction of city-rural by subject caste: \( F(2,426) = 4.30 \) (\( p < .012 \)). This interaction showed no differences between the urban castes, but did yield some slight differences between the rural castes. The same ANOVA also yielded a main effect of the city-rural factor for OM-12 (without item 5): \( F(1,426) = 164.53 \) (\( p < .001 \)). The OM-12 mean for the city was 42.42, and the mean for rural was 36.92, showing only a modest difference between the two groups. The ANOVA also yielded a main effect of subject caste: \( F(2,426) = 5.03 \) (\( p < .001 \)). The means for the Brahmins, Marathas, and Mahars were 40.59, 38.97, and 39.44, respectively.

**Socio-economic Status**

The four items included in the socio-economic status scale consisted of education, income, value of land possessed and occupation. This socio-economic status scale yielded an acceptable Cronbach's alpha value = .632. The possible range for socio-economic status was 0 to 20.

The 2x3 ANOVA for socio-economic status with two levels of city-rural and three levels of subject caste yielded a 2-way interaction of city-rural by subject caste: \( F(2,426) \)
This interaction showed that for the rural sample, the Brahmins enjoyed a higher socio-economic status than the Marathas, and these two castes together were relatively higher than the Mahars. The urban pattern was similar except that the Marathas enjoyed a higher socio-economic status than the Brahmins. The same ANOVA also yielded two main effects of the city-rural and the subject caste factors: $F (1,426) = 263.94 (p < .001)$ and $F (2,426) = 46.30 (p < .001)$, respectively. The socio-economic status mean for the city was 10.76, and the mean for the rural was 6.09. The means for the Brahmins, Marathas, and Mahars were 9.09, 9.71, and 6.51, respectively.

**Casteism Scale**

The casteism scale consisted of the sum of the responses of the subjects to the 10 caste-relevant beliefs which were used to manipulate caste belief similarity. These items were all scored to show how much the subjects supported and accepted the caste system. The casteism scale yielded an acceptable reliability value = .608, and was considerably raised to a very good .738 by dropping item 7 ("It is useless to raise the expectations of schedule castes/tribes and leave them disappointed and unhappy"). Hence, the casteism scale without item 7 was utilized for the analysis. The possible range for the casteism scale (without item 7) was 0 to 45.
A 2x3 ANOVA for the casteism scale with two levels of city-rural and three levels of subject caste yielded a main effect of the city-rural factor: $F(1,426) = 179.97$ ($p < .001$). The casteism scale mean for the city = 11.94, and the mean for the rural = 20.07. The ANOVA also yielded a main effect of subject caste: $F(2,426) = 164.18$ ($p < .001$). The means for the Brahmins, Marathas, and Mahars were 21.07, 18.57, and 8.38, respectively. The ANOVA did not yield a 2-way interaction.

Why Covariates?

In this study, the OM-12, the socio-economic status, and the casteism scale were used as covariates in the above mentioned analyses of variance for the dependent measures of attraction and SD ratings.

The OM-12 and the socio-economic status scale were introduced in these analyses because it was considered plausible that the difference in the dependent measures could be a function of the subjects' lack of modern ideas, or inability to avail himself/herself of modern means. Here, if the effects of the independent variables are unaffected by the inclusion of these covariates, it may indicate the presence of possible robust cause-effect relationships. Moreover, it was also expected that the subjects' casteism scores would be somehow confounded with the caste of the subject and
stimulus, and with the caste beliefs of the stimulus. If the effects of caste similarity were still strong after removing the variance explained by casteism, it would imply a possible stronger influence of caste similarity on the dependent measures. Casteism, in itself, would inherently involve a negative attitude toward other castes. Effects that remain after controlling for casteism could then be labelled as real unfounded prejudice toward the other castes. Since all the covariates are somehow linked to the study, their inclusion as covariates might either diminish or even completely remove some of the effects of the independent variables. Hence, it was decided to do the analyses of variance with and without the covariates in order to examine the robustness of these relationships.

Other Scales

Measure of Actual Contact

Included in the study were ratings of seven behaviors relatively common to urban and rural *Sitz im Leben* which were utilized as a measure of overall actual contact (overall AC). Subjects were asked to report how often during the "past month" they had engaged in the specified behavior. The range of possible scores for the overall AC scale was 0 to 210. On the basis of a factor analysis, the overall AC scale was broken down into two subscales: actual contact
near home (near home AC) and actual contact far from home (far from home AC). The alpha reliability values for the near home AC = .654, and for the far from home AC = .629, while the overall AC yielded a .672 alpha value. Although these values were not very high, they were acceptable for a meaningful analysis.

Attributions

A set of attributional questions were asked to examine the basis of the attributions made by the subjects regarding their ratings on the Byrne IJS and their willingness to engage in the behaviors from the combined SD scale. A factor analysis done on these attributional questions yielded a cluster for external attributions (EA), while no such clustering was seen for the items intended as internal attributions (IA). The external attributions scale (EA scale) yielded a rather low alpha value = .497, while the internal attributions (IA scale) yielded a very low alpha = .215. This is probably because many of the attribution items were understood differently by different subjects. However, only attribution items 5 and 6 seem to have been understood as items of external and internal attribution, respectively. Besides, one must not forget that these attributions were not only somewhat ambiguous in their wording, but also responses to a very global set of varied situations, which included all the subjects' ratings on the Byrne IJS as well
as their willingness to engage in behaviors from the combined SD scale. The ambiguity of the attributions and the application of responses to a global set of varied situations are probable explanations for the lack of consistency and hence low reliability especially on the IA scale.

**Social Desirability**

A factor analysis done on the items which were used to gauge normative threat and the manipulation checks used to measure social desirability yielded a social desirability factor composed of the second normative threat item (within caste social desirability) and the first social desirability item (outside caste social desirability). The reliability value for the social desirability scale was a relatively low .535. The range of possible values for social desirability scale was 0 to 10.

A 2x3 ANOVA for the social desirability scale with two levels of city-rural and three levels of subject caste, yielded a main effect of city-rural factor: F (1,426) = 9.21, (p < .003), and a main effect of subject caste: F (2,426) = 16.22 (p < .001). The mean of social desirability for the city sample was 6.67, and for the rural sample was 7.81, and the means for the Brahmins, Marathas, and Mahars were 6.53, 6.64, and 7.61, respectively. The rural sample was more confident that its responses would be acceptable to
society; and of the three subject castes, the Brahmins and Marathas rated their responses as being less desirable than the Mahars.

**Normative Threat**

Normative threat was measured by two questions included in the main questionnaire (See Procedure). These were aimed at measuring how threatened the subjects felt by the type of questions posed to them. The reliability value for this normative threat scale was a relatively low .387. The range of possible values for normative threat scale was 0 to 10.

A 2x3 ANOVA with two for the normative threat scale with two levels of city-rural and three levels of subject caste, yielded a main effect of city-rural factor: \( F (1,426) = 6.86, (p < .009) \), and a main effect of subject caste: \( F (2,426) = 8.59 \ (p < .001) \). The mean of normative threat for the city sample = 4.21, and for the rural sample = 4.63, and the means for the Brahmins, Marathas, and Mahars were 4.93, 4.71, and 3.63, respectively. The rural sample felt more threatened by the questions than the urban sample; and of the three subject castes, the Brahmins and Marathas felt more threatened by the questions than the Mahars.

**Interviewer Evaluation**

The last two items of the questionnaire were evaluations
of the interviewee on scales of honesty and fear or nervousness, made by the interviewer (See end of Appendix B). These two items loaded very heavily on a common factor. The reliability value for interviewer evaluation scale yielded an acceptable alpha = .671. The range of possible score for interviewer evaluation scale was 0 to 10.

The 2x3 ANOVA for interviewer evaluation with two levels of city-rural and three levels of subject caste yielded a main effect of city-rural factor: F (1,426) = 287.04 (p < .001), and a main effect of subject caste: F (2,426) = 13.34 (p < .001). The mean of interviewer evaluation for the city sample was 9.80, and for the rural sample it was 8.23. The means for the Brahmins, Marathas, and Mahars were 8.74, 8.97, and 9.33, respectively. The interviewers rated the rural sample as being less honest than the city sample; while of the three subject castes, the Brahmins and Marathas were rated as being less honest in the overall impression given to the interviewer.

Since all the interviews were conducted by two different interviewers, one must be careful in interpreting the city-rural differences on all the measures. This caution is important, since many of the subjects were illiterate or only minimally educated and often the interviewers had to explain the meaning of the questions to them, and later estimate a number value for the response given. This led to
possible bias not only because explanations given may not have been perfectly identical, but also because some bias could arise from their subjective estimates of the responses of illiterate subjects. Such caution would also be critical in the case of interviewer evaluation because this would be biased by the interviewer.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS: PART I "MAIN HYPOTHESES"

Hypothesis 1.1: Law of Attraction

According to the Byrne's "Law of Attraction," attraction between two people is a positive linear function of the proportion of similar beliefs.

Attraction was measured by the last two items of the Byrne IJS, and belief similarity was based on the manipulation of overall belief similarity (OBS). OBS had three levels: low, medium, and high with 20%, 50%, and 80% similarity, respectively (See Illustration 1). A 2x2x2x3x3 ANOVA was done for attraction, with two levels of city-rural, general belief similarity (GBS) and caste belief similarity (CBS), and three levels of subject caste and stimulus caste yielded support for the hypothesis that attraction between two persons is a positive linear relationship of the proportion of similar beliefs (See F values in Table 2). Taking into account the 2x2 belief similarity design, two contrasts were planned to examine: (a) the difference in the level of attraction between the low level of OBS (GBS = low and CBS = low) and high level of OBS (GBS = high and CBS = high); and (b) the difference between medium OBS (GBS = high and CBS =
TABLE 2

Five-factor ANOVA Summary for Attraction with and without Covariates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Effect</th>
<th>Attraction (Byrne IJS 5+6)</th>
<th>Attraction (Byrne IJS 5+6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City-rural (CR)</td>
<td>14.10 (p&lt;.001) (df = 1,360)</td>
<td>7.92 (p&lt;.005) (df = 1,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Belief Similarity (GBS)</td>
<td>16.91 (p&lt;.001) (df = 1,360)</td>
<td>16.53 (p&lt;.001) (df = 1,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caste Belief Similarity (CBS)</td>
<td>8.39 (p&lt;.001) (df = 1,360)</td>
<td>8.59 (p&lt;.004) (df = 1,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Way Interactions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR x Subject (SS)</td>
<td>11.03 (.001) (df = 2,360)</td>
<td>10.93 (p&lt;.001) (df = 2,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulus (ST) x SS</td>
<td>3.23 (p&lt;.013) (df = 4,360)</td>
<td>3.09 (p&lt;.016) (df = 4,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST x CBS</td>
<td>5.44 (p&lt;.005) (df = 2,360)</td>
<td>5.43 (p&lt;.005) (df = 2,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3-Way Interactions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS x ST x CBS</td>
<td>3.71 (p&lt;.006) (df = 4,360)</td>
<td>3.73 (p&lt;.005) (df = 4,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS x GBS x CBS</td>
<td>3.21 (p&lt;.042) (df = 2,360)</td>
<td>3.16 (p&lt;.044) (df = 2,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4-Way Interactions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR x GBS x SS x ST</td>
<td>3.15 (p&lt;.014) (df = 4,360)</td>
<td>3.19 (p&lt;.013) (df = 4,357)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** There was no significant 5-way interaction nor any significant main effect of the covariates (Socio-economic Status, Overall Modernity or Casteism.)
low or GBS = low and CBS = high) and the low and high levels of OBS taken together. The \( t \) values for each of these contrasts were 4.97, \( (p < .001) \), and 1.37 \( (NS) \), respectively. These two contrasts: (a) lend support to the prediction that "high" OBS leads to higher attraction ratings than "low" OBS, and (b) show that attraction is an approximately linear function of the proportion of similar beliefs. The means for the different levels of OBS are reported in Table 3. The Byrne IJS with a range of 0 to 10 has a mid-point of 5. It should be noted that all the means are above this theoretical mid-point. On the average the subjects were neutral toward a stranger who was low in similarity and moderately positive toward the medium and high similarity stimulus.

In keeping with the Byrne-type analysis, a straight line function was fitted to the data by the least squares method, yielding the formula: \( Y' = 3.02X + 4.82 \). Illustration 2 shows this relationship, and lends support for the "empirical law of attraction" which permits the prediction of specific attraction responses within this type of experimentation (Byrne, 1969). When a similar straight line function was fitted by the least squares method using perceived similarity (See Manipulation Checks, in Appendix B, VI, 2) rather than actual manipulated belief similarity, it yield the following formula: \( Y' = 2.88X + 4.81 \). The standarized
### TABLE 3
Means for Different Levels of Belief Similarity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief Similarity</th>
<th>Attraction Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Overall Belief Similarity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Similarity</td>
<td>5.33 (108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Similarity</td>
<td>6.63 (216)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Similarity</td>
<td>7.15 (108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. General Belief Similarity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Similarity</td>
<td>5.70 (216)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Similarity</td>
<td>6.87 (216)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Caste Belief Similarity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Similarity</td>
<td>5.96 (216)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Similarity</td>
<td>6.71 (216)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Range of Attraction scores = 0 to 10. Values in parentheses = N of subjects.
ILLUSTRATION 2: Attraction toward a Stranger as a Linear Function of the Proportion of Similar Beliefs.

\[ Y' = 3.02X + 4.81 \]

Proportion of Similar Beliefs

Low | Med. | High
---|---|---
.20 | .50 | .80
Beta values for manipulated belief similarity and perceived belief similarity were .214 and .212, respectively.

Following the 2x2x2x3x3 ANOVA, a third contrast was planned to test the relative influence of GBS vs. CBS on attraction. This contrast yielded a $t$ value of 2.38 ($p < .05$). This $t$ value, small though it be, shows that across all subjects variation in GBS had a greater impact on attraction than variation in CBS. The means for the different levels of GBS and CBS are presented in Table 3. It should be noted that these means are also above the theoretical mid-point of the Byrne IJS.

The above mentioned ANOVA (See Table 2) for attraction, besides aiding in the calculation of planned contrasts, yielded a 3-way interaction of subject caste by stimulus caste by CBS: $F (4,360) = 3.71$, ($p < .001$). This interaction is demonstrated in Illustrations 3 and 4. In the CBS "low" condition, Illustration 3 shows that each caste group likes its own group more that the other two caste groups; and in the CBS "high" condition, Illustration 4 shows a similar pattern for the Marathas and Mahars, but not for the Brahmins. The Brahmins like other caste groups in the "high" CBS condition as much as or better than their own caste group. The ANOVA also yielded a main effect of GBS: $F (df = 1,360) = 16.91$ ($p < .001$); and a main effect of CBS: $F (df = 1,360) = 8.39$ ($p < .001$). Looking at the Omega
ILLUSTRATION 3: Graphic Presentation of CBS x SS x ST Interaction for Attraction in the CBS "Low" Condition.
ILLUSTRATION 4: Graphic Presentation of CBS x SS x ST Interaction for Attraction in the CBS "High" Condition.
Square values for these two effects, GBS explained 4.73% of the variance in attraction, while CBS explained 2.54%. This again supports the earlier finding that GBS is somewhat more influential than CBS in leading to attraction.

Hypothesis 1.2: Caste Similarity vs. Belief Similarity

Caste similarity, like belief similarity, influences interpersonal attraction as measured by the last two items of the Byrne IJS; and as for their relative importance (belief similarity vs. caste similarity), in keeping with the Byrne findings, belief similarity is expected to exert a greater influence on attraction than caste similarity.

Caste similarity had been manipulated by presenting subjects with stimuli either from their own caste or one of the other castes. Belief similarity was presented with the two factors of GBS and CBS, each with "low" and "high" levels of similarity between the subject and the stimulus person.

As shown in Table 2, the analysis yielded a 2-way interaction of subject caste by stimulus caste \( F(4,360) = 3.23, p < .013 \). Illustration 5 shows this interaction graphically. This 2-way interaction was broken down into four contrasts: (a) "same" stimulus caste vs. "other" stimulus caste across all subjects, (b) Brahmin vs. non-Brahmin stimulus for only Brahmin subjects, (c) Maratha vs. non-Maratha stimulus for
ILLUSTRATION 5: Graphic Presentation of SS x ST Interaction for Attraction.
only Maratha subjects, and (d) Mahar vs. non-Mahar stimulus for only Mahar subjects. These yielded significant $t$ values (one-tailed) equal to 3.39 ($p < .001$), 1.85 ($p < .05$), 2.44 ($p < .01$), and 6.45 ($p < .001$), respectively. Thus across all subjects, persons from the same caste are liked more than persons from other caste groups, that is, for each of the subject castes the ingroup liking was significantly higher than outgroup liking. Looking at the subject caste groups relative to each other on the attraction measure, the Mahars were more ingroupish than the Marathas, who in turn were more ingroupish than the Brahmins.

In order to examine if belief similarity was more important than caste similarity, Omega Square values for the respective $F$ values were calculated. These Omega Square values for caste similarity and OBS explained 3.35% and 6.67% of the variance in attraction, respectively. This indicates that in terms of attraction, the influence of belief similarity is more important than caste similarity. In conclusion, support has been found to indicate that both caste similarity and belief similarity does influence attraction and that between these two OBS is relatively more important than caste similarity.

Doing the above analysis of variance even with the covariates did not significantly change the strength of the main effects of caste or belief similarity (See Table 2), but
they did however, considerably reduce the main effect of the city-rural factor. This shows that the main effects of caste and belief similarity are quite robust and unaffected by the presence of the covariates.

**Hypothesis 1.3: Rural Area: Caste vs. Belief Similarity**

In the rural areas, caste similarity will have a greater impact on attraction than belief similarity (GBS or CBS).

Caste similarity was expected to be more important for the rural sample, on the grounds that being less modernized, it would cling to its religion-based traditional caste preferences in manifesting its liking for stimulus persons.

Therefore, a 4-way interaction of city-rural by subject caste by stimulus caste by caste/general belief similarity was expected. Table 2 shows that although no such interaction was found for city-rural by subject caste by stimulus caste by CBS, a 4-way interaction was found for city-rural by subject caste by stimulus caste by GBS: \( F (4,360) = 3.15 \) (\( p < .014 \)). This interaction shows that in the rural area there is a greater tendency to rate "same" stimulus caste persons somewhat higher than in the urban area (See Table 4). The same Table shows that in the rural areas Brahmins and Mahars like their own caste persons more than they like other caste persons in the "low" GBS condition; and that
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GBS (Low)</th>
<th></th>
<th>GBS (High)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brahmin</td>
<td>Maratha</td>
<td>Mahar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brahmin</td>
<td>Maratha</td>
<td>Mahar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulus Caste</td>
<td>Brahmin</td>
<td>Maratha</td>
<td>Mahar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmin</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maratha</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahars</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>8.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahars</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Range of Attraction scores = 0 to 10.
GBS = General Belief Similarity.
Marathas and Mahars like their own groups more in the "high" GBS condition. For the urban sample however, this tendency is found only in the case of Maratha subjects in the "low" GBS condition, and only among Mahar subjects in the "high" GBS condition. The urban Mahars are the only group reporting liking (or "disliking") with means below the theoretical mid-point of the Byrne IJS. This interaction yielded only a small $F$ value, and although there is a greater tendency to take caste similarity into account at the rural level, this could well be a spurious interaction owing to the very high rating given by the rural Mahars in the "low" GBS condition. A similar interaction of city-rural by caste similarity by GBS was not found when a 2x2x2x2 ANOVA was done by combining subject caste and stimulus caste into a caste similarity factor. Similarly, doing the 2x2x3 ANOVA by combining the two general and caste belief factors into an overall belief factor (OBS), did not yield a 3-way interaction of city-rural by caste similarity by OBS.

In conclusion, one would have to say that no strong support was found for the idea that caste similarity has a greater impact than belief similarity (GBS or CBS) on attraction in the rural rather than in the urban areas.
Hypothesis 1.4: Intimate vs. Public Behaviors

Caste similarity is more important for intimate behaviors (SD home and SD marriage) than for public behaviors (SD public); and hence one will find a lower level of openness to "other" stimulus castes, especially on the question of intimate forms of behavior.

According to the above hypothesis, one should find subjects in the "same" stimulus caste condition more open than those subjects in the "other" stimulus caste condition. SD home consisted of the items which made up the near home factor; SD public consisted of the items included in the far from home factor; and SD marriage consisted of the single marriage item. Hence, one should find a lower level of openness to "other" stimulus castes on the SD home and SD marriage items, which deal with intimate behaviors, than on the SD public items, which concern the far from home public behaviors.

MANOVA for all SD Measures

Table 5 shows 2x2x2x3x3 MANOVA summary putting all the SD ratings into one analysis with two levels for each of city-rural, GBS and CBS, and three levels of subject caste and stimulus caste. This MANOVA yielded two 3-way interactions: one of city-rural by subject caste by stimulus caste: $F(12,1080) = 3.35$, ($p < .001$); and another of subject caste
### TABLE 5

**Five-factor MANOVA Summary for the 3 Social Distance Measures with and without Covariates.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Effect</th>
<th>Variables entered in Manova SD Home, SD Public, &amp; SD Marriage (No Covariates)</th>
<th>Variables entered in Manova SD Home, SD Public, &amp; SD Marriage (3 Covariates)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City-rural (CR)</td>
<td>16.75 (p&lt;.001) (df = 3,358)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Caste (SS)</td>
<td>7.28 (p&lt;.001) (df = 6,718)</td>
<td>3.51 (p&lt;.002) (df = 6,712)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulus Caste (ST)</td>
<td>4.46 (p&lt;.001) (df = 6,718)</td>
<td>4.72 (p&lt;.001) (df = 6,712)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Way Interactions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR x SS</td>
<td>4.02 (p&lt;.001) (df = 6,718)</td>
<td>4.49 (p&lt;.001) (df = 6,712)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR x ST</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2.29 (p&lt;.033) (df = 6,712)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS x ST</td>
<td>6.68 (p&lt;.001) (df = 12,1080)</td>
<td>6.57 (p&lt;.001) (df = 12,1071)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS x CBS</td>
<td>2.45 (p&lt;.024) (df = 6,718)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS x GBS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>2.45 (p&lt;.024) (df = 6,712)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3-Way Interactions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR x SS x ST</td>
<td>3.35 (p&lt;.001) (df = 12,1080)</td>
<td>3.70 (p&lt;.001) (df = 12,1071)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS x ST x CBS</td>
<td>2.57 (p&lt;.002) (df = 12,1080)</td>
<td>2.55 (p&lt;.003) (df = 12,1071)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST x GBS x CBS</td>
<td>2.16 (p&lt;.045) (df = 6,718)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** There were no significant 4/5-Way interactions.
by stimulus caste by CBS: \( F(12,1080) = 2.57, (p < .001) \). The MANOVA also found 2-way interaction effects of subject caste by stimulus caste: \( F(12,1080) = 6.68, (p < .001) \), and city-rural by subject caste: \( F(6,718) = 4.02, (p < .001) \). The MANOVA also yielded three main effects of city-rural: \( F(3,358) = 16.75, (p < .001) \), subject caste: \( F(6,718) = 7.28, (p < .001) \) and stimulus caste: \( F(6,718) = 4.46, (p < .001) \). The MANOVA did not show any main effects of the belief factors of CBS or CBS.

With the inclusion of the covariates (OM-12, socio-economic status, and casteism), (a) the 3-way and 2-way interactions retained their strength, (b) the strong main effect of city-rural disappeared completely, (c) the main effect of subject caste became weaker, and (d) the main effect of stimulus caste became a little stronger. There are other interaction effects, not mentioned above, which either disappeared or showed up only when the analysis was done with the covariates. These were relatively weak and hence have not been elaborated upon (See Table 5).

