

# A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON PREJUDICED BEHAVIOR OF COLLEGE GOING STUDENTS

Sunanda Nanda Bera<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Asheesh Kumar Bajpai<sup>2</sup>,

<sup>1</sup> Research Scholar (Ph.D. in Education), Department of Education, RKDF University, Bhopal, M.P., India.

<sup>2</sup> Department of Education, RKDF University, Bhopal, M.P, India.

Email - <sup>1</sup>snbera9@gmail.com <sup>2</sup>asheesh0512@gmail.com

**Abstract:** 'Prejudice' is known as preconceived or fixed opinions or bias against a person or thing. Prejudice is unfair behavior that results from without affecting any other legal matter. The present study intends to measure the prejudiced behavior of college going students who belong to different religions, i.e., Hindu, Muslim, and Christian. The total Sample comprises of 100 students (50 Male & 50 Female) were randomly selected from 10 different colleges of Howrah City of West Bengal State and equally distributed among Hindu, Muslim & Christian male and female College students. The "Prejudice Scale" (Revised in 2006) developed by Dr. R. L. Bharadwaj and Dr. H. Sharma was used for this study. The obtained data were analyzed by the investigator with the help of 'mean', 'standard deviation' & 't-test'. The findings of the present study revealed that there was a significant difference in the prejudiced behavior between male and female college going students. Whereas the researcher found an insignificant difference in the prejudiced behavior of college students on the basis of religions like Hindu, Muslim, and Christian at 0.05 levels of significance.

**Key Words:** Study, Prejudice, Prejudiced Behavior, College going Students, Religion

## 1. INTRODUCTION:

Prejudice is a useful term that is often misused. Its Latin root is "prejudicial", meaning "an opinion or judgment formed without due examination." We might define prejudicial acts as decision-making on the basis of incomplete information. 'Prejudice' is defined as the holding of negative beliefs and feelings toward a group and its members or the exhibition of hostile or negative treatment directed at a group and its members. Prejudice is an unreasonable dislike of a particular group of People or things or a Preference for one group of people or things over another. One can be prejudiced against or have a preconceived notion about someone due to any characteristics they find to be unusual or undesirable. In his seminal volume, "The Nature of Prejudice", **Allport (1954)** defined prejudice as 'an antipathy based on faulty and inflexible generalization. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed toward a group as a whole or toward an individual because he is a member of that group'. Most researchers have continued to define prejudice as a negative attitude (i.e., an antipathy). Prejudice is defined by **Aboud (1988)** as "a unified, stable, and consistent tendency to respond in a negative way toward members of a particular ethnic group". Many people in today's society would not consider themselves to be ethnically or racially prejudiced, but as **Allport (1954)** suggests in his definition, even reluctance is considered prejudicial in nature. Thus, prejudice is certain inevitable features of human society and plays an important role in the undaunted expression of behavior when two groups come into face relation.

## 2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE:

It is evident that all forms of prejudices are learned, (**Bonner, 1953**) and they are influenced by a variety of factors. Many types of research pay more emphasis on religious affiliation as one of the factors of prejudices. The researcher conducted in Indian socio-cultural settings show that Muslim possesses more prejudices than Hindus (**Adinarayan, 1953; Chaudhary, 1958; Hassan, 1975, 1978, Hassan and Singh, 1973, Enayatullah, 1980, Singh, 1980**). Whereas **Natraj (1962)** found that Hindus have more conservative socio-economic attitude and economic conservation (**Sarkar and Hasan, 1973**) than Muslims. There was more mistrust among Hindus than Muslims (**Chatterjee, 1967**). To say in more general term religious people possess more prejudices than not-religious ones (**Adorno, 1950; Allport and Ross, 1967**). **Gaertner, Samuel L. et al., (1989)** investigated on "Reducing Intergroup Bias: The Benefits of Recategorization". Three hundred sixty undergraduates participated in small groups in an experiment that tested 2 strategies, based on the social categorization approach, for reducing intergroup bias. **Engstrom, Catherine McHugh, and Sedlacek, William E. (1991)** have conducted a Study of Prejudice toward University Student-Athletes. The attitudes of 293 first-time entering students at a large, public eastern university were measured using Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) Student-Athlete. **Smith, Timothy B., and Roberts, Richard N (1996)** had studied on Prejudice and Racial Identity among White Latter-Day Saint College Students: An Exploratory Study. **Radloff, Timothy D. and Evans, Nancy (2003)** has carried a study on the Social Constructions of Prejudice among Black and White College Students. **Saenko, IU. V. (2005)** has undertaken a study on the Superstitions of

Today's College Students. In this article, the author presents a study of superstitious notions and their role in the lives and activities of college students. **Chekroud, Adam M. et al., (2014)** investigated a review of Neuroimaging Studies of Race-related Prejudice: Does amygdala response reflect threat?.

### **3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:**

According to the need and purpose of the study, the researcher has framed the following objectives for the present study.

- To be determined the prejudiced behavior of college going students.
- To examine the prejudiced behavior of male and female college going students.
- To find out the prejudiced behavior of Hindu and Muslim college going students.
- To assess the prejudiced behavior of Hindu and Christian college going students.
- To study the prejudiced behavior of Muslim and Christian college going students.

### **4. HYPOTHESES:**

Considering the objectives of the study mentioned above, the investigator framed the following hypothesis.

**H01:-** There exists no significant difference in the prejudiced behavior of male and female college going students.

**H02:-** There exists no significant difference in the prejudiced behavior of Hindu and Muslim college going students.

**H03:-** There exists no significant difference in the prejudiced behavior of Hindu and Christian college going students.

**H04:-** There exists no significant difference in the prejudiced behavior of Muslim and Christian college going students.

### **5. METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY:**

#### **5.1 SAMPLE:**

In the present study as per need, the investigator has randomly selected 100 students from 10 different undergraduate general degree colleges affiliated to Calcutta University and from the areas of Howrah city of West Bengal State based on Hindu, Muslim, and Christian male and female. Simple random sampling technique had been used by the researcher for selection of Colleges as well as Sample for the present research work.

#### **5.2 VARIABLES:**

##### **A) Dependent Variables-**

- Prejudice behavior

##### **B) Independent Variables-**

- Gender: Male & Female
- Different Religions: Hindu, Muslim & Christian

#### **5.3 TOOLS USED:**

The tools used by the investigator in the present study was "prejudice scale" (Pr scale) developed by Dr. R. L. Bharadwaj and Dr. H. Sharma to measure the prejudiced behavior of college-going students belonging to Hindu, Muslim & Christian Religions.

#### **5.4 STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES:**

The investigator analyzed the collected data by finding 'mean', 'Standard