Although the central issue in this hypothesis is the relative influence of caste similarity on each of the SD ratings, it seems out of place just to refer to this aspect of each ANOVA without putting it in its context. Hence, the three SD ratings will be compared after the five-factor ANOVA for each of them has been examined.
ANOVA for SD Home

A 2x2x2x3x3 ANOVA summary for SD home, with two levels of city-rural, GBS and CBS, and three levels of subject caste and stimulus caste is presented in Table 6. First, this ANOVA yielded a 3-way interaction of city-rural by subject caste by stimulus caste: \( F(4,360) = 2.82, (p < .025) \). Illustrations 6 and 7 show the subject caste by stimulus caste pattern for the urban and rural areas, respectively. The ingroup vs. outgroup differences are larger for the rural sample than for the urban one. For the urban sample the Marathas and Mahars rate their own group higher, while the Brahmins rate Marathas a little higher than their own. The Mahars prefer to be more with the Brahmins than with the Marathas. Across all the subjects, the various stimulus groups are preferred more or less equally. The rural Brahmins maintain a greater distance between themselves and the Marathas and Mahars. The rural Marathas keep a greater distance between themselves and the Mahars, but rate the Brahmins a little higher than themselves. The rural Mahars rate their own group high, but do not rate Brahmins and Marathas very much lower than they rate their own groups. Looking at Illustration 7 from the point of view of stimulus caste, the Brahmins are the most preferred, and the Mahars are the least preferred for behaviors near the home. The means for SD home given in the above mentioned Illustrations are all above the
TABLE 6
Five-factor ANOVA Summary for the SD Home with and without Covariates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Effects</th>
<th>SD Home (No Covariates)</th>
<th>SD Home (3 Covariates)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City-rural (CR)</td>
<td>21.62 (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(df = 1,360)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Caste (SS)</td>
<td>7.62 (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(df = 2,360)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulus Caste(ST)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3.17 (p&lt;.043)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(df = 2,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Way Interactions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR x SS</td>
<td>5.51 (p&lt;.004)</td>
<td>6.13 (p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(df = 2,360)</td>
<td>(df = 2,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR x ST</td>
<td>3.81 (p&lt;.023)</td>
<td>5.13 (p&lt;.006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(df = 2,360)</td>
<td>(df = 2,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS x ST</td>
<td>3.70 (p&lt;.006)</td>
<td>3.38 (p&lt;.010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(df = 4,360)</td>
<td>(df = 4,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Way Interactions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR x SS x ST</td>
<td>2.82 (p&lt;.025)</td>
<td>3.54 (p&lt;.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(df = 4,360)</td>
<td>(df = 4,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR x GBS x CBS</td>
<td>5.14 (p&lt;.024)</td>
<td>4.29 (p&lt;.039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(df = 1,360)</td>
<td>(df = 1,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects (Covar.):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Modernity</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.99 (p&lt;.015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(df = 1,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casteism</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>26.20 (p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(df = 1,357)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: There were no significant 4/5-Way interactions.
ILLUSTRATION 6: Graphic Presentation of CR x SS x ST Interaction for SD Home in the Urban Area.
ILLUSTRATION 7: Graphic Presentation of CR x SS x ST Interaction for SD Home in the Rural Area.
mid-point of 5.5 (range for SD home = 0 to 11), and many are near the top indicating some ceiling effect.

The ANOVA for SD home also yielded a 2-way interaction of subject caste by stimulus caste (F (4,360) = 3.70, p < .006). Illustration 8 shows that this interaction pattern is the same as the one for the rural sample with the differences between ingroup vs. outgroup means relatively weaker due to the impact of urban people. This interaction of subject caste by stimulus caste was broken down into four contrasts: (a) "same" stimulus caste vs. "other" stimulus caste across all subjects, (b) Brahmin vs. non-Brahmin stimulus for only Brahmin subjects, (c) Maratha vs. non-Maratha stimulus for only Maratha subjects, and (d) Mahar vs. non-Mahar stimulus for only Mahar subjects (See Table 7). These yielded significant t values (one-tailed) equal to 3.63 (p < .001), 5.67 (p < .001), 2.23 (p < .05), and 3.00 (p < .001), respectively. Thus across all subjects, persons from the "same" stimulus caste are preferred more than persons from "other" stimulus caste when it comes to SD home behaviors. Further, for each of the subject castes openness to the ingroup was significantly higher than openness to the outgroup. Looking at the subject caste groups relative to each other on the SD home measure, the Brahmins were more ingroupish than the Mahars, who in turn were more ingroupish than the Marathas.
ILLUSTRATION 8: Graphic Presentation of SS x ST Interaction for SD Home.
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The ANOVA for SD home also yielded another 2-way interaction of city-rural by subject caste ($F(2,360) = 5.51, p < .004$). Illustration 9 shows that in the city sample the subject castes are not really different from one another in their openness to stimulus persons, but in the rural sample there are significant differences. The rural Mahars, who are the most open, are followed by the Marathas who in turn are more open than the Brahmins.

The five-factor ANOVA for SD home also yielded two main effects: one for city-rural ($F(1,360) = 21.62, p < .001$), and another for subject caste ($F(2,360) = 7.62, p < .001$). The SD home mean for the urban sample was 10.50, and the mean for the rural sample was 9.58, showing that the urban sample is more open to interact with others on SD home behaviors. The SD home means for Brahmins, Marathas and Mahars are 9.53, 10.15, and 10.46, respectively. This points to the fact that across the urban and rural samples, the Brahmins are more ingroupish than the Marathas, and the Marathas are more ingroupish than the Mahars on the SD home measure.

It must be noted here, that when the same five-factor ANOVA for SD home was done with the covariates (OM-12, casteism, and socio-economic status) the main effects of city-rural and subject caste completely disappeared (See Table 7). In their place the main effects of OM-12 and
ILLUSTRATION 9: Graphic Presentation of CR x SS Interaction for SD Home.
### TABLE 7

**F Values for Planned Contrasts to Examine Ingroup vs Outgroup Mean Differences for Each of the SD Ratings Across All Subjects and for Each Subject Caste.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Various Contrasts:</th>
<th>SD Home</th>
<th>SD Public</th>
<th>SD Marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Same&quot; Caste vs &quot;Other&quot; Caste: (For all Subjects)</td>
<td>F = 13.21 (p &lt; .001)</td>
<td>F = 4.45 (p &lt; .050)</td>
<td>F = 65.03 (p &lt; .001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omega Square:</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmins vs Non-Brahmin: (For Brahmin SS.)</td>
<td>F = 32.11 (p &lt; .001)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>F = 109.21 (p &lt; .001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omega Square:</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td></td>
<td>.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maratha vs Non-Maratha: (For Maratha SS.)</td>
<td>F = 5.01 (p &lt; .050)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>F = 114.01 (p &lt; .001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omega Square:</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td></td>
<td>.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahar vs Non-Mahar: (For Mahar SS.)</td>
<td>F = 9.00 (p &lt; .001)</td>
<td>F = 5.06 (p &lt; .050)</td>
<td>F = 9.41 (p &lt; .001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omega Square:</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** F values have been calculated from the t values for each of the 4 contrasts. Degrees of freedom for all F values = 1,360.
casteism were found to be significant. This shows that the variance accounted for by the city-rural and subject caste factors was in fact due to city-rural differences on the OM-12 and the casteism scale.

ANOVA for SD Public

The 2x2x2x3x3 ANOVA summary for SD public with two levels of city-rural, GBS and CBS, and three levels of subject caste and stimulus caste is presented in Table 8. First, this ANOVA yielded a 3-way interaction of subject caste by stimulus caste by caste belief similarity ($F(4, 360) = 6.19$, $p < .001$). Illustrations 10 and 11 show what the subject caste by stimulus caste interaction looks like for the "low" and "high" CBS, respectively. The former Illustration shows that Brahmins are not open to other Brahmins who are "low" on CBS. The latter Illustration shows that the subject castes are more open to their own castes, when they are "high" on CBS. One should note here too, that all the means for the above Illustrations are above the mid-point of 2 (range for SD public = 0 to 4), and some of the means are close to the top showing some ceiling effect.

The ANOVA for SD public also yielded a 2-way interaction of subject caste by stimulus caste ($F(4, 360) = 2.44$, $p < .007$). Illustration 12 shows that the Marathas and Mahars are more open to their own castes than to other castes. The
TABLE 8
Five-factor ANOVA Summary for SD Public with and without Covariates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Effect</th>
<th>SD Public (No Covariates)</th>
<th>SD Public (3 Covariates)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City-rural (CR)</td>
<td>4.36 (p&lt;.037) (df = 1,360)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Way Interactions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR x ST</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3.64 (p&lt;.027) (df = 2,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS x ST</td>
<td>2.44 (p&lt;.047) (df = 4,360)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS x GBS</td>
<td>5.55 (p&lt;.004) (df = 2,360)</td>
<td>4.59 (p&lt;.027) (df = 2,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3-Way Interactions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR x SS x GBS</td>
<td>3.16 (p&lt;.044) (df = 2,360)</td>
<td>3.77 (p&lt;.024) (df = 2,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS x ST x CBS</td>
<td>6.19 (p&lt;.001) (df = 4,360)</td>
<td>6.50 (p&lt;.001) (df = 4,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects (Covar.):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Modernity</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.42 (p&lt;.020) (df = 1,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic Status</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12.97 (p&lt;.001) (df = 1,357)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: There were no significant 4/5-Way interactions.
ILLUSTRATION 10: Graphic Presentation of SS x ST x CBS Interaction for SD Public in the CBS "Low" Condition.
ILLUSTRATION 11: Graphic Presentation of SS x ST x CBS Interaction for SD Public in the CBS "High" Condition.
ILLUSTRATION 12: Graphic Presentation of SS x ST Interaction for SD Public.
Brahmins are slightly more open to the Mahars than to their own caste group. This interaction of subject caste by stimulus caste was broken down into four contrasts: (a) "same" stimulus caste vs. "other" stimulus caste across all subjects, (b) Brahmin vs. non-Brahmin stimulus for only Brahmin subjects, (c) Maratha vs. non-Maratha stimulus for only Maratha subjects, and (d) Mahar vs. non-Mahar stimulus for only Mahar subjects (See Table 7). These yielded $t$ values (one-tailed) equal to 2.11 ($p < .025$), -.598 (NS), 1.85 ($p < .05$), and 5.06 ($p < .001$), respectively. Thus across all subjects, persons from the "same" stimulus caste are preferred more than persons from "other" stimulus caste when it comes to SD public behaviors. However, this conclusion does not apply generally because the Brahmin vs. non-Brahmin contrast was not only non-significant, but also yielded a negative $t$ value, showing that their rejection of Brahmins who are "low" in CBS was really quite strong. For the Marathas and Mahars castes however, the openness to the ingroup was significantly higher than openness to the outgroup. Looking at the subject caste groups relative to each other on the SD public measure, the Brahmins were more open than Marathas, who in turn were more open than the Mahars.

The five-factor ANOVA for SD public also yielded a main effect of city-rural ($F (1,360) = 4.36, p < .037$). The SD Public mean for the urban sample was 3.36, and the mean for


the rural sample was 3.54, showing that the rural sample is slightly more open to interact with others on SD public behaviors. However, one must remember that the F value was very small.

It must be noted here, that when the same five-factor ANOVA for SD public was done with the covariates the main effect of city-rural which was weak to begin with completely disappeared (See Table 8). This main effect was replaced by significant main effects of OM-12 and socio-economic status. This shows that the variance accounted for by the city-rural factor was due to the covariates of OM-12 and socio-economic status.

ANOVA for SD Marriage

A 2x2x2x3x3 ANOVA summary for SD marriage with two levels of city-rural GBS and CBS, and three levels of subject caste and stimulus caste is presented in Table 9. First, this ANOVA yielded an interaction of city-rural by subject caste by stimulus caste (F (4,360) = 3.36, p < .001). Illustrations 13 and 14 show this interaction for SD marriage for the urban and rural areas, respectively. The ingroup vs. outgroup differences are larger for the rural sample than for the urban one. For the urban sample each caste group prefers its own caste group more than the other caste group. The Illustration for the rural area shows that this ingroup
TABLE 9

Five-factor ANOVA Summary for SD Marriage with and without Covariates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Effect</th>
<th>SD Marriage (No Covariates)</th>
<th>SD Marriage (3 Covariates)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Caste (SS)</td>
<td>13.70 (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>3.37 (p&lt;.039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(df = 2,360)</td>
<td>(df = 2,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulus Caste (ST)</td>
<td>4.52 (p&lt;.012)</td>
<td>4.44 (p&lt;.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(df = 2,360)</td>
<td>(df = 2,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Way Interactions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR x SS</td>
<td>7.92 (p&lt;.004)</td>
<td>8.43 (p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(df = 2,360)</td>
<td>(df = 2,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS x ST</td>
<td>18.32 (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>17.98 (p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(df = 4,360)</td>
<td>(df = 4,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS x GBS</td>
<td>3.39 (p&lt;.035)</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(df = 2,360)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3-Way Interactions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR x SS x ST</td>
<td>3.36 (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>6.59 (p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(df = 4,360)</td>
<td>(df = 4,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR x SS x CBS</td>
<td>4.27 (p&lt;.015)</td>
<td>4.36 (p&lt;.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(df = 2,360)</td>
<td>(df = 2,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST x GBS x CBS</td>
<td>4.96 (p&lt;.007)</td>
<td>4.44 (p&lt;.012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(df = 2,360)</td>
<td>(df = 2,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects (Covar.)</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic Status</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>13.93 (p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(df = 1,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casteism</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9.59 (p&lt;.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(df = 1,357)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** There were no significant 4/5-Way interactions.
ILLUSTRATION 13: Graphic Presentation of CR x SS x ST Interaction for SD Marriage in the Urban Area.
ILLUSTRATION 14: Graphic Presentation of CR x SS x ST Interaction for SD Marriage in the Rural Area.
preference is more marked than for the urban sample. In the rural sample, however, the Mahars show a rather high openness to the Brahmins. SD marriage with a range of 0 to 1 has no real mid-point, but any mean below .5 reveals that the majority are negative. In Illustration 13 only the mean of Brahmins rating Brahmins is notably above the mid-point. The rest are about evenly divided or negative. In Illustration 14 it is revealed that the great majority of Brahmins and Marathas would not marry outside their caste, but most Mahars would marry Brahmins and more than half would accept Marathas.

The ANOVA for SD marriage also yielded a 2-way interaction of subject caste by stimulus caste (F (4,360) = 18.32, p < .001). Illustration 15 shows that this interaction pattern is the same as the one for the rural sample with the differences between ingroup vs. outgroup means relatively weaker due to the effect of urban people. The high Mahar openness to marriage with Brahmins also shows itself here. This interaction of subject caste by stimulus caste was broken down into four contrasts: (a) "same" stimulus caste vs. "other" stimulus caste across all subjects, (b) Brahmin vs. non-Brahmin stimulus for only Brahmin subjects, (c) Maratha vs. non-Maratha stimulus for only Maratha subjects, and (d) Mahar vs. non-Mahar stimulus for only Mahar subjects (See Table 7). These yielded significant \( t \) values (one-tailed)
ILLUSTRATION 15: Graphic Presentation of SS x ST Interaction for SD Marriage.
equal to 8.06 ($p < .001$), 10.45 ($p < .001$), 10.67 ($p < .001$), and 3.07 ($p < .001$), respectively. Thus across all subjects, persons from the "same" stimulus caste are preferred more than persons from "other" stimulus caste when it comes to SD marriage. Further, for each of the subject castes, openness to the ingroup was significantly higher than openness to the outgroup. Looking at the subject caste groups relative to each other on SD marriage, the Brahmins and Marathas were more ingroupish than the Mahars.

The ANOVA for SD marriage also yielded another 2-way interaction of city-rural by subject caste ($F (2,360) = 7.92, p < .004$). Illustration 16 shows that in the city sample the subject castes are not very different from one another in their openness to stimulus persons: the Mahars are only a little more open than the Brahmins and Marathas. In the rural sample however, the Mahars are extremely high in their openness on SD marriage.

The five-factor ANOVA for SD marriage also yielded two main effects: one for subject caste ($F (2,360) = 13.70, p < .001$), and another for stimulus caste ($F (2,360) = 4.52, p < .012$). The SD marriage means for subject caste are .42, .40, and .64 for the Brahmins, Marathas, and Mahars, respectively. The SD marriage means for stimulus caste are .56, .49, and .41 for the Brahmins, Marathas, and Mahars, respectively. This points to the fact that although the Mahars
ILLUSTRATION 13: Graphic Presentation of CR x SS x ST Interaction for SD Marriage in the Urban Area.
are most open to others on SD marriage, the other castes show only a minimum openness to them. The Brahmins and Marathas are more or less equal in their openness to others on SD marriage, but when it comes to the most preferred marriage partners, the Brahmins are preferred.

Again it must be noted here, that when the five-factor ANOVA for SD marriage was done with the covariates the main effect of subject caste drops down considerably (See Table 9). This weakening of the main effect of subject caste was accompanied by the main effects of casteism and socio-economic status. This shows that a substantial part of the variance in SD marriage accounted for by the subject caste factor was due to the covariates of casteism and socio-economic status. The absence of any main effect of city-rural is worth noting.

Comparison of SD Measures

Because of a very strong social desirability effect on the SD ratings, there was a ceiling effect, which accounts for the rather high levels in the ratings given on the various SD ratings. This makes it difficult to find a great deal of variability in these ratings. The differences among the various ratings for caste similarity "same" and caste similarity "other" are also deceptive, because the range of each of the SD scales varies depending on the number of
items included in each scale. A comparison of these mean values alone could therefore be misleading unless one pays close attention to these range differences.

Therefore, Table 10 was prepared to demonstrate that even though the mean difference in SD home is significant, it is really not very different from the mean difference in SD public. The means were divided by the highest possible value to give a mean proportion for each of the three SD ratings. However, the differences between SD home and SD public are relatively closer to each other than they are to SD marriage. The mean proportion differences between caste similarity "same" and caste similarity "other" for SD marriage are greater than SD home, which in turn are only slightly greater than SD public.

Table 7 gives us an opportunity to examine all the three SD ratings in one glance and indicates that there is a continuum of SD behaviors ranging from the most intimate, i.e., SD marriage to SD public, which one can engage in away from the home environment. The F values for the caste similarity "same" vs. "other" condition contrasts show that the SD marriage: $F(1,360) = 65.03 \ (p < .001)$ is larger than the SD home: $F(1,360) = 13.21 \ (p < .001)$, which in turn is larger than the SD public: $F(1,360) = 4.45 \ (p < .05)$. The Omega Square values in Table 7 show that caste similarity explains 15.49%, 3.8%, and 1.49% of the variance in SD marriage, SD
TABLE 10

Social Distance Means by Caste Similarity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste Similarity</th>
<th>Intimate</th>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD Home</td>
<td>SD Marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same ...........</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ...........</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in Means ...</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omega Square Values</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Actual range for SD Home = 0 to 11.
Actual range for SD Public = 0 to 4.
Actual range for SD Marriage = 0 to 1.
Modified range for all 3 above = 0 to 1.
Similarly, the correlations of caste similarity with SD home, SD public, and SD marriage showed the same hierarchy: i.e., the correlation values of caste similarity with SD marriage (.334, df = 430, p < .001) is higher than the correlation of caste similarity with SD home (.158, df = 430, p < .001), which in turn is higher than the correlation of caste similarity with SD public (.097, df = 430, p < .022). The last correlation was the least significant of all.

Analysis of Caste Similarity with Covariates

Doing the same five-factor ANOVA with the three principle covariates (OM-12, casteism scale, and socio-economic status) for SD home, shows significant main effects of two covariates: OM-12 (F (1,360) = 5.99, p < .015); and casteism (F (1,360) = 26.20, p < .001). However, the contrast caste similarity "same" vs. "other" for SD home was not absorbed by the presence of the covariates, showing that it is a robust effect, not affected by the presence of the covariates. Similarly, for SD public the five-factors ANOVA with covariates shows significant main effects of two covariates: OM-12 (F (1,360) = 5.42, p < .02); and socio-economic status (F (1,360) = 12.97, p < .001). However, here too, the contrast of caste similarity "same" vs. "other" was not absorbed by the presence of the covariates, showing that
it is a robust effect, not affected by the influence of the covariates. When the ANOVA for SD marriage was done with the covariates it yielded main effects of two covariates: casteism \( F(1,360) = 9.59, p < .001 \); and socio-economic status \( F(1,360) = 13.93, p < .001 \). However, the main effect of caste similarity for SD marriage was not affected by the presence of the covariates indicating that it is a robust main effect. The casteism scale yielded stronger main effects than socio-economic status, which in turn was stronger than the OM-12 (See Table 11).

Hypothesis 1.5: General vs. Caste Belief Similarity

In rural areas, CBS is expected to be more important than GBS in influencing attraction and SD ratings. In urban areas, CBS and GBS may be equally important: however, for the urban sample, CBS may be more important for intimate behaviors, while GBS may be more important for public behaviors engaged in far from home.

Hence, 3-way interactions of city-rural by GBS by CBS would be expected. In other words, the GBS by CBS interaction would show different patterns for the city and rural samples. CBS was expected to be more important than GBS for the rural sample and vice versa for the urban sample. However, no such interactions were found except for SD home
**TABLE 11**

Main Effects of the Covariates for Each of the Dependent Measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>Casteism Scale</th>
<th>Overall Modernity</th>
<th>Socio-economic Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F values:</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omega Square:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F values:</td>
<td>26.20</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omega Square:</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F values:</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>12.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omega Square:</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F values:</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>13.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omega Square:</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Degrees of freedom F values in Table = 1,360.
This 3-way interaction for SD home demonstrated that "high" CBS was more important for the city sample than for the rural one in order to engage in behaviors near the home. On the other hand, the rural sample engaged in near home behaviors more or less to the same extent, when the stimuli were either "low" or "high" on both the GBS and CBS (See Hypothesis 4). This interaction did not show that CBS was more important than GBS for the rural sample. For SD marriage GBS was more important than CBS for both the rural and the urban samples (a little more so for the urban sample than for the rural). For SD public CBS seemed to be slightly more important than GBS for both rural and urban samples (a little more so for the urban sample than for the rural). However, the differences for SD marriage and SD public were too small to yield significant 3-way interactions. These findings are shown in Table 12.

In conclusion, no evidence was found for the predominance of the effect of CBS over GBS in the rural area, except for SD public. No support was found for the predominance of GBS over CBS in the urban areas, except for SD marriage, where exactly the opposite had been hypothesized.
### TABLE 12

Differences Between the Means of High and Low General and Caste Belief Similarity for Rural and Urban Areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attraction</td>
<td>CBS* &lt; GBS; .020 &lt; .467</td>
<td>CBS &gt; GBS**; .380 &gt; .314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Home</td>
<td>CBS* &lt; GBS; .013 &lt; .076</td>
<td>CBS &gt; GBS**; .121 &gt; .099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Public</td>
<td>CBS &gt; GBS**; .063 &gt; .042</td>
<td>CBS &gt; GBS**; .296 &gt; .127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Marriage</td>
<td>CBS* &lt; GBS; .000 &lt; .080</td>
<td>CBS* &lt; GBS; .040 &lt; .140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** GBS = General Belief Similarity, and CBS = Caste Belief Similarity. Cells contain high minus low Belief Similarity differences in z values.

* Less threatening to the caste structure.
** More threatening to the caste structure.
Hypothesis 1.6: Tradition and Modernity

The rural sample was expected to be more traditional in holding to the caste system and "orthodox" religious beliefs; it was also expected to be less modern and more prejudiced than the urban sample.

To be more traditional was understood in the sense of holding more strongly to the caste system and being more "orthodox" in terms of religious beliefs. The groups that are more casteist were also expected to be less modernized. The rural sample being more prejudiced implied that it would be less open than the urban sample on the SD scales.

Casteism in Rural Areas

Casteism, as described earlier, was measured by 10 belief statements relevant to the caste system. This scale was utilized as an indicator of how strongly the subjects favored the hierarchically structured caste system. This caste structure, not based on any egalitarian principles, has been supported by the religious traditions of Hinduism.

Table 13 contains the mean scores for each of the subject groups whether they be urban or rural. The overall mean for casteism for the rural sample (20.07) was much higher than the one for the urban sample (11.94). A two factor ANOVA for casteism with two levels of city-rural and three levels
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Caste</th>
<th>Brahmin</th>
<th>Maratha</th>
<th>Mahar</th>
<th>Overall Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban SS</td>
<td>16.51</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>11.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural SS</td>
<td>25.63</td>
<td>22.86</td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td>20.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Means</td>
<td>21.07</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>16.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main Effects:**

- City-rural \( F (1,426) = 179.97, (p < .001) \)
- Subject Caste \( F (2,426) = 164.18, (p < .001) \)

**Note:** Range of Casteism Scale = 0 to 45.
of subject caste yielded a main effect of city-rural: $F(1, 426) = 179.97, p < .001$. The rural folk because of their tradition-bound way of life find it difficult to give up or even question the traditions of their ancestors. The same ANOVA also yielded a main effect of subject caste: $F(2, 426) = 164.18, (p < .001)$. The Brahmins were the most casteist with an overall mean of 21.07, while the Mahars were the least so with a mean of only 8.38. The Marathas were much closer to the Brahmins with a mean of 18.57. Then, the Brahmins consider themselves to be the "top" caste, and are normally acknowledged as such; hence they can only lose by giving up the hierarchical caste structure. On the other hand, the Mahars being lowest of the three castes studied, can only gain by giving up the structure in favor of a more egalitarian way of life.

However, it is not so easy to show that casteism has been favored by the religious orthodox. An attempt to do this was made by demonstrating that there are similarities in our subjects' ratings on their casteism scale and an almost identical group of 702 subjects who were asked to fill out a small questionnaire on religious topics (items) that were gleaned from a content analysis of one item from the pilot study questionnaire (See Appendix B, III, 6.). The two scales would have correlated positively with each other.
After most of the subjects were interviewed, the religious beliefs scale was administered to 702 subjects, which included almost 80-90% of the subjects who had already been used in the main study. Although the scores of these subjects on the religious beliefs scale cannot be correlated with other items from the main study, they indicate a pattern similar to that of the casteism scale. The results from this religious survey were very similar to the casteism scale (See Tables 13 and 14). First, the two-factor ANOVA for the religious beliefs scale with two levels of city-rural and three levels of subject caste yielded a weak but significant interaction of city-rural by subject caste: $F(2, 696) = 4.14$, ($p < .016$). The same ANOVA yielded a main effect of city-rural: $F(1, 696) = 43.59$, ($p < .001$). Table 14 shows that the rural mean (37.21) is higher than the overall city mean (34.59). Again the ANOVA yielded a main effect of subject caste: $F(2, 696) = 28.72$, ($p < .001$). The Brahmins were more religious than the Mahars: Brahmins mean = 38.33, while the mean for Mahars = 32.25; and the Marathas were closer to the Brahmins with a mean of 38.04.

Hence, one could say that although no correlation of casteism with the religious beliefs scale could be calculated, the similar pattern of differences in the means point to the likelihood of significant correlations between the two scales. Thus, the subjects of the same caste and loca-
TABLE 14
Religious Beliefs Scale Broken Down City-rural by Subject Caste.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Caste</th>
<th>Brahmin</th>
<th>Maratha</th>
<th>Mahar</th>
<th>Overall Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban SS</td>
<td>37.30</td>
<td>37.25</td>
<td>29.30</td>
<td>34.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural SS</td>
<td>39.34</td>
<td>38.82</td>
<td>34.48</td>
<td>37.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Means</td>
<td>38.33</td>
<td>38.04</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>35.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Effects:
- City-rural $F (1, 696) = 43.59$, $(p < .001)$
- Subject Caste $F (2, 696) = 28.72$, $(p < .001)$

Interaction:
- City-rural by Subject Caste $F (2, 696) = 4.14$, $(p < .016)$

Note: Range of Religious Beliefs Scale = 0 to 45.
N of subjects = 702.
ation covary in the pattern of means they show.

The OM-12 yields results that are similar to casteism. The urban sample was more modernized than the rural sample. First, the two-factor ANOVA for OM-12 with two levels of city-rural and three levels of subject caste yielded a 2-way interaction of city-rural by subject caste: $F(2,426) = 4.30, (p < .012)$. This interaction showed that differences between urban caste groups were minimal, as opposed to the differences between rural caste groups. The same ANOVA (See Table 15). also yielded a main effect of city-rural: $F(1,426) = 164.53, (p < .001)$, and a main effect of subject caste: $F(2,426) = 5.03, (p < .001)$. It is quite clear from Tables 13 and 15 that the rural sample was not only more casteist, but was also less modern. Hence, one would expect to find a negative correlation between casteism and the OM-12. This correlation was equal to $-0.387 (p < .001)$. Thus, on the basis of this one can easily conclude that the rural sample was more casteist and less modern than the urban sample.

Given this background, the SD ratings can now be examined to see if the data support the hypothesis that the rural folk would be more prejudiced in terms of the SD ratings.

Refering back to the MANOVA table (See Table 5), where all the three SD ratings were included together, one finds a
TABLE 15
OM-12 Broken Down by City-rural and Subject Caste.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Caste</th>
<th>Brahmin</th>
<th>Maratha</th>
<th>Mahar</th>
<th>Overall Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban SS</td>
<td>42.44</td>
<td>42.26</td>
<td>42.54</td>
<td>42.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural SS</td>
<td>38.74</td>
<td>35.68</td>
<td>36.33</td>
<td>36.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Means</td>
<td>40.59</td>
<td>38.97</td>
<td>39.44</td>
<td>39.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Effects:
- City-rural: $F (1,426) = 164.53, \ (p < .001)$
- Subject Caste: $F (2,426) = 5.03, \ (p < .001)$

Interaction:
- City-rural by Subject Caste: $F (2,426) = 4.30, \ (p < .012)$

Note: Range of OM-12 Scale = 0 to 55.
main effect of city-rural: \( F(3,358) = 16.75, (p < .001) \).
Although, this effect seems to be very strong, it dis­
appeared altogether when the same analysis was repeated with
the covariates. This showed that the city-rural differences
on the SD ratings were closely associated with the covari­
ates and were not as strong as they seemed.

However, looking at each of the SD ratings separately,
one found main effects of city-rural for SD home and SD pub­
lic, but no such effect for SD marriage. First, on the SD
home measure for intimate behaviors, the urban sample was
more open than the rural one. The means for SD home city
and rural were 10.50 and 9.58, respectively. These differ­
ences yielded a main effect for city-rural for SD home: \( F
(1,360) = 21.62, (p < .001) \). The SD home difference between
ingroup and outgroup means for the rural sample (1.30) was
greater than the difference between ingroup and outgroup
means for the urban sample (.19). This showed that rural
sample did exhibit a definite negative attitude toward
"other" stimulus castes. Second, for SD public, i.e., the
more public behaviors, the results did not come out as
expected. For behaviors away from home, the rural sample
was more open than the urban sample: City mean = 3.36, and
the rural mean = 3.54. This difference yielded a main
effect of city-rural: \( F(1,360) = 4.36, (p < .001) \). This F
value was really not very large. The SD public difference
between ingroup and outgroup means for the rural sample (.30) was greater than the difference between ingroup and outgroup means for the urban sample (.09). Here again, the rural mean for SD public was higher than the urban mean, the rural sample did in fact exhibit a somewhat negative attitude toward "other" Stimulus castes. Third, on SD marriage the most intimate factor, the rural sample was more open than the urban sample: the rural mean of .51 was greater than .46, the mean for the city. This difference, however, was not large enough to yield a significant F value. Once again, one should not be deceived into believing that the rural folk are more open to marrying any stimulus caste person, because the means clearly show that the higher mean for the rural sample was due to high ingroup openness (.88).

The SD marriage difference between ingroup and outgroup means for the rural sample (.55) was greater than the difference between ingroup and outgroup means for the urban sample (.16). Thus, the rural sample, which appeared to be less prejudiced than the urban sample, was in fact more prejudiced on all SD ratings.

Hence, in conclusion, the rural sample as compared to the urban was more casteist, more religious, less modernized, and by and large, more prejudiced in the way it dealt with people of the "other" stimulus castes.
CHAPTER V

RESULTS: PART II "RELATED HYPOTHESES"

Hypothesis 2.1: Attitude-Behavior Consistency

The measure of actual contact was expected to covary with degree of attraction and SD ratings.

Seven behaviors common to the Indian context were used as a measure of actual contact. Subjects had been asked how often they engaged in these behaviors with persons of the stimulus caste. Although these seven were all combined into one scale of overall actual contact (overall AC) they were also broken down into two subscales: near home actual contact (near home AC) and far from home actual contact (far from home AC). These measures of actual contact were correlated with attraction (last two items of Byrne IJS), SD ratings (SD home, SD public or SD marriage), and overall SD (all three SD ratings taken together).

In the context of this hypothesis, SD home was expected to correlate positively with near home AC; this correlation was also expected to be larger than not only the correlations of near home AC with attraction, SD public, SD marriage, and overall SD, but also the correlations of SD home
with far from home AC, and overall AC. Again, SD public was expected to correlate positively with the far from home AC; this correlation is also expected to be higher than not only the correlations of far from home with attraction, SD home, SD marriage, and overall SD, but also the correlations of SD public with near home AC, and and overall AC.

Although many of the correlations are significant and in the right direction, the sizes of two correlations are contrary to the hypothesis (See Table 16). The SD home with near home AC and the SD public with far from home AC are both smaller than expected. The correlation of attraction with near home AC was both positive and higher than the correlation of attraction with far from AC. This shows that those who engaged in near home AC also showed higher levels of attraction for the stimuli persons. The differences between the correlations of attraction with near home AC and far from home AC yielded a z value of 2.04, p < .005; and the difference in correlations of SD public with near home AC and far from home AC yielded a z value of 2.79, p < .005. These were the only correlations significantly different from one another. Moreover, the correlation of SD public with far from home AC was in the opposite direction, while the SD home with near home AC was in the expected direction. This correlation of measures of reported actual contact with SD ratings indicates that attitude-behavior consistency was
TABLE 16
Correlations of Reported Actual Contact with Attraction and Social Distance Ratings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of Actual Contact</th>
<th>Near home</th>
<th>Far from home</th>
<th>Overall Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Attraction (Range = 0-10)</td>
<td>.154 (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>.013 (p&lt;.394)NS</td>
<td>.078 (p&lt;.053)NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With SD Home (Range = 0-11)</td>
<td>.120 (p&lt;.006)</td>
<td>.165 (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>.180 (p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With SD Public (Range = 0-4)</td>
<td>.149 (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>-.042 (p&lt;.193)NS</td>
<td>.031 (p&lt;.261)NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With SD Marriage (Range = 0-1)</td>
<td>.182 (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>.082 (p&lt;.045)</td>
<td>.143 (p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Overall SD (Range = 0-16)</td>
<td>.163 (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>.122 (p&lt;.006)</td>
<td>.166 (p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Range of score for Overall Actual Contact could vary from 0 to almost 210, if any subject claimed that he engaged each of 7 behaviors everyday. Degrees of freedom for correlations = 430.
critical within the home environment, but was of no great concern for behaviors away from home.

Thus, although most of the correlations point to attitude-behavior consistency (except on the far from home front) these correlations are indeed small and explain less than 4% of the variance. Table 17 gives the reliability values for the scales used in this analysis. The imperfect reliabilities, of course, serve to attenuate the correlations between the "attitude" and the "behavior" measures.

Hypothesis 2.2: Contact Conditions and Attraction

Conditions of reported actual contact (not specific to any specific type of contact) are expected to covary with self-reported actual contact and interpersonal attraction.

According to the contact theory of prejudice reduction (Amir, 1969), a variety of contact conditions should be helpful in leading to more favorable attitudes. The contact conditions consisted of: (a) belief similarity, (b) caste similarity, (c) living near each other, (d) good acquaintance, (e) considering other as equal, (f) maintaining good relationship with other, and (g) disliking the caste system. This last contact condition had been specially included, since it was considered important for the Indian context. In keeping with the above hypothesis these condi-
TABLE 17

A Summary of the Alpha Values for Most of the Subscales Used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Alpha Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Attraction (Byrne IJS 5+6)</td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SD Home (Near Home)</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SD Public (Far from Home)</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SD Marriage</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Overall SD</td>
<td>.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Near Home Actual Contact</td>
<td>.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Far from Home Actual Contact</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Overall Actual Contact</td>
<td>.672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SD Marriage = single item, hence no alpha value computed.
tions of reported contact were expected to correlate with the degree of self-reported actual contact, showing support for the contact theory of prejudice reduction.

The contact hypothesis of prejudice reduction finds support in that the conditions often researched and found to have an impact on the reduction of prejudice were found to covary with reported actual contact and attraction. Table 18 presents the correlations of the conditions of actual contact with self-reported actual contact and attraction. "Disliking the caste system" was the only condition which did not consistently covary with the degree of self-reported actual contact and attraction. One reason for this could be that "disliking the caste system" does not necessarily mean that one can act according to one's dislikes. Doing the correlational analysis for each of the subject castes for the city and rural sample gives us an idea of what may be happening (See Table 19). There appears to be a marked difference between the rural and city samples. The correlations for the urban sample were smaller and far from significant while the correlations for the rural sample were either significant or nearly significant. This could well be an indication that the rural sample was more candid than the city one in reporting their acceptance of the caste system. On the other hand, they may have also over-reported their level of actual contact.
TABLE 18

Correlations of Contact Conditions with Actual Contact and Attraction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row with Column</th>
<th>Near home</th>
<th>Far from home</th>
<th>Overall (Byrne IJS Contact items 5+6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Condition 1 (Similar beliefs)</td>
<td>.240 (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>.402 (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>.416 (p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Condition 2 (Same caste)</td>
<td>.302 (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>.143 (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>.244 (p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Condition 3 (Live near)</td>
<td>.421 (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>.133 (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>.288 (p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Condition 4 (Good acquaintance)</td>
<td>.181 (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>.164 (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>.206 (p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Condition 5 (Consider as equal)</td>
<td>.146 (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>.241 (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>.250 (p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Condition 6 (Good relations)</td>
<td>.163 (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>.299 (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>.303 (p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Condition 7 (Dislike Caste Sys.)</td>
<td>-.066 (p&lt;.085)</td>
<td>.198 (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>.123 (p&lt;.005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Degrees of freedom for correlations = 430.
TABLE 19
Correlations of "Dislike Caste System" with Attraction for each Subject Caste in both Rural and Urban Areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Caste</th>
<th>Brahmin</th>
<th>Maratha</th>
<th>Mahar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Subjects</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p&lt;.277)</td>
<td>(p&lt;.461)</td>
<td>(p&lt;.488)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Subjects</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p&lt;.073)</td>
<td>(p&lt;.029)</td>
<td>(p&lt;.071)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N of Cases for each Cell = 72 only.
Degrees of freedom for correlations = 70.
The findings in Table 18, the near home AC correlated highly with contact condition 2 (same caste) and contact condition 3 (live near), and the far from home AC correlated highly with contact condition 1 (similar beliefs), contact condition 5 (consider as equal) and contact condition 6 (maintain good relations). In this context, it was thought worthwhile to do a regression analysis to see if these were indeed good predictors of near and far from home AC for the city and rural samples. Tables 20 and 21 show the stepwise regression analysis with the variables in the order in which they were entered for the near and far from home AC.

For near home AC (See Table 20), there were three conditions which were significant predictors of the urban group: (a) live near (8.2%) (b) similar ideas (3.6%), and (c) maintained good relations (2.2%). For the rural sample, the one and only condition which was an important predictor was live near (23.6%). Similarly, for far from home actual contact (See Table 21), there were three conditions which were significant predictors of the urban group: (a) similar ideas (17.6%), (b) know well (4.1%), and (c) live near (2.6%). For the rural sample, the contact conditions which were significant predictors were: (a) live near (23.4%), (b) maintained good relationships (3.7%), and (c) similar ideas (1.6%). Across both types of AC, "live near" and "similar ideas" were common predictors for the urban sample, and
TABLE 20

Order in which Contact Conditions were Entered in Predicting Near Home Actual Contact. Variance Accounted by Each Contact Condition is also Entered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors of Near Home Actual Contact:</th>
<th>Urban Subjects</th>
<th>Rural Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Live near</td>
<td>F (1,214) = 19.12 (p &lt; .001)</td>
<td>1) Live near</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance explained = 8.2%</td>
<td>F (1,214) = 65.11 (p &lt; .001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Similar ideas</td>
<td>F (1,213) = 8.50 (p &lt; .001)</td>
<td>Variance explained = 3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance explained = 3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Maintained</td>
<td>F (1,212) = 5.54 (p &lt; .025)</td>
<td>3) Same caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good relations</td>
<td>Variance explained = 2.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Same caste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Know well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Consider as equal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Dislike caste system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only significant F values have been presented.
TABLE 21

Order in which Contact Conditions were Entered in Predicting Far from Home Actual Contact. Variance Accounted by Each Contact Condition is also Entered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors of Far From Home Actual Contact:</th>
<th>Urban Subjects</th>
<th>Rural Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Similar ideas</td>
<td>F (1,214) = 45.96 (p &lt; .001)</td>
<td>1) Live near F (1,214) = 65.32 (p &lt; .001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance explained = 17.6%</td>
<td>Variance explained = 23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Know well</td>
<td>F (1,213) = 11.22 (p &lt; .001)</td>
<td>2) Maintained good relations F (1,213) = 10.90 (p &lt; .001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance explained = 4.1%</td>
<td>Variance explained = 3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Live near</td>
<td>F (1,212) = 7.18 (p &lt; .001)</td>
<td>3) Similar ideas F (1,212) = 4.77 (p &lt; .005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance explained = 2.6%</td>
<td>Variance explained = 1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Dislike caste system</td>
<td></td>
<td>4) Dislike caste system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Same caste</td>
<td></td>
<td>5) Know well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Maintained good relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Consider as equal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only significant F values have been presented. Two contact conditions were not entered in the regression analysis for the rural subjects.
"live near" was the only condition that mattered for the rural sample.

In conclusion, the correlations of the conditions of actual contact (except "dislike caste system") were found to covary with self-report actual contact and attraction. The contact condition "live near" was a fairly good predictor of attraction for the rural sample, but no one good predictor was found for the urban sample.

Hypothesis 2.3: Attributions

Those more open on the SD ratings were expected to make internal attributions (IA), and those who are less open to make external attributions (EA).

In the light of attribution studies, it was expected that subjects who were more open on the SD ratings would want to take credit for their being so open, assuming of course that being open to others would be a socially desirable thing to do. The eight attributions included in the questionnaire were intended to be either external (items 1, 3, 5, and 7) or internal (items 2, 4, 6, and 8). Within the above frame-work, it was hypothesized that positive correlations of SD ratings with internal attributions for the subjects who rated their responses high on social desirability scale, and negative correlations of SD ratings with external attri-
butions would be found for those who rated their responses low on social desirability scale. The social desirability median was used to divide the subjects into the "high" and "low" social desirability groups.

The correlational analysis done with the subjects broken down into groups above and below the social desirability scale median, did not yield the positive and negative correlations one would have expected. "High" openness on the SD ratings did, however, yield significant positive correlations for item 6 (IA = open-mindedness of the subject). Conversely, "low" openness on the SD ratings yielded negative correlations for item 5 (EA = caste differences). The correlation of item 6 with all SD ratings combined together (overall SD) was a strong .351 (df = 253, p < .001), and the correlation of item 5 with all SD ratings combined together (overall SD) was a modest .134 (df = 253, p < .05). Similarly, "low" openness on the SD ratings did yield significant negative correlations only for item 5 (EA = caste differences). Conversely, "high" openness on SD ratings did yield consistent positive correlations for item 6 (IA = open-mindedness). The correlation of item 5 with overall SD was also a strong -.318 (df = 179, p < .001), and the correlation of item 6 with overall SD was also a strong .322 (df = 179, p < .001). For the rest, the other attributions did not yield any significant pattern consistent with the attri-
Another way to analyse this data would be to compare the IA and EA scale means for the subjects "high" and "low" on social desirability. Subjects rating their responses "high" on social desirability were expected to show higher levels of IA than EA, and vice versa. It was also expected that subjects "high" on social desirability would make relatively higher IA than subjects "low" on social desirability. The means for "high" social desirability subjects for IA and EA were 11.68 and 3.87, respectively; and the means for the "low" social desirability for IA and EA were 12.12 and 3.23, respectively. These means support the idea that subjects "high" on social desirability made higher IA than EA. However, the second expectation was not fulfilled, because those "high" on social desirability made lower IA than those "low" on social desirability.

There are possibly two reasons for lack of support for the attribution hypothesis. First, the SD ratings were very socially sensitive, and were loaded with a high social desirability factor. As a result, most of the subjects reported that the kind of responses they gave were socially acceptable, which allowed for little variance in the social desirability ratings. Table 22 shows the mean ratings for social desirability were somewhat high: the city and rural means were 6.67, and 7.19, respectively; and similarly, the
TABLE 22

Social Desirability Broken Down by City-rural and Subject Caste.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Caste</th>
<th>Brahmin</th>
<th>Maratha</th>
<th>Mahar</th>
<th>Overall Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban SS</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural SS</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Means</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Effects:

- City-rural \( F (1,426) = 9.21, (p < .003) \)
- Subject Caste \( F (2,426) = 16.22, (p < .001) \)

**Note:** Range of Social Desirability = 0 to 10.
means for the Brahmins, Marathas, and Mahars were 6.53, 6.64, and 7.61, respectively. The actual range of scores clustered close to the median/mean making it difficult to divide the subjects down into two groups: "low" and "high" in social desirability. Second, what is considered as socially desirable by the subject is confounded by two sets of norms: (a) whether their responses are acceptable to society at large, and (b) whether their responses are acceptable within their own caste group. This confound possibly led all subjects to rate their responses as socially desirable either to society at large or within their own caste group. This was supported by the fact that, although the rural sample was more ingroupish than the urban sample in its ratings of outcaste persons, it still considered its behavior to be socially desirable. The rural sample had a higher social desirability mean than the urban sample. If one compares this with the findings on casteism, one finds that although the rural sample was more casteist, it still thought that its ratings would be socially desirable.

On account of the above mentioned high social desirability scores all the subjects were considered as belonging to the "high" social desirability condition and only one correlational analysis was done across all subjects. Table 23 shows all the correlations of all attributions with SD ratings. Except for item 5 (EA) and item 6 (IA), there was no
**TABLE 23**

Correlations of Social Distance Ratings with Various Attributions for all Subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row with Column</th>
<th>Pearson Product Moment Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution 1</td>
<td>-.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Social Pressure)</td>
<td>(p&lt;.133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution 2</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Own choice)</td>
<td>(p&lt;.159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution 3</td>
<td>-.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Religious Values)</td>
<td>(p&lt;.039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution 4</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Own Educ. level)</td>
<td>(p&lt;.147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution 5</td>
<td>-.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Caste differences)</td>
<td>(p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution 6</td>
<td>.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Own open-mind)</td>
<td>(p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution 7</td>
<td>-.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Situation limits)</td>
<td>(p&lt;.176)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution 8</td>
<td>-.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Economic status)</td>
<td>(p&lt;.397)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only internal Attributions</td>
<td>.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Items 2, 4 &amp; 6)</td>
<td>(p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only external Attributions</td>
<td>-.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Items 1, 3, 5 &amp; 7)</td>
<td>(p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Degrees of freedom for correlations = 430.
consistent pattern in the correlations. Apparently, these two attributions seem to be the only ones that were understood by the subjects as they were really intended, i.e., as external and internal. A closer look at the pattern for item 6 (IA) shows that those who were "high" on openness to the stimulus persons were also "high" on internal attribution. The significant positive correlations of item 6 (IA) with the SD ratings show this. The same group of subjects who were "high" on openness to the stimulus were "low" in their level of external attributions. This is seen in the significant negative correlations of item 5 (EA) with SD ratings. Thus across all the SD ratings, one finds that subjects do tend to take credit for responses they consider socially desirable, and do not like to attribute their praiseworthy behavior to factors in the external situation. This is also supported when one looks at the combined indices of EA and IA as reported at the bottom of Table 23. First, the correlations of SD ratings with IA scale are positive, and the ones of SD ratings with EA scale are all negative. Although not all of them are significant, they do lend some minimal support for the hypothesis.

In order to examine the confound of "caste" social desirability and "societal" social desirability, the above correlational analysis was redone by breaking down overall social desirability into its caste and societal components (See
Preliminary Analysis). These two types of social desirability were further broken down into sub-groups below and above the median. Furthermore, because of the high social desirability of within caste group behavior, only cases in the caste similarity "other" were examined. From the four sets of correlations (96 correlations altogether), 17 changed in the expected direction, and seven changed in the opposite direction, indicating some support for the idea that overall social desirability did deal with two confused sets of norms. However, even with this method to eliminate the confound of caste and societal social desirability, the correlations did not yield a consistent pattern, and many of them were still not significant.

In conclusion, the possible confound of what was socially acceptable and desirable within the caste group and what was socially acceptable and desirable outside the caste group was one of the reasons why the correlations of attributions with SD ratings were not in the expected direction. Doing the analysis, for caste similarity "other" did yield more correlations in the expected direction. Thus, although the results did not yield strong support for attribution theory (Jones and Nisbett, 1971), they did give some support for the hypothesis.
CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

This study has covered several different topics in a whole array of closely knit and interrelated hypotheses. The results dealt with each hypothesis separately. In this discussion chapter, it was considered worthwhile to focus on each topic and discuss it across all the hypotheses that pertain to it. In keeping with this plan the following topics will be discussed: (i) attraction, (ii) social distance ratings, (iii) tradition and modernization, (iv) actual contact, (v) conditions of contact, and (vi) attributions.

Attraction

The first thing that strikes one about this study is the confirmation of the "Law of Attraction" in an Indian context. One finds that attraction is indeed a positive linear function of the proportion of similar beliefs purported to be held by a stranger. First, this was found to be true for overall belief similarity (OBS), and second, for the two sub-factors of belief similarity: i.e., general belief similarity (GBS) and caste belief similarity (CBS). This confirms the findings of Byrne and his associates (Byrne, 1961;
Byrne, 1962; Byrne, 1971; Byrne and Clore, 1966; Byrne and Griffitt, 1966; Byrne and Nelson, 1965; Byrne, Nelson and Reeves, 1966; Clore and Baldridge, 1968; and Griffitt, 1971). As belief similarity increases, attraction also increases. What is particularly striking is that this relation was supported in a different cultural context, even when no special effort was made to operationalize attraction for the new setting. Davidson and Thomson (1980), while arguing for functionally equivalent and cross-culturally validated measures, emphasize that these are not easy to develop. They state however, that the difficulty of developing such measures decreases as the strength of the theory or model one is testing increases. In the case of the "Law of Attraction," the lack of a cross-culturally validated measure of attraction was compensated by the strength of the theoretical relationship of attraction and the proportion of belief similarity. However, the fact that attraction was not operationalized for the Indian context, probably explains why the relationship was not found to be very strong. Better results could possibly be obtained with attraction specifically operationalized for India and the caste system.

Another reason for the lack of a strong effect of belief similarity (and perhaps caste similarity) is that the Byrne IJS, as utilized in this study, required subjects to respond
to a "hypothetical" person; in contrast the Byrne-type studies presented the stimulus as a real person, whom the subjects could possibly meet somewhere. The present study was originally planned to present the stimulus to the subjects as a real person, but owing to the great reluctance shown by many rural subjects to rate and evaluate a real-life person, the stimulus had to be presented only as imaginary. This, too, may have diminished the strength of the attraction ratings.

Furthermore, comparing caste belief similarity (CBS) and general belief similarity (GBS), the GBS vs. CBS contrast yielded a significant $t$ value, and showed that GBS did influence attraction significantly more than CBS (See Hypothesis 1.1). This relatively stronger influence of GBS was also borne out by the ANOVA (See Table 2), which yielded a larger $F$ for GBS than for CBS. The Omega Square values for GBS and CBS show that they explained 4.73% and 2.54% of the variance in attraction respectively. GBS was twice as influential as CBS in leading to attraction. Here, the small effect of CBS implies either (a) that the CBS is really not too important to the level of attraction one feels towards a stranger, or (b) that the topic of caste was a very sensitive one, making the subjects defensive, and consequently more cautious in admitting their dislike for or prejudices against those who did not agree with their caste
beliefs. Everyone who is knowledgable about the caste
system in India is aware that the first alternative is con-
trary to fact. Besides, the evaluation by interviewers and
the subjects' own ratings about the social desirability of
their ratings points in the direction of the second alterna-
tive. As Table 24 shows, the rural subjects were very cau-
tious, and were rated by the interviewer as being not com-
pletely honest in their responses. Similarly, looking at
Table 25, one finds a similar pattern, where the rural sam-
ple felt about as threatened as the higher caste subjects.
The latter alternative is also confirmed by the overall
impression of the experimenter, who personally moved around
in both the rural and urban areas, and spoke to several peo-
ple informally. Most of their off the record comments seem
to indicate that caste beliefs were indeed very strong and
that the inclusion of this factor was a definite source of
great threat to them. This led the experimenter to conclude
that subjects were very defensive in their responses and
cautious about how they were judged, and consequently were
not completely sincere.

Attraction was also found to be influenced by the city-
rural factor, when the analysis was done with and without
the covariates (See Table 2). The city-rural differences
indicated that, contrary to normal expectations, the rural
sample had a higher threshold of openness to stimuli than
TABLE 24

Interviewer Evaluation Broken Down by City-rural and Subject Caste.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Caste</th>
<th>Brahmin</th>
<th>Maratha</th>
<th>Mahar</th>
<th>Overall Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural SS</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>8.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Means</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>9.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Effects:

City-rural \( F(1, 426) = 287.04, (p < .001) \)
Subject Caste \( F(2, 426) = 13.34, (p < .001) \)

Note: Range of Interviewer Evaluation = 0 to 10.
### TABLE 25

**Normative Threat Broken Down by City-rural and Subject Caste.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Caste</th>
<th>Brahmin</th>
<th>Maratha</th>
<th>Mahar</th>
<th>Overall Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban SS</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural SS</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Means</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main Effects:**

- **City-rural**  \( F(1, 426) = 6.86, \ (p < .009) \)
- **Subject Caste**  \( F(2, 426) = 8.59, \ (p < .001) \)

**Note:** Range of Normative Threat = 0 to 10
the urban sample: rural mean for attraction = 6.82, and city mean = 5.85. However, this rural openness will have to be qualified because the caste similarity "same" vs "other" differences for the urban and rural samples showed that the rural sample was more open to "same" caste groups and less open to "other" caste groups: the rural mean for attraction in the caste similarity "same" condition was 7.66 and in the caste similarity "other" condition was 6.40, with a difference of 1.26 between the two; in contrast, the urban mean for attraction in the caste similarity "same" condition was 6.25 and in the caste similarity "other" condition was 5.65, with a difference of .60 between the two. Thus, although the rural sample was more open on the overall mean than the urban sample, it was more ingroupish than the urban sample. Besides, the variance explained by the city-rural factor is reduced from 4.03% to 2.42% with the inclusion of the covariates. This implies that a substantial part of the city-rural differences are due to the covariates of modernity, socio-economic status and casteism.

Rural India, with its relative lack of exposure to modern ideas and a rather severe lack of modernization, was expected to be more traditional and custom-bound by holding on to the old institution of caste more strongly. Several authors have claimed that caste in rural India would have a stronger grip over the people (Srinivas, 1962), or that
rural areas would be more prejudiced (Simon, 1965): consequently these factors would have a strong influence in leading to attraction. Hence, within the subject caste by stimulus caste interaction, stimuli of the same caste as the subject were expected to be rated as more attractive in the rural than in the urban areas. There was a "main effect" of caste similarity although subject caste or caste of stimulus by themselves did not influence attraction (See Table 2). But the city-rural by subject caste by stimulus caste interaction was not found to be significant: the effect of caste similarity was not different for the city and rural samples.

Looking at the relative strengths of the main effects of belief and caste similarity one finds that each explains 6.67% and 3.35% of the variance in attraction. Belief similarity was more important: belief similarity had twice as much impact on attraction as caste similarity. In the context of several studies (Byrne and Wong, 1962; Insko and Robinson, 1967; Newcomb, 1956; Rokeach et al., 1960) belief similarity was expected to be the dominant factor. This expectation was supported by the results of this study. Other studies (Bergeron and Zanna, 1973; Triandis and Davis, 1965) found that race (group membership) also accounted for a significant amount of the variance in attraction, because of strong ingroup norms. This too was supported in that caste (group membership) did exert a significant influence
on attraction. It cannot be denied that the caste system does involve strong ingroup norms (Dumont, 1970; Kolenda, 1978; Mahar, 1958; Simon, 1965; Srinivas, 1962) and hence it is quite understandable that caste should also be an important factor explaining a significant amount of variance in attraction.

Knowing the caste system and how it functions in India, one ought to be surprised that this effect of caste membership was not any stronger. Wherever you go in India, some of the very first questions asked of a stranger are: "Where do you come from?" and "What is your name?" "What is your paternal and maternal ancestry?" etc. (Bhattacharya, 1968). The questions are often adequate to identify one's caste and influence all subsequent interactions. Hence, it is clear that caste is quite salient in the minds of the people. Moreover, the caste issue, tied as it is to hierarchical status and discriminatory practices, is a very sensitive issue, and consequently does not easily permit subjects to be completely unbiased and honest. This latter reason also is a possible explanation for the small effect of caste similarity.

These results are limited, of course, to the way in which belief similarity and caste were operationalized. The results would probably be different if the operationalizations of belief similarity and caste were done in some other
Moreover, Triandis and Davis (1965) had expected and found race (group membership) influencing attraction when more intimate behaviors were used to measure attraction. The fact that caste similarity was found to influence attraction, although (a) it was not made as salient as belief similarity, and (b) it was not operationalized in terms of very intimate behaviors, shows the stranglehold that caste has over the common man in India.

One explanation for the absence of the greater strength of caste similarity over belief similarity in the rural areas could be that the rural folk, due to their lack of exposure to city interviewers or social desirability of the dependent measures, gave cautious responses. Once again one could look at Tables 24 and 25, to ascertain that the subjects did indeed appear threatened by the questionnaire. Here too, the informal chats with would-be interviewees and post-interview off the record remarks from subjects do indicate the extreme caution exhibited by the rural sample. This caution on the part of rural sample probably reduced the strength of the subject caste by stimulus caste interaction.

Another plausible explanation for the lack of the caste similarity effect could be that all subjects were volunteers. This "self-selection" may have led only those who were more open and liberal to volunteer for the study. One
could rightly assume that, only those persons who had little or nothing to hide in terms of their "socially" unacceptable caste relationships were among those who readily agreed to be interviewed. There were several who refused to be interviewed (the experimenter regrets that no data were collected to document this), among whom may have been the more bigoted and less open of the possible subjects.

A third possible explanation for the absence of the greater strength of the caste similarity effect in the rural area could be due to the fact that the city and rural interviews were conducted by two separate interviewers. Although efforts had been made to ensure that each interviewer would use the same standard procedure and explanations, it is not unlikely that some variations crept in, which may account for the city-rural differences. However, one must note that if there were any biases, they did not consistently show up in the same direction. For instance, the rural sample was higher than the urban one on the attraction measure, but the urban sample was more open on some of the SD ratings than the rural one. Furthermore, on the SD marriage item, the rural subjects showed a greater openness toward persons of their own caste, an openness which was much higher than the openness shown by the urban subjects. Thus one does find sufficient variability to support a lack of any consistent bias. The inability to keep to a limited schedule, and at
the same time to get one reliable interviewer to do all the interviews was a real limitation of this study.

Given the way belief similarity was manipulated and made salient, and the fact that reminders of caste similarity were minimal, the caste similarity aspect, although not forgotten, faded into the background, and did not affect the subjects as much as it otherwise might have. Although reminders of both belief and caste similarity were used throughout each interview, special care had been taken to keep the subjects reminded of the proportion of GBS and CBS, and this may have made the beliefs seem more important than the similarity of subject and stimulus castes.

Besides the differences due to caste similarity, the ANOVA also yielded a 3-way interaction of subject caste by stimulus caste by CBS across all subjects, showing that CBS leads to greater liking when the person is of the same caste than when he is of the other caste. This subject caste by stimulus caste by CBS interaction confirmed earlier findings, which showed that a stigmatized person would be disliked even though he was similar to the subject. In their study, Novak and Lerner (1968) dealt with stimuli who were stigmatized because of some mental/emotional illness, and were consequently repulsed. Byrne and Lamberth (1971) have also reported several replications of the Novak and Lerner study. In this study, stimuli with similar caste beliefs
were not liked in proportion to their belief similarity, because belonging to the "other" caste was enough of a stigma to warrant dissociation from them. Apparently, when a person of the other caste is similar to the subject on caste related issues the situation is as anxiety provoking as when the person is similar but is stigmatized for some "unacceptable" condition. Taylor and Mettee (1971) found that a pleasant similar other was liked more than a pleasant dissimilar other. Thus, being different on one dimension was enough to create some dislike, although the stimulus was likeable along another dimension.

Both belief similarity and caste similarity influence attraction. Furthermore, both the sub-factors of GBS and CBS are important, except that GBS seems to be the stronger of the two influences. All in all, the effect of caste similarity and CBS seem to be weakened by the fact that the caste issue is a very sensitive one. In reality, the influence of caste and caste-related beliefs are probably much stronger than the data seem to indicate.

Social Distance Ratings

When we go beyond the mere expression of liking and ask our subjects about the various types of behaviors they would be willing to tolerate of stimulus subjects, one finds the belief similarity factor, which was quite strong in affect-
ing liking, is completely obliterated. When it comes to the mere verbal expression of liking for a stimulus person, belief similarity is more important than subject caste or stimulus caste taken singly or even when combined to yield a common factor of caste similarity. However, when it comes to behaviors between the subject and "other" stimulus castes, the factors which do exert any influence are the city-rural and subject caste and stimulus caste (See Tables 6, 8, and 9) while the factors of GBS and CBS are non-significant. This lack of a main effect for belief similarity in any form was truly remarkable, since the SD behaviors were a perfectly legitimate way of operationalizing attraction.

Table 26 shows that the correlations of attraction with the three SD ratings were fairly high and significant, indicating that the SD ratings were also measuring what can be termed as attraction. There is definitely something about the nature of the SD ratings that make belief similarity fade into the background and allow caste similarity to become so dominant. Another way to compare attraction and the SD ratings is to look at the pattern of interactions yielded by the attraction measure in the ANOVA and by the three SD ratings in the five-factor MANOVA. From such a comparison it is clear that there are some common interactions which are found for both attraction and SD ratings:
TABLE 26
Correlations of Attraction with SD Measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attraction</th>
<th>Pearson Product Moment Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with SD Home</td>
<td>.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p &lt; .001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with SD Public</td>
<td>.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p &lt; .001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with SD Marriage</td>
<td>.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p &lt; .001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Overall SD</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p &lt; .001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Degrees of freedom for correlations = 430.
subject caste by stimulus caste by CBS, subject caste by stimulus caste and the city-rural by subject caste. This seems to indicate that CBS is somewhat important for the SD ratings as it is for attraction. However, there were no main effects for GBS and CBS for the SD ratings as there were for attraction. For attraction, GBS was significantly more important than CBS, while CBS was important only in some of the higher order interactions in the SD analyses.

Another possible reason for the lack of any main effect of belief similarity might be the way it was manipulated. Belief similarity may have had a stronger effect if: (a) a different degree of separation had been used (e.g., 10% vs. 90% instead of the 20% vs. 80%), or (b) more levels of similarity has been utilized, or (c) the total number of belief items had been increased. This would probably have made the manipulation of belief similarity not only easily noticeable but also more realistic.

The city-rural factor was found to be significant for SD home and SD public and non-significant for SD marriage. First, the urban sample was more open on the SD home; and while the rural sample was apparently more open on the SD public (See Hypothesis 1.6), it was in fact more open to those who were "same" than to those who were "other" on the caste similarity factor. The difference between the ingroup vs. outgroup openness was greater for the rural sample than
for the urban one. The rural context with its caste-ridden mentality still protects the home environment from encroachment by "other" stimulus castes, while it can afford to be somewhat lenient on interactions away from home.

Second, another factor that did influence this was that a village is, physically speaking, a rather small entity and interactions away from home cannot really be very far from home: it probably implies a walking distance of about one mile or less. For the urban sample, on the other hand, SD public behaviors could be several miles from home and involve travelling quite a distance. Besides, the urban context with its relative openness provides greater opportunities for interacting with other caste groups near the home and consequently eliminates the "need" for such interactions away from home.

Third, the lack of openness to other caste groups among the rural sample is the result of the housing pattern which segregates caste groups into different parts of the village. It is rare that low caste persons, except when they are Government employees or possibly very well educated, would live within the village settlement. More often than not, the low caste persons would live in a settlement some distance from the bulk of village housing or with some luck, on the fringe of the village. This definitely reduced the opportunity for the lower castes to associate with other high caste groups.
The differences between ingroup and outgroup openness on the SD ratings for the city sample were relatively small. The city-rural effects for both SD home and SD public are not independent of the covariates. The main effects of city-rural for SD home and SD public are obliterated when the three covariates are entered. This points to the differences between the city and urban samples being a function of their modernization, socio-economic level and the casteist mentality.

Although one does not find a main effect of city-rural for SD marriage, one ought not to be deceived into believing that there are no city-rural differences. The rural sample was extremely ingroupish on the marriage factor, so that the difference between its ingroup and group choices was very large. The urban sample was also less open to the outgroups but the difference was not too sharp. Thus, although the overall openness of the rural sample was greater than the city sample, this overall rural average was inflated by the super-ingroupishness of the rural sample. It is worth noting that on SD marriage, each subject caste is ingroupish in saying "Yes" to an approximately equal number in the "same" stimulus caste (Brahmins = 35, Marathas = 34, and Mahars = 35); however, when it comes to the number of "Yes" responses in the "other" stimulus caste condition, one finds that the Mahars are the only ones who make more outgroup choices.
(Brahmins = 26, Marathas = 23, and Mahars = 57). This seems quite natural for the Mahars, because marriage with out-groups implies moving up the status ladder in society, while for the Brahmins and Marathas, it means giving up their caste-related high status.

Comparing the three covariates, it is obvious that casteism exerts the strongest influence on SD home, accounting for 7.07% of the variance; it also exerts a moderate influence on SD marriage, explaining 2.88% of the variance (See Table 11). The next important covariate was socio-economic status accounting for 3.77% and 4.01% of the variances in SD public and SD marriage respectively. The OM-12 showed itself to be the weakest of the three, explaining 1.82% and 1.77% of the variances in SD home and SD public, respectively. Thus, modernization as measured by the OM-12 did not account very much for the different levels in the dependent measures. The dominant position of casteism fits in perfectly with the caste-conscious society, which is afraid to admit its part in the oppressive structure, but also does little to discourage the flagrant violation of the rights of lower castes, who linger at the bottom of the totem pole.

The subjects in this study were more affected by caste beliefs - traditionally backed by the "orthodox" religious - and by their own socio-economic status. More than just accepting modern ideas in general, one has especially to
give up traditional caste beliefs and also enjoy a fairly high socio-economic status in order to be open to others on the SD ratings. Table 27 shows a pattern of mean values for socio-economic status that parallels the OM-12 (See Table 15). The correlations of OM-12 with socio-economic status (.521, df = 430, p < .001) indicates that attitudes toward modernity and economic well-being go hand in hand. Again, the correlations of the casteism scale with socio-economic status (-.140, df = 430, p < .002) and with the OM-12 (-.387, df = 430, p < .001), show that casteism diminishes as the economic well-being and favorable attitudes toward modernity flourish. In this context, many more SD interactions would be encouraged between the various caste groups by reducing the dominance of caste beliefs, and by raising the socio-economic status of the people. The relatively stronger effects of casteism on the SD ratings seem to suggest that the subjects' efforts to give only cautious and socially desirable responses were not entirely successful.

The other aspect of the SD ratings is the presence of a clear cut hierarchy from the most intimate to the most public. Triandis and Davis (1965) found support for the view that greater social distance would be maintained between persons of diverse racial groups when it comes to intimate rather than public behaviors. This finding was also confirmed here (See Table 7). Rokeach et al. (1960), while
TABLE 27
Socio-economic Status Broken Down City-rural by Subject Caste.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Caste</th>
<th>Brahmin</th>
<th>Maratha</th>
<th>Mahar</th>
<th>Overall Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban SS</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>12.81</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>10.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural SS</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Means</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>8.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Effects:
- City-rural: \( F(1,426) = 263.94, (p < .001) \)
- Subject Caste: \( F(2,426) = 46.30, (p < .001) \)

Interaction:
- City-rural by Subject Caste: \( F(2,426) = 8.42, (p < .001) \)

Note: Range of Socio-economic Status = 0 to 20.
examining the race vs. belief controversy, had also found that Whites rejected Blacks who had similar beliefs from intimate social relationships, but apparently liked them when they engaged in more casual encounters. SD marriage is the one interaction which is strongly guarded by the most extreme form of ingroup breeding. The other measures, SD home and SD public, are more susceptible to change than the marriage item. And in the case of SD home and SD public the subjects were more willing to tolerate behaviors which were public than those which were near home. If any realistic change is to take place in the amount of SD behaviors between the caste groups, one would have to start with goals that are achievable, namely those more amenable to change like the SD public behaviors rather than with those which would be more resistant to change, like SD marriage, or even some of the SD home items.

It was also expected that the subject caste by stimulus caste by CBS interaction for attraction and SD home would yield a different pattern for the city and the rural areas. Basically, one would expect a 4-way interaction of city-rural by subject caste by stimulus caste by CBS. But no such interaction was found for any of the SD ratings. One finds however, a pattern contrary to one’s expectations, which indicates that the caste belief factor is of greater concern to the urban sample than to the rural one. Table 12 which
shows the differences between the city and rural means for GBS and CBS point to SD public as the area where all subjects are interested in associating with stimuli who have similar caste related ideas, while they are not too concerned about this when it comes to SD marriage. One reason for this seems to be that the marriage item is so protected by all the "do's" and "don't's" that the question of checking into CBS just does not arise, because it is taken for granted. The rural sample, in a similar way, was not concerned about CBS when associating with other stimuli, while the city sample liked stimuli who were similar to them in caste beliefs and would associate with them on the SD home, and SD public type behaviors. The rural sample lived in an environment protective of its caste structure and beliefs, and hence did not feel too threatened by "some" differences in caste-related beliefs. For the urban sample however, which is constantly bombarded by a whole variety of "anti" caste beliefs and behaviors, CBS seemed to be more critical than GBS. History bears it out time and again, that when the existence of a group is threatened by an "hostile" environment, the group fights back to protect itself.

In the case of SD ratings too, there were problems of ceiling effects due to the social desirability of the measures. Very often subjects would give a response indicating high openness to "other" castes, although they did not
really mean it. One rather clear instance of this was seen by the experimenter in an exchange of ideas with a rural Brahmin. After the interview was over, a Brahmin who had said that he was open to let his son marry outside the caste, made a complete about-face in a more informal talk with him. The experimenter was willing to admit that often, the lower caste people in a rural area are not too concerned about hygiene and cleanliness, a factor instrumental in explaining the reluctance of the Brahmins to associate with them. This encouraged the Brahmin to venture on a long tirade against the lower castes for their lack of education and culture, as the principle reason why the Brahmins do not easily inter-marry. The experimenter suggested a scenario in which a good-hearted Brahmin would adopt a low caste child and bring him up according to all the standards of education and culture prevalent in a Brahmin household, and then asked the Brahmin whether he would be open to let his daughter marry such a "cultured" but low caste person. At this, the Brahmin was incensed and angrily retorted: "The question of marrying or giving my daughter in marriage is no concern of anybody outside my household." This seems to discard the notion that the upper castes do not inter-marry with the low castes for reasons of hygiene, education, or culture. The idea of possessing "blue-blood" and caste-superiority, which cannot easily be wiped out or overlooked even if others abide by their standards of hygiene, educa-
tion and culture lurks at the back of their minds.

Thus, in summary, it could be said that the SD ratings used in this study were good indicators of the level of prejudice which exists within the caste context. The subject caste and stimulus caste surface again and again in different ways to show how they are important for within caste interaction, and how they discourage relationships with other caste groups. The CBS factor also featured in some of the higher order interactions.

**Tradition and Modernization**

With regard to hypothesis 1.6, the results show that greater SD was maintained by the rural sample, which was more casteist, although not significantly so for SD public. Table 13 shows that the rural sample was more casteist and less open on the SD ratings. Although the same subjects could not be utilized for the religious beliefs scale, the results of the casteism scale from the main study (See Table 13) and the religious beliefs scale data from a partly different sample (See Table 14) were found to be parallel. This is due to the fact that the higher castes (Brahmins and Marathas) have all to gain by holding on to the caste system, while the Mahars have all to lose by the perpetuation of the status quo. The city Mahars are the lowest on the casteist scale and are also the most extreme in their rejec-
Concerning the question of religious "orthodoxy," the Brahmins and Marathas have shown higher scores on the religious beliefs scale than the Mahars. The latter demonstrate their utter rejection of the religious traditions which have harbored the hierarchical structure of the caste system. Although many Mahars openly take pride in belonging to their caste, in principle they have given up Hinduism and have embraced Buddhism. Most of the post-interview informal chats seemed to indicate their total disregard for "orthodox" Hinduism which has perpetrated oppression and misery for them over the centuries. In practice however, many Mahar Buddhists still hold to Hindu religious practices, and although they have "officially" become Buddhists, they are still treated like other Mahars who have chosen to remain within the Hindu fold. Basically, the Mahars are clamoring for equality and want to do away with the caste system, but are quite helpless in changing the minds and hearts of others around them.

The OM-12 did show only small subject caste differences which indicates that it was not a very potent measure to discriminate between them (See Table 15). However, it was a really effective tool to discriminate between the urban and rural samples. Although the rural sample was significantly less modern than the urban sample, it must be noted that the
city-rural difference on the OM-12 was not too large. This could possibly be a function of the inadequacy of the OM-12 (Amer and Schnaiberg, 1972; Berry, 1980; and Jones, 1977), because it measured only the individual's attitudes toward modernity, without taking into account the personality variables or the modernizing structures within society. Related to the previously discussed city-rural differences owing to the relative lack of exposure to modern ideas and a de facto lower level of modernization, is the idea that the rural sample would be more prejudiced than the urban one (Srinivas, 1962; Simon, 1965) with regard to its SD ratings.

By and large, the rural sample was definitely more prejudiced than the urban sample. The ingroup vs. outgroup difference for SD behaviors were proportionately larger for the rural than for the urban sample (See Hypothesis 1.4). Although it is true that the rural sample is more prejudiced than the urban sample, the differences between the two samples are largely a function of the three covariates: casteism, OM-12, and socio-economic status. The relative strengths of the covariates show that casteism is more influential than socio-economic status which in turn is more influential than OM-12 (See Table 11). Casteism goes hand in hand with religious "orthodoxy" to increase prejudice, while modernity and socio-economic status go hand in hand to reduce prejudice, except in the case of upper caste groups
who have vested interests in keeping the lower castes down and out. The OM-12 by itself was not a very influential covariate. However, if one agrees that (a) giving up casteist traditional values, and (b) improving one's socio-economic status, should be included in the idea of modernity, then modernity is really the "main covariate," the lack of which in the rural sample is largely responsible for the lower SD ratings toward "other" castes.

**Actual Contact**

The reported actual contact measures, as an index of the amount of social relationships maintained, were expected to correlate with attraction and the SD ratings. This was found to be so for the near home actual contact (near home AC) but not for the far from home actual contact (far from home AC) with attraction and SD public. Similarly, the correlations of the overall contact with attraction and SD public were non-significant (See Table 16).

First, the correlations were not all significant and in the expected direction. Even when they were significant, in keeping with the attitude-behavior consistency studies (Wicker, 1969), they were relatively small and consequently not too convincing (See Table 16). Basically, the correlations did not yield the expected pattern, both in terms of the direction and the strength of the relationships; hence
one could not conclude that there was much attitude-behavior consistency. The attraction and SD ratings refer to different specific stimuli than the measures of near and far from home actual contact: the attraction and SD ratings refer to a specific, but imaginary target having certain characteristics, while no such stimulus was presented to the subjects for their responses to the measures of actual contact. The latter measures dealt with real past interactions with all sorts of people within a specific stimulus caste. This lack of congruence in the specificity of the target responded to may have reduced the strength of the correlations. However, items included in both sets of measures did cluster together into near and far from home factors. This global sort of correspondence did yield values to marginally support attitude-behavior consistency, especially near the home front.

Also, the measure of attraction is only a verbal expression of liking, and does not commit the subject to tolerate any form of behavior on the part of the stimulus person. Hence, it is understandable that the subjects find it easier to report liking than tolerance for specific forms of behavior. Furthermore, even among the SD ratings, which required some definite commitment to tolerate different forms of behavior, there were degrees of involvement from the most intimate to the more public (Layton and Insko, 1974). Of all the three SD ratings the behaviors mentioned in SD pub-
lic (the more public behaviors) were more easily tolerated than the those in SD home or SD marriage. SD public is an area of interactions where attitude–behavior consistency is not very important. For the most part, interactions far from home take place in a fairly "anonymous" atmosphere, and even when the identity of persons is known, the frequency with which anti-normative behaviors take place make it impossible to abide by any ritual-pollution regulations. Thus, for the subjects in this study, attitude–behavior congruency seemed to be more critically important for the SD home or SD marriage items, than for the SD public or attraction (expressing verbal liking only) items. This is borne out by the fact that attraction and SD public seemed to fall into one category, in that they yielded a similar pattern of correlations with far from home contact and overall contact; and similarly, the correlations of SD home and SD marriage also yield a similar pattern of correlations. This probably explains the lack of significant correlations in the SD public/attraction area.

Another factor which may possibly explain the lack of strong and predictable correlations could be the lack of voluntary control over one's actual environment (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980). The attraction and SD ratings are dealing with the subjects' willingness to accept as a friend and engage in behaviors with stimulus. However, in the case of
actual contact, the situational variables over which the subject has little or no control may exert a greater influence on whether a subject really interacts with persons of other castes or not. A subject's favorable attitudes toward other castes may not find an opportunity for behavioral expression or vice versa, making it difficult to find attitude-behavior consistency.

Although only self-reported actual contact measures were taken, they seem to have been adequate to yield some support for the attitude-behavior consistency theory. However, these data were to a great extent influenced by social desirability, and consequently make these findings somewhat less convincing.

**Conditions of Contact**

Amir's (1969) contact theory of prejudice reduction also finds some support in that the conditions of actual contact did covary with reported contact and attraction. The conditions of contact, i.e., similar beliefs, same caste (similar group membership), living near (proximity), good acquaintance, considering as equal, and maintaining good relationships, all correlated with reported actual contact with values ranging from .133 to .432, all significant at $p < .005$ or better (See Table 18). Here, as in the case of attributions, the conditions of contact did not refer to any spe-
cific form of contact, and therefore one finds only weak support for the contact theory.

All the same, it is clear that contact based on certain conditions would have to be emphasized if one sought to reduce the negative impact of caste prejudice. First, in the context of this study these contact conditions would be those of similar beliefs and common group membership (Byrne, 1960; Byrne and Wong, 1962; Insko and Robinson, 1967; Rokeach et al., 1960, Triandis and Davis, 1965). However, the beliefs stressed should be in the direction of giving up the caste system, and group membership should deal with more than a narrow communal identity. Second, conditions fostering propinquity in terms of work, housing, and recreational facilities will also help in improving the situation (Hamilton and Bishop, 1976; Segal, 1974, Wilner, Walkley and Cook, 1955). With the growth and strengthening of democratic processes, concepts of freedom of opportunity and equality for all in all spheres of life are beginning to take root. These changes, coupled with civil relationships and even better friendships will go a long way in the effort towards integration. Contact conditions, which destroy any belief in an hierarchy like the caste system, afford people the opportunity to mix more freely with others and see the many commonalities among different groups, and thus lead to an era of true development and progress for all.
The only contact condition which did not correlate well with the near home AC and attraction was "disliking the caste system." This condition had been especially introduced for the Indian context to see if it would make any difference to the degree of contact maintained by the subjects. Near home AC yielded a non-significant but negative correlation with "disliking the caste system." This indicated that those who disliked the caste system did not engage in socializing with "others" near the house, or that those who did not dislike the caste system were forced to interact with "others" in the vicinity of their homes.

Although the above mentioned correlation was non-significant, the lack of voluntary control over one's environment (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980) makes the above explanations quite plausible. Low caste persons from the village, whose kith and kin are well-known to upper caste people, are not the normal targets of any near home AC interactions; but "strangers" - like the experimenter for one - whose roots are unknown, are treated fairly well by the upper castes, lest they reject someone who may be a Government official or perhaps one of their own caste. There are many villages where complete strangers, often from the lower castes, would be allowed access to temples on special feast days, while local low caste groups would be unofficially prohibited.

The regression analysis done on the conditions of actual
contact for the rural sample showed that both near and far from home AC was to a great extent a function of whether the target person "lives near" them: 23.6% of the variance in near home AC, and 23.4% of the variance in the far from home AC was accounted for by the "live near" condition. This makes sense for the rural situation because not only are most SD behaviors influenced by the caste similarity factor, but also there is little integrated housing for the various caste groups. For the rural sample, "maintaining good relations" and "similar ideas," conditions were also important for the far from home AC, but very weakly so. For the city sample, on the other hand, where integrated housing is only beginning to take place, the "live near" factor is less important: 8.2% of the variance in near home AC, and 2.6% of the variance in far from home AC accounted for by the "live near" condition. For the city sample, "similar ideas" and "maintaining good relations," and "similar ideas" and "know well" condition were important for the near and far from home AC respectively. Thus, proximity in housing was really a critical factor for the rural sample, but similar ideas and maintaining good relations with acquaintances were more important for urban one.

Last, since these conditions were also "self-reported" like their corresponding contact measures, social desirability was also operative here. Furthermore, no specific type
of contact was examined for each condition of contact, and this makes these findings—based on such loose linkage—somewhat dubious.

**Attributions**

In keeping with the predictions of attribution theory, it was expected that for those subjects who were more open to others, the SD ratings would correlate positively with internal attributions (IA). Similarly, for those who were less open to others the SD ratings would correlate positively with external attributions (EA). These expectations were not fulfilled across all the SD ratings (See Hypothesis 2.3). SD home was the only measure where (a) subjects who were more open made significantly higher IA (items 2, 4, and 6 taken together), and (b) subjects who were low on openness to others were made significantly higher EA (items 1, 3, 5, and 7 taken together). Even when one looks at all the subjects together, one finds SD home measure stands out with significant correlation values. The same is true also for the overall SD rating (See Table 23). The strength of these correlations stems mainly from attributions 5 and 6. For the rest, the results yield at best, very weak support for the attribution hypothesis.

If one were to advance possible reasons for this, one finds that first, the concept of attribution may not have
been accurately translated. Together with this difficulty, the subtle differences between internal and external may have complicated the issue still further. Second, even if the translations of these concepts were wholly accurate, they may well have been beyond the grasp of the common folk, especially those less educated. The correlations of SD ratings with all the attributions were examined for only the educated subjects, but this did not show any noticeable change in the chaotic pattern: two correlations changed in the direction of the hypotheses, four changed against it, eight correlations that were contrary to the hypothesis did not change their direction. None of the correlations which changed were significant. Third, although many subjects were not very open to other caste groups, they thought their behavior to be socially desirable. A close look at the social desirability ratings in Table 22 shows this quite clearly. This is probably due to a dual nature of social desirability, where what is desirable at the level of the caste is not so desirable at the level of society and vice versa. Thus no matter what answer was given by the subject, it could be socially desirable either from the point of view of one's caste or that of society at large. There is a self-serving bias at work here (Ross, 1977) which makes it difficult to separate the confound of social desirability according to caste norms and social desirability according to the norms of society in general. Last of all, the attri-
butions were not directed to any specific behavior, but rather to a whole set of SD ratings. A global response to a whole set of diverse behaviors may have confused the issue still further, and made it impossible for the subjects to respond in any consistent or reasonable way.

Basically, the attribution data yielded findings which were quite patternless and chaotic: with little or no support for the different types of perceptions relative to praise-worthy and blame-worthy behavior (Jones and Nisbett, 1971). Several methodological problems need to be sorted out and clarified.
One of the more significant aspects of this study is the overall support given to the idea that similarity leads to liking or conversely, the absence of negative prejudice. Of the five factors included in this study, city-rural, the two sub-factors of belief similarity and caste similarity (when subject caste and stimulus caste were combined) were the major influences on attraction scores. When both the belief similarity factors were examined in a single contrast to test for the effect of overall belief similarity, it was found to be stronger than the effect of caste similarity. Caste similarity, examined in a planned contrast from a combination of the factors of subject and stimulus caste, showed that it was a significant incentive toward greater attraction. The emphasis on belief similarity and group membership (caste similarity in this study) to encourage greater liking is consistent with most research done in the past. The question of their strength relative to each other seems to be a function of the contextual variables at play in any given situation. The caste-ridden context in India
is such that belief similarity had a far greater impact on attraction as measured by the last two items of the Byrne IJS, but the caste similarity dimension became salient and important when it came to inter-caste mixing and mingling.

The effects of similarity (belief and caste) on attraction however, are a mixed blessing. One aspect of similarity influencing liking relationship would be to keep similar caste beliefs from becoming salient and getting the upper hand. Although belief similarity did influence attraction favorably, CBS was counter productive when it came to liking other caste groups. The Brahmins and the Marathas were higher in their caste beliefs than the Mahars, and hence the former betrayed a casteist mentality. Caste beliefs, which support a casteist mentality, did undoubtedly influence subjects to refrain from demonstrating liking toward other caste groups. These, like caste similarity, would have to be discouraged, particularly because they structuralize the caste groups into a hierarchical pattern. Hence the idea of equality for all, independent of caste membership, also needs to be emphasized. There is no high and low or great and small. To be different, as all men definitely are, is not to be better or worse. Either one is human or one is not. If one is, then there is only one way to treat him/her, i.e., in a human way. The fact that others merely do not belong to the "our" group, but possess a "They-ness"
which is distinct from the "We-ness" is no reason for disliking and discriminating (Merton, 1972). The hierarchical structure that puts one group on a pedestal made of other oppressed groups is inhuman, because it denies the oppressed castes the dignity and rights which are due to them.

Caste similarity led to greater liking within caste groups. Similar others belonging to other groups were not liked as much as similar others from the same caste group. In this context, much as it is important to emphasize common group membership, one has to be careful to see that this group is not a small caste group, but a broader more encompassing group, which is open to cross-caste membership. The smaller the group, the easier it is to foster and maintain a within group feeling of belonging and acceptance. It could and normally does lead to conflict situations with many more groups. Conversely, if the emphasis is put on a large group with wider membership possibilities, one finds that it would be much harder to establish and maintain feelings of belonging and acceptance. This calls for a good balance between maintaining those aspects of the smaller group which foster a feeling of belonging and acceptance, and emphasizing identity within a a larger group which transcends narrow group boundaries. However, such a situation would also provide fewer outgroups with minimum opportunities for conflict.
One way to reach some sort of homogeneity between the caste groups would be that of amalgamation i.e., a biological intermixture of the various castes (Hunt and Walker, 1974). This seldom takes place through any planned official policy, and frequently takes place through unplanned situations which promote contact between different caste groups. But in the case of caste groups with strong ingroup marriage preferences, this process would probably take many many generations.

The topic of prejudice and discrimination also surfaces in this study. In terms of rating others on the attraction and SD ratings, on the one hand, there is fairly consistent bias in favor of the upper castes and against the Mahars. The latter, on the other hand, are also responsible for their unfavorable ratings of the Brahmins and Marathas, on both attraction and the SD ratings (except marriage). Prejudice is more than mere non-acceptance as a friend, it often includes negative behaviors. Although this study did not professedly look at any negative behaviors like beatings, expulsions from temples and restaurants, or other discriminating practices in terms of housing, jobs etc., there is no doubt that there is enough of negativity toward the lower caste groups to make such behaviors probable. For instance, the pattern of housing in the rural areas and even some urban areas is a clear indication of the extent of such dis-
crimination. The differences between the various subject castes is to be found both in the rural and urban areas. However, the city-rural differences show that rural India has quite a long way to go before free and open relationships begin to take place. But this does not mean that the urban areas are free of any discriminatory practices against "other" castes. The city ways of discriminating are probably a lot more subtle and difficult to detect.

One available option seems to encourage the process of "sanskritization" by which a lower caste can move up to the status of a higher caste (Srinivas, 1956). This apparently would allow lower caste groups to gradually merge with the higher groups making it impossible to discern them from the rest. This process would make caste a more lenient form of class, without the stigma of being born into a group for life. On the other hand, this very process of "sanskritization" assumes the givenness of a hierarchy which permits one to move up higher. Such an assumption cuts at the very roots of equality and admits to a structure of high and low among human beings. The admittance of any hierarchy is a step backward in a democratic country that officially subscribes to equality for all (Revankar, 1971). What one needs to do is to create an environment where any vestige of the past is completely obliterated. Sanskritization is a step which is counter-productive to this goal, hence one
needs to find another more functional alternative.

The Government of India in its effort to do away with the caste system has stopped collecting any data in its census records which will identify and categorize people according to their castes. From one point of view, this is indeed data lost; but from another point of view, the Government has taken a very sensible step in the process of doing away with the caste category. This made it extremely difficult for the interviewer to locate villages and city neighborhoods which housed the castes he was interested in studying. This also gave people the freedom not to identify themselves with any caste nomenclature, and thus maintain their freedom to assert their disbelief in the caste system.

Another way out of this situation suggested by several Indologists is to politicize the lower caste groups (Carter, 1974; Karve, 1972; Singh, 1972; Sirsikar, 1970). This process supposedly will make them aware of their rights, duties and group identity. Although this suggestion comes from good and well-intentioned people, the result of this effort has not been so promising. On the one hand, ruthless politicians have exploited them with broken promises in return for their vote, and on the other they find themselves polarized against other groups in animosity and conflict which has often resulted in incidents too horrible to describe. The recent mass slaying in Assam, India (McNulty, 1983) was
too gruesome an episode, one of many violent eruptions of an otherwise dormant volcano of inter-group rivalry. These were triggered off by all too politicized tribal groups, against settlers who had moved into the area in search of better living conditions.

According to the upper castes, the Government of India with its official policy of "protective discrimination" in favor of the schedule castes and schedule tribes have turned them into "Government Brahmins" (Srinivas, 1957). This has angered upper caste groups. Until recently, the allotted quotas for the schedule castes and schedule tribes in terms of places in educational institutions and jobs in Government organizations were rarely filled. But only as a growing number of them began to fill these reserved places through good education and better jobs, did it start hurting the higher caste groups. Although the blame for perpetuating the caste system is now placed squarely on the shoulders of the Government, no one comes forward with any better solution which will help the schedule castes and schedule tribes to rise from their state of abject poverty and oppression. The anger and frustration of the higher castes is often vented on poor helpless low caste peasants: last year alone there were several such instances of "Harijans" (low caste people) mercilessly slaughtered by unknown raiders, who are probably hand in glove with the powers that be (And now
Many such editorials from newspapers and other articles related to Harijan (low caste) conversion to Islam or Christianity (Akbar, 1982; Chawla, 1981; Malkani, 1981; Nilekani, 1981; Sonalkar, 1982), indicate how the issue of caste is extremely complex. On the one hand, the upper castes do not want to admit that they have been to a great extent responsible for the plight of the low caste people; on the other hand, they resent low caste Hindus embracing Islam or Christianity. Caught between the devil and the deep blue sea, the low castes are pushed into an extremely frustrating situation, from which there is neither relief nor any opportunity to move away from this helpless mess. Although the higher caste groups are in conflict over issues of power and control among themselves, they still seem quite united when it comes to protecting their vested interests against any encroachment by the lower castes. There is no doubt however, that the official policy of the Government of India is in favor of the low castes, but very often the local officials manage to find enough loop-holes to avoid implementing Government directives.

It is surprising that within each sub-sample the Brahmins and the Marathas were quite modernized, but still were among the more casteist and more prejudiced. Socio-economically, they are among the more privileged now, just as they were in
the past. With the advent of independence and democracy, other lower caste groups are competing for a greater share of the pie, which the upper castes are reluctant to give. In practice, the official policies of the Government are not quite "okay" with most of the upper castes, because it calls on them to give up their privileged positions in favor of others whom they did not and perhaps still do not consider as equal. Furthermore, with the temporary privileges granted to the lower caste groups, to enable them to come up to the level of the other castes, the upper castes are not only disgruntled, but often helpless to openly do anything to salvage their privileges and keep their upper status. This is probably another reason why there is so much subtle resistance to inter-caste relationships.

Another significant aspect of this study is that the conditions of actual contact correlate quite strongly with self-report measures of actual contact. This could show that subjects were aware of what helped them to interact with stimulus caste persons. These contact conditions need to be fostered to provide real opportunities for persons of various castes to meet and mix. If ever the amalgamation of the various caste groups is to come about, the conditions which permit contact between different caste groups have to be encouraged. One of the conditions which seemed very important was the one of "living near" each other. This
alone would help to bring many more people together in ways that would break down the artificial barriers resulting from the caste system.

Outlook for the Future

In speaking about India's ex-untouchables, Isaacs (1964) emphasizes their effort to hide their caste identity. He shows how this has been successfully done by so many who through good education and a good job have managed to grow out of their old ways and make good progress in the direction of becoming respectable citizens, who could stand up to anyone on a one-to-one basis. In terms of changing the present situation much faster, and in completely erasing any link with an ignoble past, the role of education is primary. Education is especially important in rural India, where almost 80% of the population lives. Efforts have to be made to reverse the high drop-out rate among school children and get them back to books and basics rather than keep them at home for short-lived gain as helping hands around the house. The lessons of fraternity, equality and justice for all have to be drilled into the hearts and minds of our young, so that there is no vestige of the past to haunt them. Education should be aimed at making people competent and skillful, and not at keeping them in their ignorance and want. The lower caste persons have to realize that if they want to go ahead and make progress in life it has to be done through
competence and skill, and not through hand-outs which will forever keep them dependent on the donor.

Contact on the basis of equal status will have to take place in a way that does away with all distinctions based on caste. There was a time in India, when one acquired social status and acceptance only through birth in one caste or another. This period is going or almost gone (Karve, 1972). Now status and acceptance often comes through one's competence and skill, job and income. This is a sign of great hope for the future of intercaste relationships. We should look forward to a time when there would be no need at all to mention one's caste to gain any form of respectability. Hence, anything to do with caste or caste-endorsing beliefs have to be stamped out once and for all. For educationalists in India, it is a primary goal; there is no other.

The Government has, as mentioned earlier, been instrumental in providing the schedule castes and schedule tribes with privileges as a form of "protective discrimination." This has no doubt benefitted the lower castes and tribes by providing them with better education and better jobs. At the same time, it has made it so lucrative for the schedule castes and schedule tribes to cling to their caste nomenclature, that they are in danger of being labelled as such for life. This protective discrimination, which was initiated only for a period of 10 years, has not been discontinued,
because the politicians have vested interests in satisfying the electorate, including the lower castes and tribes. In the long run, such a short-sighted measure will probably boomerang and hurt those whom it was intended to help. The Government also has similar programs, which aid the economically backward classes. Rather than use caste (group membership) as a pre-condition for aid, the Government should move in the direction of making economic backwardness the basis for aid. This way will help the upper castes and the lower castes, when they are in real need, precluding any favoritism based on caste membership. If the Government does not move in this direction soon, it faces the responsibility of explaining how it has been instrumental in preserving the caste system, in the name of helping the lower castes.

Besides expecting the Government to do its part, it would be important to support and encourage all who help to establish and maintain the conditions which lead to more inter-caste interactions. In this context, the experience of America in dealing with its Black-White race problem can throw some light on the caste problem in India. Equality of treatment and opportunity, regardless of caste should be the rule on all formal and on-the-job situations: education, housing, hiring, promotion, etc. The American experience of equal opportunity before the law, and at times even forced
desegregation at school (Pettigrew, 1969, Webster, 1961), at work (Parrish, 1966), and integrated housing (Farley and Taeuber, 1968; Hamilton and Bishop, 1976), etc., is slowly but surely beginning to pay dividends. Such an approach will give the lower castes an opportunity to slowly move up just as it has for so many Blacks in a country with a very racist history. However, the differences between the two situations will also have to be taken into account. The caste system has a longer history, which shows that it has been nurtured and supported by a religious tradition which accepts an hierarchical structure of the high and the low among the different castes. This is fundamentally different from the American way of life which is based on equality of opportunity for all. Such a contextual difference may demand a cautious approach in following the lead of America.

One of the important conditions leading to greater contact and interaction between different caste in this study is "living near." This means that in practice integrated housing for all caste groups should be the goal both in the urban and rural areas. If one visits any village in India, and examines to see what could be done in this regard, one cannot help but notice an insurmountable economic problem. Divisions of properties and housing units have for centuries followed a segregationist policy: there is no way in which this can be changed in a few years. It may require the
passing of several generations before any significant change can take place. However, let there be no hesitation about the direction in which the country should move or about the need of taking the first step in that direction. One thing that is known is that if a person is well-educated or a government official, people will not so easily discriminate against him because of his caste. It would be critical to make use of this inroad to break down barriers to segregationist policy and practice.

Second, fostering unity through the emphasis on similarities would also be important. The commonalities that unite us are far more important than the trivialities which divide us. In the final analysis, hopefully all will come to acknowledge that they are actually alike, probably descended from common ancestors in the remote past, and that between group differences are of little importance. The common attitudes and beliefs held by people, the common identity they share as people of one state or nation will all aid in bringing together rather than dividing and separating. This will be one way of making us comfortable in the presence of and accepting of one another.

The third point to pay attention to would be not to lose touch with reality. Although there are commonalities, there are also bound to be differences. Without being blinded by similarities, to be accepting of others in spite of differ-
ences would call for more mature sharing with and respect for one another. Human understanding is ill-served by bigotry, which emphasizes intergroup differences, and condemns others, or by blind, insensitive determination to ignore all differences on the grounds that all are the same. Diversity does provide a variety without which mankind would be the poorer. However, diversity could also lead to friction and conflict. Let us not fear to dialogue and share, realizing that the universality of our common nature is not something that ignores differences, but explores them. Differences there will always be, but to enrich ourselves through them and look beyond them to solve common problems and make this world a better place is the obligation of all men of good will.
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I A. Below you will find a set of 50 beliefs each of which have to be rated by you for two different reasons. First of all, you must rate them for their **degree of controversy** utilizing a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = Not at all controversial, and 5 = Very controversial. Similarly, you must rate each of these belief statements for their **degree of relevance to the Indian cultural context**. Here too, you will use a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 = Not at all relevant, and 5 = Very relevant. The first belief statement is illustrated in detail, while the others are merely typed for information.

1. The schedule castes/tribes are fit to use their brawn, not their brains. (R)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controversial</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Honesty is the best policy in all cases.

3. Generally speaking people do not work hard unless they have to.

4. India should vigorously advocate a policy of integrated
housing for all caste. (R)

5. Success in life is pretty much determined by forces outside our control.

6. Most peoples' first loyalty is to themselves rather than to their country.

7. God is the real author of the caste system. (R)

8. People are very much alike in their basic interests.

9. The idea of God is unnecessary for our enlightened age.

10. All have the primary obligation to promote the common good of society rather than the well-being of their caste. (R)

11. People should be open to new ideas even when they go against traditional values and beliefs.

12. People normally help rather than hurt one another.

13. Children of low caste parents do badly in school because of their "deprived" background. (R)

14. One must always avoid being dependent on other persons or things; the control over one's life should come from within oneself.

15. Religion is the opium of the people.

16. The oppressive tactics of the higher castes have been largely responsible for the poverty and misery of the lower castes. (R)

17. India's social problems are so vast and deep, that democratic methods can never solve them.

18. Land-owners dominated and oppressed the poor laborers.
19. It is alright to falsify one’s income certificate in order to qualify for the Economic Backward Class Scholarship.

20. Our government should take more affirmative action to do away with the caste system. (R)

21. People go too far in hiding their backgrounds by changing their names and even imitating the manners and customs of others.

22. People are always dissatisfied and looking for something new.

23. Privileges given to the schedule castes/tribes result in incompetent persons being promoted to positions of importance. (R)

24. People keep too much to themselves, instead of taking a proper interest in community problems and good government.

25. There are spiritual realities of some kind.

26. Indian society functions better with each caste having its own profession. (R)

27. There is little one can do to alter one’s fate in life.

28. There is no life after death.

29. The higher castes have effectively used religion to keep the lower castes ignorant and oppressed. (R)

30. There is a supreme being (God) who is concerned about and cares for the world.

31. What India needs is a strong dictatorship to make good
progress for its many poor millions.

32. It is useless to raise the expectations of the schedule castes/tribes and leave them disappointed and unhappy. (R)

33. Man ought to be guided by what his experiences tell him is right rather then by what past religious tradition dictates.

34. There is nothing beyond the material world which we perceive.

35. No one should be denied the right to take part in social events only because of their caste. (R)

36. People who try, but are unable to help themselves, have the right to expect help from others.

37. The cultural influences of western civilization have been detrimental to true and genuine progress in our country.

38. The hierarchical structure which results in the caste system is made by man. (R)

39. Patriotism and loyalty are the first and most important requirements of a good citizen.

40. Marrying outside one's caste should be encouraged. (R)

41. It is better to be ordinary and honest, than to be famous and dishonest.

42. Man is always responsible for his actions.

43. The system of reserved seats for schedule castes/tribes should be continued. (R)
44. Most people are basically good and kind.

45. A person can be quite happy and enjoy life to the full without ever believing in God.

46. All people regardless of their caste are equal and hence have an equal right to the benefits of society. (R)

47. Poverty could be almost entirely done away with, if we made some basic changes in our social and economic system.

48. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important things that children should learn.

49. The quota system is unjust since it discriminates against qualified and deserving members from the higher castes. (R)

50. Schools and colleges should teach students to accept the religious and social standards traditional to our way of life.

Note: Here is a list of scales from which some of the above statements have been borrowed. All page numbers refer to Robinson and Shaver(1975), and all item numbers refer to the items in the above list of belief statements.

   - Item 2 from Machiavellianism IV.
   - Items 3 and 44 from Machiavellianism V.
   - Item 41 from Kiddie Machiavellianism.
   - Item 5 from James's Internal External Locus of Control.

   - Items 6, 17 and 24 from Misanthropy Scale.

   - Items 8, 11, 12 and 27 from Philosophy of Human Nature.

   - Items 9 and 45 from Inventory of Religious Belief.

   - Item 14 from Dimensions of Value.

   - Items 15 and 42 from The 'Beliefs' Test.

   - Item 19 from Change in Moral Values.

   - Item 22 from Acceptance by Others.

    - Items 25 and 34 from Study of Religious Belief.

    - Item 28 from Dimensions of Religious Ideology.

    - Item 36 from Social Values Questionnaire Scale.
I B. Now, please go over each of the 50 belief statements and circle the number before those which in your opinion are related to the caste system. For example, if you consider the first belief statement is related to caste, then draw a circle around the number like this 1. Do not make any mark for the beliefs unrelated to caste.

Note: Statements which are marked with (R) were originally intended as caste related statements. In addition, other statements judged as caste related by pilot study subjects were also included as caste beliefs.

II Would you consider the following behaviors admissible on the part of a person of the ________ (stimulus caste name included here) Caste? Using a rating scale from 1 to 5, where 1 = Not at all, and 5 = Very definitely, circle the number which corresponds most closely to your answer. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can sit next to me on a bus.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now, if your answer is Not at all, then circle 1, and if your answer is Very definitely, then circle 5, and so on.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Can touch you.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Can sit on your cot.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Can come into your kitchen.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Can touch your brass utensils.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Can touch your earthenware vessels.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Can smoke your pipe.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Can smoke your bowl of pipe (hukka).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Can accept fried (pakka) food from him.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Can accept boiled (kaccha) food from him.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Can accept dry uncooked food from him.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Can take drinking water from his hand.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Can touch your water vessel.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Can touch your children.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Can marry into your family.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Can be your friend.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Can live on your street as your neighbor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Can be your co-worker in an office, factory or farm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Can be citizen of your country.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Can be a visitor only to your country. (If you had had your way).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Would be expelled from your country. (If you had your way).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Can be your boss.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The above set of items were presented to the subject thrice with each of the three stimulus castes included in the blank space. Thus, the relative differences in social distance ratings could be measured for each of the three stimulus castes.
III. Now, last of all, I want you to answer a few questions which will help us to classify and use the information you have given us in a systematic way.

1. Age: __________  2. Sex: Male / Female.
3. Caste: Brahmin / Maratha / Mahar / Other.
4. Number of years lived in urban area: __________
5. Number of years lived in rural area: __________
6. Mention one or two religious beliefs which you consider important to the Hindu religion.
   a) ___________________________________________________________________
   b) ___________________________________________________________________
7. Mention one or two reasons why people think that the caste system is either forced on them or chosen by them.
   a) ___________________________________________________________________
   b) ___________________________________________________________________
8. Mention one or two reasons why we should do away with the caste system in India.
   a) ___________________________________________________________________
   b) ___________________________________________________________________
This questionnaire is to study belief, attitude and friendship patterns among the three major caste groups in this region of Maharashtra. This study will also gauge the similarities and differences between the same three caste groups. All your responses to any of the questions asked here will be confidential. Thus, even though, your face and name will be known to us, your name will not be disclosed to anyone, nor written anywhere on this form.

I A. Following are a set of belief statements. Please rate your personal opinion on each of them using the following system: 0 indicates strong disagreement with the opinion, 1 indicates simple disagreement, 2 indicates only slight disagreement, 3 indicates slight agreement, 4 indicates simple agreement, and 5 indicates strong agreement. Listen carefully to each statement and then give a number indicative of your rating.

GENERAL BELIEFS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The idea of God is unnecessary for our enlightened age. 0 1 2 3 4 5
2. What India needs is a strong dictatorship to make progress for its many poor millions.

3. There is little one can do to alter one's fate in life.

4. People are very much alike in their basic interests.

5. Generally speaking, people do not work hard unless they have to.

6. Man is always responsible for his actions.

7. Honesty is the best policy in all cases.

8. The cultural influences of western civilization have been detrimental to true and genuine progress in our country.

9. There is nothing beyond the material world which we perceive.

10. People normally help rather than hurt one another.
CASTE BELIEFS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. The schedule castes/tribes are fit to use their brawn, not their brains. 0 1 2 3 4 5

2. Indian society functions better with each caste having its own profession. 0 1 2 3 4 5

3. The system of reserved seats for schedule castes/tribes should be continued. 0 1 2 3 4 5

4. Children of low caste parents do badly in school because of their "deprived" background. 0 1 2 3 4 5

5. India should vigorously advocate a policy of integrated housing for all castes. 0 1 2 3 4 5

6. The oppressive tactics of the higher castes have been largely responsible for the poverty and misery of the lower castes. 0 1 2 3 4 5
7. It is useless to raise the expectations of schedule castes/tribes and leave them disappointed and unhappy. 0 1 2 3 4 5

8. Privileges given to the schedule castes/tribes result in incompetent persons being promoted to important positions. 0 1 2 3 4 5

9. People go too far in hiding their backgrounds by changing their names and even imitating the manners and customs of others. 0 1 2 3 4 5

10. God is the author of the caste system. 0 1 2 3 4 5

II. Following is a set of demographic questions meant to collect information about some common variables which may have some influence on the similarities and differences between the many subjects interviewed. Where an exact answer is not possible, make your best guess.

1. Age: ___________ 2. Sex: Male / Female.

How long have you lived in the rural/urban area?

Specify: ___________ years.

6. Your level of education: (Choose any one):
   a) Below 4th Grade ___
   b) Grade 4 complete ___
   c) Between 5th and 7th Grade ___
   d) Between 8th and 10th Grade ___
   e) Between 11th and 12th Grade ___
   f) Some College ___
   g) Completed Baccalaureate ___
   h) Master's or above ___

7. Monthly Income (Rupees) of all earning household members put together.

   a) Less than 200 ____  b) 201 to 400 ____
   c) 401 to 600 ____  d) 601 to 800 ____
   e) 801 to 1,000 ____  f) 1,001 to 1,200 ____
   g) 1,201 to 1,400 ____  h) 1,401 to 1,600 ____
   i) 1,601 to 1,800 ____  j) 1,801 to 2,000 ____
   k) Above 2,001 ____

8. Do you own any landed property? Yes / No.

   If yes, how many acres? Specify: __________

   Total Rupee value of this property: __________

9. What is your regular occupation?

   Specify: ____________________________________
Here are some ratings given by another person who belongs to __________ Caste. The ratings given by him are his personal opinions about the same belief statements rated by you. Try to form an impression of this person: "What do you think a person giving answers like this is like?" Then, based on this information, I would like you to answer a few questions for me.

Note: Here the general and caste belief items filled by an hypothetical person were presented to the subject for his personal perusal and judgment. The degree of similarity/dissimilarity was manipulated as shown earlier in Illustration 1 (See Chapter II).

In response to this the subjects were asked to answer several sets of questions, some evaluating the stimulus person, others relating to the behaviors and attributions of the subject himself.

These were as follows:

A) The Byrne Interpersonal Judgment Scale.
B) Social Distance Ratings.
C) Attribution information, and
D) Questions regarding normative threat.
III A. Modified Interpersonal Judgment Scale.

Now I want you to recollect the impression you have of this person and answer the following:

1. Do you believe that this person is intelligent? (Choose any one answer).
   - Very Intelligent
   - Not at all Intelligent

2. Do you think that this person has knowledge of current events?
   - Certainly Has no knowledge
   - Has knowledge

3. Does this person impress you as being a moral person?
   - Extremely Immoral
   - Moral

4. Do you believe that that person is well adjusted?
   - Very Well
   - Very poorly
   - Adjusted

5. Do you feel that you would probably like this person?
   - Like
   - Dislike
   - very much

6. Would you like to work with this person on the same job?
   - Like
   - Dislike
   - very much
III B. Now once again, I want you to recollect the impression you have of this person and respond whether you would consider the following behaviors admissable on the part of this person.

1. Can touch you.  
2. Can sit on your cot.  
3. Can come into your kitchen.  
4. Can touch your brass utensils.  
5. Can touch your earthenware vessels.  
6. Can smoke your pipe.  
7. Can accept fried (pakka) food from him.  
8. Can accept boiled (kaccha) food from him.  
9. Can accept dry uncooked food from him.  
10. Can take drinking water from his hand.  
11. Can touch your water vessel.  
13. Can marry into your family.  
14. Can be your friend.  
15. Can live on the same street as your neighbor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Can be your co-worker in an office, factory or farm.
   No   Yes
   0    1

17. Can be your boss.
   No   Yes
   0    1

III C. To what do you attribute your permitting or not permitting the items mentioned in III B. Check as many as you think appropriate.

   No   Yes
1. Social Pressure. 0 1 2 3 4 5
2. Your own personal choice. 0 1 2 3 4 5
3. Religious values. 0 1 2 3 4 5
4. Your educational level. 0 1 2 3 4 5
5. Caste differences. 0 1 2 3 4 5
6. Your open-mindedness. 0 1 2 3 4 5
7. Situational limitations. 0 1 2 3 4 5
8. Your economic well-being. 0 1 2 3 4 5

III D. Questions to be answered by all subjects:

1. Do you think that an average person from your own caste group would be threatened by the questions asked in III B.?
   No   0 1 2 3 4 5 Yes

2. Would other persons from your caste approve of your responses?
   No   0 1 2 3 4 5 Yes
IV A. Measure of Actual Contact.

Now, specify as best as you can remember how often you did each of the activities with a person of 
_____ (stimulus) caste during the last month only.

1. How many times did you go out to the movies with 
a person of this caste?
Specify the number: ________.

2. How many times did you invite a person of this 
caste to have meals at your house?
Specify the number: ________.

3. How many times did you go to visit the house of a person of this caste?
Specify the number: ________.

4. How often did you go out to a restaurant (for 
tea/meals) with a person of this caste?
Specify the number: ________.

5. How often did you have a chat with a person of this caste?
Specify the number: ________.

6. How often did you work together with a person of this caste?
Specify the number: ________.

7. How many times did you invite a person of this caste to your house for tea?
Specify the number: ________.
IV B. Try and recollect the situations under which you did what you did in IV A. And for each of the situations mentioned below check the degree of agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. You both had common goals.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. You belong to same caste.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. You live near each other.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. You know each other from a long time.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. You consider him/her equal in status.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. You are favorably disposed toward him/her.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. You dislike caste system.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. A Modified Version of Overall Modernity Scale (OM-12):

1. Did you ever get so highly concerned about some public issue that you really wanted to do something about it? Please specify the number: __________.

2. If schooling were freely available (and there were no other obstacles), how many years of school do you think children of people like you should have? Specify the number: __________.
3. Would you agree with the farmer who said, "It is good to think of new and better ways of growing corn (or jowar)?"

   No  0  1  2  3  4  5  Yes

4. Would you agree with the person who said, "It is necessary for a man and his wife to limit the number of their children so that they can better care for those they already have?"

   No  0  1  2  3  4  5  Yes

5. Do you think that a man can be really good without having any religion at all?

   No  0  1  2  3  4  5  Yes

6. If you were to meet a person from another country a long way off (about 1,000 kilometers away), could you understand his way of thinking?

   No  0  1  2  3  4  5  Yes

7. It is good to have the best educated person who has special knowledge to hold important places in the country's government.

   No  0  1  2  3  4  5  Yes

8. The hard work of our people is the most important asset for the future of our country.

   No  0  1  2  3  4  5  Yes

9. Do you think that the progress made by science in industry and medicine has been beneficial to society?

   No  0  1  2  3  4  5  Yes
10. Would you agree that you are interested in reading international news?
   No 0 1 2 3 4 5 Yes
11. Do you belong to any organizations or groups like social clubs, unions or political parties?
    Specify the number:__________.
12. How often do you get your news and information from newspapers?
    Never 0 1 2 3 4 5 Everyday

VI. Manipulation Checks:
1. What was the caste of the person about whom you were asked so many questions?
   Specify the caste:__________.
2. Was the person about whom you were asked so many questions (stimulus) similar to you in his beliefs?
   Not at all   Yes, very
   similar 0 1 2 3 4 5 similar
3. Was the person about whom you were asked so many questions similar to you in his caste related beliefs?
   Not at all   Yes, very
   similar 0 1 2 3 4 5 similar
4. Was the person about whom you were asked so many questions similar to you in his more general beliefs?
   Not at all   Yes, very
   similar 0 1 2 3 4 5 similar
5. Do you think that people in society at large would approve of the type of responses you have given in this questionnaire?

Not approve Yes, approve
very much 0 1 2 3 4 5 very much

6. Would you be ashamed to admit and/or act according to the responses you have given in this questionnaire?

Not at all Yes, very ashamed
ashamed 0 1 2 3 4 5 ashamed

Final Questions: (For interviewer only)

1. Do you think that the interviewee gave honest and truthful answers?

No 0 1 2 3 4 5 Yes

2. Did the interviewee manifest any signs of uneasiness or fear during the interview?

No 0 1 2 3 4 5 Yes
APPENDIX C
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RELIGIOUS BELIEFS SCALE**

Interviewee Caste: ____________

1. Hindu festivals create a spirit of unity in society. 0 1 2 3 4 5
2. Each one's caste is determined by *Karma* in one's past life. 0 1 2 3 4 5
3. Hinduism's impact is very good since it's the best religion. 0 1 2 3 4 5
4. God always looks after the good people. 0 1 2 3 4 5
5. God is the author of the caste system. 0 1 2 3 4 5
6. I love the Hindu religion. 0 1 2 3 4 5
7. Every one must deal with each other with brotherly love. 0 1 2 3 4 5
8. I do not believe in reincarnation. 0 1 2 3 4 5
9. Sacrifice, devotion and faith have a place in one's life. 0 1 2 3 4 5
10. Each one must do one's duty without expecting any reward (*Nishkama Karmayogi*). 0 1 2 3 4 5
APPENDIX D

VERNACULAR EDITIONS
APPENDIX D.1

VERNACULAR EDITION

(Appendix A in Marathi)
१. वृत्तान्त संदर्भे

यांनी विश्वास विधानाचे संघ दिलेला आहे. त्यात स्थानीत प्रस्तुत विधानाचे
दोन केवळ विधानाचे काळद्वारे मुख्यमंत्री करावयाचे आहे. प्रमाण १ ते ५
ही मोजळदुटी वापरले ते विधान फलात विवाद आहे ते उत्तर :-

१ = निर्विवाद आणि ५ = उत्तितप्राप्त

यांनी विधानाचे ही विमाने भारतीय संसदीय मंत्रालय फलात सुरूलेला आहेत ते उत्तर.

२ = उत्तितवाद तुलनेत नाही आणि ५ = अन्यदेश तुलनेत आहे.

तुलनेच्या उत्तराच्या बदल असलेल्या आरक्षितांमध्ये गोरी करा.

1) अन्यवर्तन वातां-वातात लोक केवळ शास्त्रीय काळ करण्यासाठी तयार आहे, ते आहे.

निर्विवाद १ २ ३ ४ ५. उत्तित प्राप्त

उत्तितवाद तुलनेत नाही १ २ ३ ४ ५ अन्यदेश तुलनेत आहे.

2) प्रस्तुत बास्तवात प्रमाणाच्या माध्यम उत्तम मार्ग होय.

निर्विवाद १ २ ३ ४ ५. उत्तित प्राप्त

उत्तितवाद तुलनेत नाही १ २ ३ ४ ५ अन्यदेश तुलनेत आहे.

3) सर्वसाधारणांत: लोक अन्यदेश आश्वासनाला अतंग मोडणार काम करत नाहीत.

निर्विवाद १ २ ३ ४ ५. उत्तित प्राप्त

उत्तितवाद तुलनेत नाही १ २ ३ ४ ५ अन्यदेश तुलनेत आहे.

4) सर्व वातांत तयारी शास्त्रीय मूल्याना-मोजळदुटी तयारी पुरस्कार

निर्विवाद १ २ ३ ४ ५. उत्तित प्राप्त

उत्तितवाद तुलनेत नाही १ २ ३ ४ ५ अन्यदेश तुलनेत आहे.
4) जीवनार्थीत प्रमाण है बहुदोषी अवधुता नियन्त्रणाधार्त अनेक शक्तिशाली अवन्तित जन्म।

| निविदाद्वारा | १ | २ | ३ | ४ | ५ |
| कारणात मुंबई नाथी | १ | २ | ३ | ४ | ५ |

5) बहुतोष लोकेश्वर निवडता या रथ्याध्यात्र्य भव्यतानुसार स्वाभाविक पृथ्वी निगमित अवतार, राष्ट्रार्थी नाथी।

| निविदाद्वारा | १ | २ | ३ | ४ | ५ |
| कारणात मुंबई नाथी | १ | २ | ३ | ४ | ५ |

6) जातिरूपांत्र ही परम्परानेप निम्नांक केली आहे।

| निविदाद्वारा | १ | २ | ३ | ४ | ५ |
| कारणात मुंबई नाथी | १ | २ | ३ | ४ | ५ |

7) मुंबूत्र आशा-आश्नीक कारणी अवतारत तरी लोक साधकांने।

| निविदाद्वारा | १ | २ | ३ | ४ | ५ |
| कारणात मुंबई नाथी | १ | २ | ३ | ४ | ५ |

8) ज; प्रबोधनाध्यात्र्य या पुण्यत ईश्वरी कल्याण अनामशक्त आहे।

| निविदाद्वारा | १ | २ | ३ | ४ | ५ |
| कारणात मुंबई नाथी | १ | २ | ३ | ४ | ५ |

9) प्रबोधनाध्यात्र्य या पुण्यात आळ्याविरध अनुमानात गाम्यांचे स्थान आहे।

| निविदाद्वारा | १ | २ | ३ | ४ | ५ |
| कारणात मुंबई नाथी | १ | २ | ३ | ४ | ५ |
10) केवल अपना नाटक देखते हीत न जगता तव समाजाध्याय दिताध्याय विदाह
करने हे प्रयोजकते आय करत्या आहेत.

निर्दिष्ट वाद 1 2 3 4 5 जती विवाद
अधिबात तुलनेत नाही 1 2 3 4 5 उगडते तुलनेत आहेत

11) पारंपारिक बंधोनाअधिक मुल्यांक विशेष कर्नामात्र तोंबेकी
नवनीत कल्याणाना सामरे तेजे पहिले.

निर्दिष्ट वाद 1 2 3 4 5 जती विवाद
अधिबात तुलनेत नाही 1 2 3 4 5 उगडते तुलनेत आहेत

12) साधारणबने तोड कमेंटाट जसे देशायेखा मदत करतात.

निर्दिष्ट वाद 1 2 3 4 5 जती विवाद
अधिबात तुलनेत नाही 1 2 3 4 5 उगडते तुलनेत आहेत

13) कनिष्ठ जार्नलिस्ट पाहतायी मूले अपना "मैंचित" (गरीब) पालक्सेपियुके चरणारी पुष्टी कर-पंजत नाहीत.

निर्दिष्ट वाद 1 2 3 4 5 जती विवाद
अधिबात तुलनेत नाही 1 2 3 4 5 उगडते तुलनेत आहेत

14) बाहु गोट्टीपाट आधित अध व्यक्तिवर अवलल्यां राहते प्रयोजकते टाकले
पहिले; अपलि आकृत्यार अपता स्वतंत्र ताता असता हवा.

निर्दिष्ट वाद 1 2 3 4 5 जती विवाद
अधिबात तुलनेत नाही 1 2 3 4 5 उगडते तुलनेत आहेत

15) धर्म ही जासोसी जुक्या गोळी आहेत.

निर्दिष्ट वाद 1 2 3 4 5 जती विवाद
अधिबात तुलनेत नाही 1 2 3 4 5 उगडते तुलनेत आहेत
16) कनिष्ठ नातीयाच्या दाखिलपत्रात आधिक दुःखात उपशर्यांच्या कृपाने नामांकन पर बसते प्रमाणात कारणसूत्र जादे।

निर्दिष्ट   १  २  ३  ४  ५ जॉन विवाद
उद्धीर्ण तुलना करते १  २  ३  ४  ५ अनदेह सुंगगत जादे

17) भारताचे सामाजिक प्रसन हे साहित्य आधिक खोलत र्याच्या झालेले, की लोकांनी मानायले ते क्रायणे तुटणे घट जाणे।

निर्दिष्ट   १  २  ३  ४  ५ जॉन विवाद
उद्धीर्ण तुलना करते १  २  ३  ४  ५ अनदेह सुंगगत जादे

18) अमीन्दराच्या महिला, भूमिकाते शेखरच्या रिह्यान होते, त्यानी रिह्यान जुडून औज़ बनता।

निर्दिष्ट   १  २  ३  ४  ५ जॉन विवाद
उद्धीर्ण तुलना करते १  २  ३  ४  ५ अनदेह सुंगगत जादे

19) आर्थिकचंद्रा मानामढे संस्कृती अलेक्ट्र विवश्वासी भिक्षुहारी भविष्यासाठी सापडत्यात उपनापि झाले प्रमाणात निघाले, तर द्याचे झाले फुक नाही।

निर्दिष्ट   १  २  ३  ४  ५ जॉन विवाद
उद्धीर्ण तुलना करते १  २  ३  ४  ५ अनदेह सुंगगत जादे

20) जारीसंदेहे निहून्ने कर्षण प्रथमसाठी दुःखीने शांतनात अधिक दिवाचय कार्य करावा होय।

निर्दिष्ट   १  २  ३  ४  ५ जॉन विवाद
उद्धीर्ण तुलना करते १  २  ३  ४  ५ अनदेह सुंगगत जादे

21) आपणी जागृती कर्षणसाठी लोक काय वाढते ते करतात। आपणी नावे बदलतात, तर उत्तराचू रीतीमार्गी अनुश्य उल्लेख करतात।

निर्दिष्ट   १  २  ३  ४  ५ जॉन विवाद
उद्धीर्ण तुलना करते १  २  ३  ४  ५ अनदेह सुंगगत जादे
22) नायक नेहरू अस्तित्व राजनीति महाजना शहीदात साझेदार.

निर्विवाद  1  2  3  4  5  असंशय
शिष्य तुलना नाही  1  2  3  4  5  अत्यधिक तुलना आहे

23) निवृत्त राजीवजीतील लोकांना दिल्या आणि-या लोकी सकलांके सहजात्या पदावर रविवार शासकी नसलेन्या लोकांनाचे निपुंश रोहे.

निर्विवाद  1  2  3  4  5  असंशय
शिष्य तुलना नाही  1  2  3  4  5  अत्यधिक तुलना आहे

24) कार्यक्रम राजीवाचे उभारणीत अग्रणीमध्ये पंत पांडवांे कुठे लोकांना रत

निर्विवाद  1  2  3  4  5  असंशय
शिष्य तुलना नाही  1  2  3  4  5  अत्यधिक तुलना आहे

25) आधारित गोडटीपाची अक्षम आहे.

निर्विवाद  1  2  3  4  5  असंशय
शिष्य तुलना नाही  1  2  3  4  5  अत्यधिक तुलना आहे

26) आधारित निर्देशित द्वितौर बरका-या जाती-व्यवस्थेमध्ये भारतीय समाजाचे कार्य वागले वासले.

निर्विवाद  1  2  3  4  5  असंशय
शिष्य तुलना नाही  1  2  3  4  5  अत्यधिक तुलना आहे

27) आयतले देश बदलणे आधुनिक हाती नसले.

निर्विवाद  1  2  3  4  5  असंशय
शिष्य तुलना नाही  1  2  3  4  5  अत्यधिक तुलना आहे
28) इसलिए यथाप्राप्त जीवनली अतिशय नाहीं

निर्विदाद 1 2 3 4 5 जर्ति विवाह
अधिवास हुस्तेत नाहीं 1 2 3 4 5 अग्रदी हुस्तेत जाहे

29) करिकत अतीयन्त्र अपुष्पवा वर्त्तकाबाली आर्थिक अधानांत तेवारातांही
उच्च वर्त्तकाना ध्यानवा मोळ्या धर्मपालने वापर केला.

निर्विदाद 1 2 3 4 5 जर्ति विवाह
अधिवास हुस्तेत नाहीं 1 2 3 4 5 अग्रदी हुस्तेत जाहे

30) या जनाचा मार शा परसोंचा सत्त्वापर (तेवारान) जाहे. तोष या
लक्षणांची हामवी देतो.

निर्विदाद 1 2 3 4 5 जर्ति विवाह
अधिवास हुस्तेत नाहीं 1 2 3 4 5 अग्रदी हुस्तेत जाहे

31) अपुष्पवा स्वामाली द्विवृत्ती लोकांकी प्रगती करारकी असें, तर भारताला कटोर
हुस्तकाहीचे हानांकता जाते.

निर्विदाद 1 2 3 4 5 जर्ति विवाह
अधिवास हुस्तेत नाहीं 1 2 3 4 5 अग्रदी हुस्तेत जाहे

32) अनुपूर्त विद्वते बिंदुक्षेपाच्या लोकाच्या इतर-अर्वांका उपायानुसार लोकाना
अनुपालानी आर्थिक हुज्जी वनक्रमास काही अर्थ नाहीं.

निर्विदाद 1 2 3 4 5 जर्ति विवाह
अधिवास हुस्तेत नाहीं 1 2 3 4 5 अग्रदी हुस्तेत जाहे

33) पारंपारिक धार्मिक स्थिति वर्त्तक मानवाचेका मार्गाने रुवळ-ध्या अनुपूर्त
रक्षणेच फिरले पाहिजे.

निर्विदाद 1 2 3 4 5 जर्ति विवाह
अधिवास हुस्तेत नाहीं 1 2 3 4 5 अग्रदी हुस्तेत जाहे
34) अध्याय 2: आबाद-या या देविक अध्यायात्मिक दायित्व नहीं।

निर्विवाद 1 2 3 4 5 अर्थ विवाद
अविवाद हुनेगा नाही 1 2 3 4 5 उंगादी हुनेगान आहे

35) हेचक एकादश धातुमुख अध्याय-सामाजिक समारम्भात भाग
कार्याच्या हक्क नाहासता ब्रांज नये।

निर्विवाद 1 2 3 4 5 अर्थ विवाद
अविवाद हुनेगा नाही 1 2 3 4 5 उंगादी हुनेगान आहे

36) प्रयत्न कल्ही स्वाजांवी हीक भा बाब-या तसोंना ड्यावेकून मदतीवी
अपेक्षा कार्याच्या हक्क आहे।

निर्विवाद 1 2 3 4 5 अर्थ विवाद
अविवाद हुनेगा नाही 1 2 3 4 5 उंगादी हुनेगान आहे

37) पावराय परम्पराच्या प्रभाव अध्याय देशाच्या १-या प्रमाणासारखे पालक अर्थ
आहे।

निर्विवाद 1 2 3 4 5 अर्थ विवाद
अविवाद हुनेगा नाही 1 2 3 4 5 उंगादी हुनेगान आहे

38) हेचक-चिंतकात्या तत्त्वाच्या आधारेची जातिविविधता मानावाने तिरित्वन
केली आहे।

निर्विवाद 1 2 3 4 5 अर्थ विवाद
अविवाद हुनेगा नाही 1 2 3 4 5 उंगादी हुनेगान आहे

39) देशविधान अथवा निधिक्या उत्तम नागरिकसांनाची आयुक्तक अस्तित्वाचे
आय आर्थी प्रमाण गोष्टी आहेत।

निर्विवाद 1 2 3 4 5 अर्थ विवाद
अविवाद हुनेगा नाही 1 2 3 4 5 उंगादी हुनेगान आहे
40) उत्सर्जनीय विवाहं उत्सर्जन दिले गेले पाहिजे.
निर्णित वाद कँ 2 3 4 5 अजिन विवाह
अयोग्य तूल्यता नाही 2 3 4 5 अगदी तूल्यता आहे
41) प्रसिद्ध पर्याय सामाजिक उत्सर्जनाने सामाजिक पद सामाजिक अवग
जात योग्य.
निर्णित वाद कँ 2 3 4 5 अजिन विवाह
अयोग्य तूल्यता नाही 2 3 4 5 अगदी तूल्यता आहे
42) माम्लाच्या प्रस्थेक युद्धीला ती स्वतःं अवांदा अजती.
निर्णित वाद कँ 2 3 4 5 अजिन विवाह
अयोग्य तूल्यता नाही 2 3 4 5 अगदी तूल्यता आहे
43) अन्दरूनीत जाती-भागीतीतील माहीतीडू राजीव जयग टेकणाऱ्यांचे धीरेण ज्यू आयाते.
निर्णित वाद कँ 2 3 4 5 अजिन विवाह
अयोग्य तूल्यता नाही 2 3 4 5 अगदी तूल्यता आहे
44) क्षेत्रसेवे जो युगात सज्जन आणि दयाबू असतात.
निर्णित वाद कँ 2 3 4 5 अजिन विवाह
अयोग्य तूल्यता नाही 2 3 4 5 अगदी तूल्यता आहे
45) पहिलीवरासंबंधी घरिपणितीतील चौका न बामता मामूल आपल्या आपल्या पूर्ण असतात देखे शकती आणि उद्दीपन राहू शकती.
निर्णित वाद कँ 2 3 4 5 अजिन विवाह
अयोग्य तूल्यता नाही 2 3 4 5 अगदी तूल्यता आहे
46) सर्व मान्य समान आदेश, या ने हृदय का अवतार अनुसार आर्थिक दामोदर सामाजिक साँभारक नियोजित सिद्धांत याड़े का समान है क आदेश।

निर्दिष्टाद 1 2 3 4 5 अधि विधाय अवधाय सुनिगत नाही 1 2 3 4 5 अन्य दुर्लग आदेश

47) आर्थिक सामाजिक आर्थिक व्यवस्थित सुधार समय पहुँच आदेश तर दारिद्र्याणे समुद्र उपयोग करणे शक्य होईल।

निर्दिष्टाद 1 2 3 4 5 अधि विधाय अवधाय सुनिगत नाही 1 2 3 4 5 अन्य दुर्लग आदेश

48) महादरक पुत्ती आर्थिक वरिष्ठादुःख आदेश अथ दोनां सार्वत महत्त्वपूर्ण गोटी मूलत्यो विकासाच उद्देश

निर्दिष्टाद 1 2 3 4 5 अधि विधाय अवधाय सुनिगत नाही 1 2 3 4 5 अन्य दुर्लग आदेश

49) हायवन जन तेस्रपादी पघट उपयोग आदेश, कारण राज्य प्रायः आदर्श कृष्टि मूलता अलेलेखा, शक्य उपयोगिचंचय अन्याच अतिसौंदर्य होता।

निर्दिष्टाद 1 2 3 4 5 अधि विधाय अवधाय सुनिगत नाही 1 2 3 4 5 अन्य दुर्लग आदेश

50) भारत-महाविद्यापथमुँ विद्याध्यायांतर परिष्कारत सामाजिक आर्थिक धार्मिक आदेश बनायले आदेश

निर्दिष्टाद 1 2 3 4 5 अधि विधाय अवधाय सुनिगत नाही 1 2 3 4 5 अन्य दुर्लग आदेश
१ ४ : जाता ही पन्नात विधाने नामवारियर्दक वापूर रचालित जो विधाने बालिस्तर्यी तंबोद्र जाते असे तुम्हारा धाटेल. रूप विधानाद्वय अगूणाभावी गोतर करा. उदाहरण: पहाड़े विधान जातीयी संबंध जाते असे तुम्हारा धाट जेल, तर २ या आरूढ़वारोती १ जाता गोत करा. जो संबंधित सत्तवाना काहीय कुं कर नका.
2 3 : एकदा महार मापूर बालीलयांसाठी वागला, तर तुम्हारांना ते वागल का?

1 ते 5 ही मोजिदारी वापरल तुम्हार उत्तराला काढून अत्तेल्या आकड्याभोज्यांगोळ गोळ करा.

1 = अविभाज्य नाही आणि 5 = अन्यदिशा नव्ही वागल

उदा. : 

बसमध्ये माहिरभोज्यांडरी वागले.

अविभाज्य नाहीं 1 2 3 4 5 अन्यदिशा नव्ही वागल

यदि तुम्हारांना वागल तुम्हांचे उत्तर "अविभाज्य नाही" या "विभाजनशील" समजून अडळे, तर मग 1 या आकड्याभोज्यांगोळ 1 असा गोळ करा आणि समजा हुम्बे उत्तर "अन्यदिशा नव्ही वागल" जेसे असेल, तर 1 या आकड्याभोज्यांगोळ 1 असा गोळ करा.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>अविभाज्य नाहीं</th>
<th>अन्यदिशा नव्ही वागल</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) तुम्हारा विभाज्य वागल</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) तुमच्या बाटायर वागल</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) तुमच्या स्वरूपाच एकता वागल</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) तुमच्या फिल्टरच्या भांड्याकुंडयांना हात लायला वागल</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अहवाल संख्या</td>
<td>अवधी नाव</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>गृहदाय पारातील मातीदाया</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>गृहदाय पारापें र्याने अंदेलने</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td>गृहदाय हुक्का र्याने अंदेलने</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td>गृहदाय त्यागभूत फिस्केले</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td>गृहदाय त्यागभूत कोरडे पदार्थ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10)</td>
<td>गृहदाय त्यागभूत न फिस्केदे</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11)</td>
<td>त्यागभूत हाताचे पाणी ध्याल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12)</td>
<td>त्याने गृहदाय पाण्याला मोहोंकन अवला तालुक्यात वासेल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13)</td>
<td>गृहदाय मोहोंकन अवला तालुक्यात वासेल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14)</td>
<td>गृहदाय कुटुम्बातच त्याकाळी मर्यादा उक्लेले वासेल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15)</td>
<td>गृहदाय पिंग होऊ खेल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16)</td>
<td>गृहदाय शेखारी मृण वासेल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17)</td>
<td>गृहदाय ह्यूरीरीत, बांजावण्यात विविध शेल्त्यावर तड़कारी मृण वासेल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रमुखता नाम</td>
<td>अगदी नक्सी पालेल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२८) हुमध्या देशाया नागरिक म्हणून पालेल</td>
<td>१  २  ३  ४  ५</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२९) हुमध्या देशाया वेजव याहुशा म्हणून पालेल (हुमध्या हातात अले तर)</td>
<td>१  २  ३  ४  ५</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>३०) हुमध्या देशाया हाजुशन धात (हुमध्या हातात अले तर)</td>
<td>१  २  ३  ४  ५</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>३१) हुमध्या वरिस्द अधिकारी हॉलेला पालेल</td>
<td>१  २  ३  ४  ५</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
२ ४: खबादा मराठी मापून बालीपामारे वागला, तर तुम्हाला ते वागले काय?

१ हे ५ ही मोजापूडी वापरल्या तुम्हाला उत्तरात येव असलेल्या आपणांची गोल करा.

१ = अविवाह नाही आणि ५ = अगदी नक्की वागले

उदाह: 
बसल्या माझी मोजापूडी बसलेला वागले.

अविवाह नाही १ २ ३ ४ ५ अगदी नक्की वागलेले

जर तुम्हाला वागले तुम्हे उत्तर "अविवाह नाही" या "विवाहाची"
संबंधित आहे, तर मग १ या आपणांची १ असा गोल करा आणि
समज तुम्हाला युक्तत "अगदी नक्की वागले" इत्यादी उसे. तर ५ या
आपणांची ५ असा गोल करा.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>अविवाह करणे</th>
<th>अगदी नक्की वागले</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>१) तुम्हाला विवाहात वागले</td>
<td>१ २ ३ ४ ५</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२) तुम्हाला विवाहात वागले</td>
<td>१ २ ३ ४ ५</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>३) तुम्हाला आपणांच्या उपरात वागले</td>
<td>१ २ ३ ४ ५</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>तम्मम दिति।ध्यान मैंना-कुड़ियों का हात लाख लेना पालेल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>तम्मम धातुके सारोप्या मैंना कुड़ियों का हात लाख लेना पालेल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>तम्मम पाठम पथाने शोकलेला पालेल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>तम्मम दुधा पथाने शोकलेला पालेल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>तम्मम द्वारका पथालेला शोकलेले (पथालेला) जनन पाल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>तम्मम द्वारका हृदय कौशल पद्धत कौशल (प्रक्रिया) पाल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td>तम्मम द्वारका न हृदय कौशल पद्धत (प्रक्रिया) पाल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td>र्यामा पाठम पाथी पाथी पाल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td>र्याने तम्मम पाठम पाथी मैंना कुड़ियों का हात लाख लेना पालेल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10)</td>
<td>तम्मम मौट का हात लाख लेना पालेल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11)</td>
<td>तम्मम हृदय कौशल पद्धती हृदय कौशली पालेल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12)</td>
<td>तम्मम मित्र होंकौशल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१६</td>
<td>तुमचा सेवक लघु वालेल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१७</td>
<td>तुमचा कोरुत, कारवाच्याच अर्धच बेलावर सन्दर्भानुसार मेला म्हणून वाळेल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१८</td>
<td>तुमचा देशाचा नागरिक म्हणून वाळेल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१९</td>
<td>तुमचा देशाचा केवळ पाहणार</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२०</td>
<td>तुमचा देशाचा लाक्षण घर</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२१</td>
<td>तुमचा विशिष्ट अधिकारी हाळेला वाळेल</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6: स्थान आगमन माध्यम उसीतमागे यागता, तर कसाता ते वालेल काय?

1 ते 5 ही मौजूदी मापस्ता तुम्हचा उत्तराला व्यक उत्तराधिकारी आकडामोठती गोळ करा.

1 = अविवाहत नाही आणि 5 = अगदी नवकी वाळेल

उदाहरण:

इत्यादी माध्यमांकांनी वाळेला वाळेल

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>अविवाहत नाही</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>अगदी नवकी वाळेल</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) तुम्हाला विविधता वाळेल</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) तुम्हाला इत्यादी वाळेला वाळेल</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) तुम्हाला इत्यादी धारांत ज्यावर वाळेला वाळेल</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संख्या</td>
<td>उदाहरण वितरणा: भेड़पाना हात लाखेला वाळेल</td>
<td>आगदी नस्करी वाळेल</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>हूमच्या खारा रनने ओळखेल</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>हूमच्या खारा रनने ओळखेल</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>हूमच्या खारा रनने ओळखेल</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>हूमच्या खारा रनने ओळखेल</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>आधिकारिक नामी</td>
<td>अगदी नक्की शाखाएँ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>तुमच्या शेजारी म्हणून वाळेल</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>तुमच्या कपेलेत, कररकान्यात र्विवर शेजारी म्हणून वाळेल</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>तुमच्या देगान्या नागारिक म्हणून वाळेल</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>तुमच्या देगान्या केडब पाहुणा म्हणून वाळेल (तुमच्या हातात उलेल तर)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>तुमच्या देगान्या हाकून वाळ (तुमच्या हातात उलेल तर)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>तुमच्या वाहिक आधिकारी शाखेता वाळेल</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 : आता माहे अगरी थोड़े प्रचन्न राहिले आतेता। हम्नी विलेव्या माहितीपेक्षा
बर्फकिर्न कला तिता योग्य पद्धतीने वापर करण्यासाठी मला हम्नी
उत्तरे आवश्यक आतेता।

1) वय              2) सिंध:  रशी / पुरुष
3) जात: जात्रस्थ/महात्र/माहात/माहात
4) शहर विभागात दिसली काही राहिला आहात?
5) प्रामाणिक विभागात दिसली काही राहिला आहात?
6) हिंदू धार्मिक हृदयाला महत्त्वपूर्ण वाक्यासाठी एक किंवा दोन कल्पना सांगा.

7) काही प्रवीण जालितसंस्था ही स्थाप्नयोग्य साधनाची जाणून ती स्थानी
स्थापनीतील स्थिरकारता जाणे, असे शोध. असे का ताता याची एक किंवा
दोन कारग्रे सांगा.

8) भारतातील जातीसंस्थेपेक्षा आपण का उपयोग करण्या हवे, याची एक किंवा
दोन कारग्रे सांगा.

पता: प्रमोद रायकर, रेखाशान,
240 शाळवार वैद, पुणे 411 030 (दूरध्वनी : ४४ ६६ ०६)
APPENDIX D.2

VERNACULAR EDITION

(Appendix B in Marathi)
महाराजदेव माननीय जी का भाषण

... विवरण

1. बाली कहानी विधाने दिली जाती.

कुम्भा पुटोल पद्मासनरूप जापले त्याविश्वसनीय मत ठरते.

0 -- याने बटटर विरोध दर्शवला जातो.
1 -- याने तापा विरोध दूरित होतो.
2 -- याने पिरोड़ा करने दूरित होतो.
3 -- याने समती करने दूरित होतो.
4 -- याने तारी दूरित होते, अभिभावक
5 -- याने संपूर्ण समती दूरित होते.

अंततः प्रत्येक विधान कार्जीपूर्वक रेखा आत्मी गुम्भा मतानुसार

त्याता क्रमशः या.

1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>जातीयसंबंधी विधान</th>
<th>क्षेत्र</th>
<th>संबंधी तहयोगी</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) अनुप्रेरित जाती-यमातीय सोड़ेक शास्त्रीय व्यक्त कार्यालय कार्यक्रम साप्ताहिक उभारने बारिशी नये हैं।</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) आयुष्मान नियोजित व्यवस्थाय रचना-या जाती-यमातीय स्वास्थ्य समाजशास्त्र कार्य चालू चर्चा है।</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) अनुप्रेरित जाती व्यायामकी कार्यक्रम ग्रामीण जना अंतर्गत धीरू के तेज यथार्थ धीरू तेज है।</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) कृतियों जाती उपायों-की परम्परा युगल प्राप्त हुआ &quot;निञ्जत&quot; (गतिविधि) ग्रामीणकुल-युगल प्राप्ती का समय नहीं है।</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) सर्व जातीयसंबंधी श्वसन गुरुरोका बोधन संभालने सेवाकर्मी पुरस्कार कार्यक्रम है।</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) कृतियों जातीयसंबंधी दारिद्र्य मात्रा व दुःखा उच्ची प्रामाण्यज्ञानी श्रेष्ठ मानवीय भर योग्य प्रामाण्य कार्यक्रम उभारने है।</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) अनुप्रेरित जाती व्यापारीय सोड़ेक द्वारा अध्याय उपाध्याय समाध्यान अवस्था असमाध्यान द्वारा अस्त्र बनविभाजन कार्य उद्योग है।</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जातीसंबंधी विधान</td>
<td>५००</td>
<td>४५०</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ग) अनुदृष्ट जाती क्षमताधारण लोकों का तिल्मा जाना-पढ़ा सोच के संलग्न महत्वपूर्ण पदावर तित्ती तापकी नकललया लोकांसी नियुक्ति होते.</td>
<td>०</td>
<td>१</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>९) अपलो जाती संबंधी लवकार्याताच्या सोच का याच वाटेल ते करतात. जापली नायक बदलतात. इतकं नक्षेत्र भर, इतरांचा रितीमात्राप्यः अनुक्रम करतात.</td>
<td>०</td>
<td>१</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१०) जाती संरचना ही परमेश्वरानेव निमाण केल्या आहेत.</td>
<td>०</td>
<td>१</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सर्वताधारण विधाने</td>
<td>बट्टर विस्तार</td>
<td>सेवापुरी सेवामती</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१) सामार्थकपणे लोक स्मृतकाना शास्त्र देयावेधा मदत करतात.</td>
<td>० १ २ ३ ४ ५</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२) आपल्याला जाणून घ्ना याच शैक्षिक आलाप तजक्या काळातील जिंदाबाद नाही.</td>
<td>० १ २ ३ ४ ५</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>३) धार्मिक संस्कृतियां प्रमाण आपल्या देशाच्या ६-७ व प्रमाणां गाल ठरता आहे.</td>
<td>० १ २ ३ ४ ५</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>४) प्रदेश बाबतीत प्रामाण्याचा हाय उत्तम मार्ग होय.</td>
<td>० १ २ ३ ४ ५</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>५) अपणाच्या प्रदेशकृतीत सोर स्वतः जवाबदार असतो.</td>
<td>० १ २ ३ ४ ५</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>६) सर्वताधारण लोक अर्थान्तर आवश्यक धार्मिक संस्कृतिकृत संकलन कम करून नाहीत.</td>
<td>० १ २ ३ ४ ५</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>७) तिकुल कला-आर्थिक धार्मिक संस्कृत पालडे लोक तरखेव साठेत.</td>
<td>० १ २ ३ ४ ५</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>८) अपणे दैव बलाचे वापर ठारा नसते.</td>
<td>० १ २ ३ ४ ५</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>९) आपल्या तहायली तरीने शीतली प्रातः करायच्या असेल, तर भारताच्या कोट खुशुगारीच्या आवश्यकता आहे.</td>
<td>० १ २ ३ ४ ५</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१०) प्रवीणाच्या पुनरुत्तर इतरी कल्पना अनावश्यक आहे.</td>
<td>० १ २ ३ ४ ५</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3: युद्ध काही वैपरेक ग्रहण दिलेले आहेत. मुलाखती वैकल्पिक निरनिराल्या 
यथार्थ्यत्वीय सामग्रीकरण पिरामिडेच्या बायकोपरल रुपाने काही 
साधारण घटक साधनमार्ग. या विकल्पी माध्यमी सिद्धांताने हा स्पष्टमाध्यम 
उपेक्षा आहे. त्याचे नेहम्मे त्येचे भव्य नसेल, ते खराबजाने साधारण वरील 
उत्तर याने:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) वयस</th>
<th>2) शिक्ष</th>
<th>3) जाति</th>
<th>4) धर्म</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5) राजकारण विकास: ग्रामीण विभाग/महारी विभाग.

या ग्रामीण/महारी विभागात जाणकारी किंवा विरुद्ध कायर

6) शैक्षणिक पात्रता: (कोणतीही एक विवरण)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) योजना उपलब्धी</th>
<th>b) योजना इम्प्लेमेण्ट पूर्ण</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) पालिकेची सांस्कृतिक इम्प्लेमेण्ट</td>
<td>d) पालिकेची राजस्वाधीन प्रतिस्पर्धी इम्प्लेमेण्ट</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) अध्ययन केंद्रातील बाह्यस्तरीय नस</td>
<td>f) अध्ययन केंद्रातील महाविद्यालयाची इम्प्लेमेण्ट</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) पदवी (वॅलेंस)</td>
<td>h) दूरसंचार (मास्टरचिकन) पदवी किंवा पदवी</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) वर्तमान काही व्यवस्थावर भिंतून मातिका उत्पादन: (व्यायाम)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) 200 हून कमी</th>
<th>b) 201 ते 300</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) 301 ते 400</td>
<td>d) 401 ते 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) 601 ते 1000</td>
<td>फ) 1001 ते 1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>न) 1201 ते 1500</td>
<td>ह) 1501 ते 1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>या) 1601 ते 1800</td>
<td>व) 1801 ते 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>त) 2001 व्या वर</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8) काही स्थान मानसिक आड़िऎ का हो/नाही. आलम्यात किती वक्र?

9) तुम्हा नियमित द्वितार्थ कोष्टा का?

3: हूँ-या यंका जातिव्या द्वितार्थ, भारतीयांती ही काही मत (मलुमार्फत) आहेत. हुम्स्टी वजन विधानात संबंधी मते त्यसक्त केली आहेत, ही त्याची वेश्यकाळ मते आहेत. या मान्सातो दिव / त्यात्म डेव्हायर आत्मांया प्रवेश करते. "ही त्यसक्त कोष्ट व्यारे प्रकारे असेल त्या तुम्हाला घावते?" आता त्या मान्सातर्व आधारानक काही प्रत्येक मती तुम्हाला विचारणार आहे,
त्याची हुम्स्टी उल्ले घायली.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>जातीसंबंधी विधानांती कुटटर विरोध संपूर्ण सहसंबधी</th>
<th>0 1 2 3 4 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>जाती संबंध ही परम्परांने निम्न वेळी आहे.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भाषीसळ्यांती संदर्भाने</td>
<td>तंत्र निरोध</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) अभ्यास जातीय संविधानातील</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>साधन क्रयासाठी</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>लोक क्रयासाठी करतात,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अभ्यास नाले बदलतात,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इतकं करून</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ते इतरांच्या रिती -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मातीचे अम्लकरण करतात.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) अनुसंधान जाती-समाजीतील</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सोहणाच्या दिल्या जाणा-या</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सोहणी साधनांच्या महत्त्वाच्या</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पदार्थांच्या रितीला माज्यांच्या</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सोहणींची नियुक्ती होते.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) अनुसंधान जाती-समाजीतील</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सोहणीता इच्छा आकांक्षा</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उथानाच्या प्रारंभाना असमाधानी</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>व डूळ जातीयमाय ताही</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अध्यात्म नाही.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) करिकड जातीयता दारिद्र्याता</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तपस्या उपचारांचा मान्य</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वातावरण कार व मूल्यमाय गृहणात</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कारणधारा आहेत.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) तर्क जातीयतांतील स्थान</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मुहरदर्शन योजनेने संकाही</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जोरदार व पुरस्कार करावला</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ह्या.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) करिकड जातीयता पालकांची मुळे</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अपल्या ‘धर्म’ (किंवा)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पार्थिवभूमि मधून यासाची गृहणात कल</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वेदन नाहीत.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जातीयता क्षेत्र विश्वास</td>
<td>ब्यूटर विरोध</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) अनूपचित जाती-समाजीय लोकोत्सवों का राजीव जस्ता सेवयों के धोरण तथा नाना टेस्खारा.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) अप्रियता नियोजित व्यक्तियों जस्ता-प्यारा जाती व्यक्तियों के साथीय समाजवादी कार्य पर्याप्त अनुमति.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) अनूपचित जाती-समाजीय नेता बैद्य शारीरिक क्रोध कर्मचारियों साथ आते, वैदिक नल्ले.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सर्वाधिक सिद्धान्त</td>
<td>हृदय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) प्रधानमंत्री प्रमाण किया जाना उनायक ढाई।</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) दक्षिण मध्यप्रदेश दरिद्र समुदाय प्रमाणी करायी जाए। तर मारा उन्हें महामायोंक जायकारताआढ़</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) जापान देश बदलने अस्थायी हाली नली।</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) महाशयाप्त मन्त्रालय मंत्री गायक समा लोक ताक सेवा जाते।</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) सर्वाधिक लोक अनदी जायकारताआढ़ मेरे मोडून काम करता नाही।</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) महाशयाप्त मन्त्रेक कुलीय तो त्वचा जमायकार अतर।</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) मन्त्रेक कायम वर्तमान आर्थिक जनसंख्या मागी मार्गी होय।</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) गृहसंग्राम सत्तुलिया प्रमाण अस्थायी विशेष अस्थायी अतर करवा जाते।</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हास्याधारण विधाने</td>
<td>कुलदर</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) आपत्तित्व आचरण-वा या रेहिक अवलोकितकर्दे क्षमाही अर्थतः नाही.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) साधारणे तों क्षेवाना आत देखायेप्रा मदतः वर्तत.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) हम्होला हो व्यक्ति युद्धकाल असती असे खाटोका का?
अभिवाद युद्धकाल नाही
अभिवाद युद्धकाल

2) स्थायित्व विक्रियाहो योना ग्राह आहे, असे हम्होला खाटोका का?
अभिवाद नाही
अभिवाद नाही

3) ही व्यक्तिरूपीय काळ काळ्य, असे हम्होला मत होती का?
अभिवाद अर्थरूपीय काळ
अभिवाद अर्थरूपीय काळ

4) ही व्यक्तिरूपीय विमान ओषध्यकाल वातावरणाती असण मान्याती योग्य
होतीने समय होऊ गाणे असे हम्होला खाटोका का?
अभिवाद नाही
अभिवाद नाही

5) ही व्यक्तिरूपीय हम्होला आयुक्तकाल संबंध आहे, असे हम्होला खाटोका का?
अभिवाद नाही
अभिवाद नाही

6) या व्यक्तिरूपी आम वलराजा हम्होला आयुक्त का?
अभिवाद आयुक्त मानी
अभिवाद मानी


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>संख्या</th>
<th>स्पष्टीकरण</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>हमारा विभेदक यात्रेचे वाळेल 0 पलीय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>हमारा बाँटदाव यात्रेचे वाळेल 0 पलीय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>हमारा स्थायी प्रसाधन यात्रेचे वाळेल 0 पलीय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>हमारा पिताच्या मांडवांडयेंचे हात लावकेला यात्रेल 0 पलीय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>हमारा पारंपरिक मार्गदर्शक मांडवांडयेंचे हात लावकेला यात्रेल 0 पलीय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>हमारा वाठक प्यागें वाळेल 0 पलीय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>हमारी त्याराकडून तिथिचिह्न देण्यास त्याचे पाव 0 पलीय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>हमारी त्याराकडून कॉर्डचे पावड्या (उक्तीकडून) प्याल 0 पलीय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>हमारी त्याराकडून तिथिचिह्न पावड्यांचे प्याल 0 पलीय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>त्यापासून हातात पावणी प्याल 0 पलीय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>त्याने हमारा पारंपरिक मांडवांडयेंचे हात लावकेला यात्रेल 0 पलीय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>हमारा मूर्तिचे हात लावलेला यात्रेल 0 पलीय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>हमारा दृष्टिकोनी त्यासीतील तय्यांचे बाळचे वाळेल 0 पलीय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>हमारा रिहत होऊ सोल 0 पलीय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>हमारा केसारी मेंढू मार्ग 0 पलीय</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>नामी</th>
<th>हीप</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14) हुमध्या कंडेरी, कारखान्यात दिव्या सैलावर सहकारी अभावशील जालेल</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) हुमध्या वारिक अधिकारी जालेला जालेल</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 5 : 3 व मध्ये हुलेग्रंथेच्या गोष्टींचा या व्यक्तीने केल्या तर हुमध्येच्या या पाली व्हटील दिस्ता नावी आणि त्याचा संबंध हुमध्यी जालोल वैकी कोणत्या गोष्टींची जोडू? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>संख्या</th>
<th>दाखल केलेले वेळ (१)</th>
<th>(२)</th>
<th>(३)</th>
<th>(४)</th>
<th>(५)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>१) तंत्रांमध्ये दाखल केलेले वेळ (१)</td>
<td>० १ २ ३ ४ ५</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२) हुमध्या स्वतंत्र विढाले विशेष (२)</td>
<td>० १ २ ३ ४ ५</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>३) धार्मिक वृद्धे (३)</td>
<td>० १ २ ३ ४ ५</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>४) हुमध्यी शैक्षणिक पाठ(४)</td>
<td>० १ २ ३ ४ ५</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>५) जीवनाचे (५)</td>
<td>० १ २ ३ ४ ५</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>६) हुमध्या विषयात दुष्टीच्या वापरहो (६)</td>
<td>० १ २ ३ ४ ५</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>७) परिस्थितीच्या मनाचे (७)</td>
<td>० १ २ ३ ४ ५</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>८) हुमध्यी आर्थिक दुष्टीच्या (८)</td>
<td>० १ २ ३ ४ ५</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 5 : या पुर्णाची उत्तरे हुमध्यी समान धार्मिक आढ़त.

1) हुमध्या जातीलील सर्वातमध्ये माणुस ३ व मधीन पुर्णाची दक्षिण अशं हुमध्या वाढत? का?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>नामी</th>
<th>० १ २ ३ ४ ५ हीप</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>२) हुमध्या जातीलील उत्तर संबंधित नामोऱ्यात हुमध्यी ही उत्तरे मान्य होतोल का?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>नामी</th>
<th>० १ २ ३ ४ ५ हीप</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
4.3: प्रायः तेजस्वी मौक्याय
जातीमहीन शाखा ध्वजसंडरे ज्ञानी गोदरी गैल्या महिन्यायत
गुम्यी किती तैल्यात ते समर्थक तोगा। हे सारे पूर्व गैल्या एका
महिन्याला उददोनु हिपारेसे आहेत।
1) गैल्या महिन्याला जातीयाचा ध्वजसंडरे गुम्यी किती तैला
पिकाटला मेलात! नेका आइको
2) गैल्या महिन्याला जातीयाचा ध्वजसंडरे गुम्यी किती तैला आपणप्रसा-
कडे बेबूला बोलायला! नेका आइको
3) गैल्या महिन्याला गुम्यी या जातीयाचा ध्वजसंडरे घरी किती तैला
मेलात! नेका आइको
4) गैल्या महिन्याला गुम्यी या जातीयाचा ध्वजसंडरे किती तैला
हॉटलमेव घातला पिकित बेबूला मेलात! नेका आइको
5) गैल्या महिन्याला जातीयाचा ध्वजसंडरे गुम्यी किती तैला
गप्पा मार्गतीत! नेका आइको
6) गैल्या महिन्याला जातीयाचा ध्वजसंडरे गुम्यी किती तैला
एका हाय केल्या! नेका आइको
7) गैल्या महिन्याला जातीयाचा ध्वजसंडरे गुम्यी किती तैला घरी
बोलायला! नेका आइको
4 व : 4 व मधील गोष्टी तुम्ही कोणत्या परिस्थितीत देखावते ते आहात.
आढ़ि खानी दिलेली माहिती प्रस्तुक परिस्थिती तुम्हाला विकसत
मान्य आहे ते दाख्या.

1) पुढील दोपारखोली उल्लिखते / इसे तयार होती.
    नाही 0 1 2 3 4 5 होय

2) पुढील दोपार पक्क झालीये आहात.
    नाही 0 1 2 3 4 5 होय

3) पुढील स्वेक्षणाला जवाब देता.
    नाही 0 1 2 3 4 5 होय

4) पुढील आपल्या शाळापासून, उर्मिलांना आहेत.
    नाही 0 1 2 3 4 5 होय

5) पुढील त्याच्या गोलाकोट्यावर जादुई उपलब्ध.
    नाही 0 1 2 3 4 5 होय

6) पुढील गोष्टी / त्याच्या तिने वाढले संपूर्ण वाचात.
    नाही 0 1 2 3 4 5 होय

7) परेंच्या खालीवाच्याच्या तुम्हाला तदनाना आहे.
    नाही 0 1 2 3 4 5 होय
4. एकूण आयुर्विकलित्रियोपयोगी मौजूददीयी दृष्टांक आपूर्ति (उन सम. 12)

1) स्वाधी सार्वजनिक प्रतिबद्ध अपनाक्षत्र सुद्धाया अतकी अतुल्य अथवा अन्य वाताभी का ? की तथा प्राचीनस्य बायोकोरय कादाहरी कार्य अथवा सुद्धाया वाटन का ? ठेवा अर्थ किसी देखा वाटन से सीमा

2) जो मौजूद विभिन्न उपवन्त क्यों तथा सुद्धाया सार्वजनिक तोजीया मूलना किसी वर्ष विभिन्न अतुल्य अथवा सुद्धाया वाटन ? नेमका आकडा

3) एक शेतक-पायदा हया तताजी तुम्ही समस्त आहात का ? तो मूळाला होता, "मान्य (ज्वारी) पेठीपयाय नवीन आणि सुमारलेल्या पद्धतीपयां दिवार करणे वागणे

नाही 0 1 2 3 4 5 होय

4) "आहेत, तया हूमायूँ आहा वागणे पातन-पोषण करण्या तरणा मायसे मुलाशी संदर्भा स्वरूपित देव आकर्षक आहे". अर्थ शकार्य मन्त्रण आहे. तुम्ही दयापयागी समस्त आहात का ?

नाही 0 1 2 3 4 5 होय

5) माफळता हूँजा भर्ती नसला, तर खराव फार भाव होईल अर्थ सुद्धाया वाटन का ?

नाही 0 1 2 3 4 5 होय

6) समग्र दूसरपय (तागारण 1000 चित्र ननि. दूर) स्वाधी वर्तव्य माफळती तुम्ही गाड़ पल्ली, तर तुम्ही यथापय दिवार करण्या पद्धत समवायून देखा संडा का ?

नाही 0 1 2 3 4 5 होय
7) ઉત ભિક્ષુ કેલેલા આજના યોગય માહિતી ઉત્સેલ્યા કોકોની 
રાજ્યના શરૂઆત (અસરભાગ્ય) મહત્વાચ્છા પદાર્થ ઉત્સેલ્યા યોગસ.
નાહી 0 1 2 3 4 5 હોય

8) આજના કોકોની કેલેલા કઠોર પરિસ્થિતિ હી દેશાલય માહિતીલાયા 
જુદતોને હહેત મહત્વાચ્છા યોગની કચાલાચી ગોષ્ટ આપે?
નાહી 0 1 2 3 4 5 હોય

9) સૂચનિક આજના લૈફીય કેલાવ દિખાવવા કેલેલી પુણાતી તમામાસા 
ઉપચારક તરીકે આપે, જિસનું તું તેમંયા વાતાવૃત કા?
નાહી 0 1 2 3 4 5 હોય

10) આંતરરાષ્ટ્રીય વાતાવૃત વાસ્તિ તું તેમંયા રાસ આપે?
નાહી 0 1 2 3 4 5 હોય

11) સ્વાભાવિક કલા, રામના સપભણ કિંયા રાજ્યની ગત યાતરાબદા 
હોયા સ્પષ્ટિક તું તેમંયા તંદુર આપે?
નાહી 0 1 2 3 4 5 હોય

12) તમની સ્વીકાર અને સમાચાર ગણાના કિંયા માહિતી કેંદ્ર વાપાત?

1) લોક 
2) આંતરરાષ્ટ્રીય તીન / ગાર વેડા 
3) પુષ્પકપાટું કંટડ / દોણડા 
4) મહિનાપ્રસિદ્ધ કંટડ કીવા 
5) અપભ્રાત નાહી

6) શ્રેષ્ઠ પ્રાણ 

1) જણ ધયાનીવદન તું તેમંયા પ્રાણ વિપ્લાવાય, સ્વા ધયાનીવા જાણ 
કોળા હોયી?
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2) या व्यक्तिबद्ध हृदयला अन्ये प्रदा निवारले, र्यायी हुमकी मत तारणी होती का?

होय, अगदी तारणी

0 1 2 3 4 5

3) या व्यक्तिबद्ध हृदयला अन्ये प्रदा निवारले, र्यायी आर्थ हुमकी बातीतत्काल्य मत तारणी होती का?

होय, अगदी तारणी

0 1 2 3 4 5

4) या प्रदा मानकिला हृदयी की उत्तरे दिलीत, ती बहुतों तमाजाला मान्य होतील असे प्रदा दाताने का?

होय, अगदी मान्य होतील

0 1 2 3 4 5

4) या प्रदा मानकिला हृदयी की उत्तरे दिलीत ती मान्य करताना दिलीता र्याय्यमाणे वागताना हृदयला तार वाटेल का?

होय, अगदी वाटेल
APPENDIX D.3

VERNACULAR EDITION

(Appendix C in Marathi)
## धार्मिक विवादाचे सर्वसमर्थन

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>मथन-साही वात</th>
<th>नाही</th>
<th>होय</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. तत्त्व ज्ञानी उल्लव यामुळे हिंदू समाजात रेवत निमाणी होते</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. पूर्ववन्याचा क्या पुर्वेकाळात वात असली वात नाही.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. रिह्यु या सर्व भेट होय. रिह्यु यांच्याँ होगारे तंत्रार धार्मिक जातेत</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. देव नेहमी 8-पंचाव (चारिक्यशालोचा) पंढरनाव अती</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. जातीश्वरधाम ही परसेवाराने निमाणी केली नाही</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. हिंदू ध्यानचंद्री मला पूर्मिंडे अपूर्वीक वांट अती</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. सार्वजनी यथेकाळी येथूनाचांने वाहते</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. पूर्ववन्याची कल्पना मला मान्य नाही</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. देवपूर्विः, मली ज्ञानी ब्रह्मा येव पूर्वेकाळात जीवनात स्थान आले</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. पुर्वेकाळेन निकाम कौशिकी जातात्वेपूर्वी एका आेखी न धतात त्वम्य \ द्वार पाठावा</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**प्रस्ता:** प्रमोद रायकर

"स्वेदन"

---
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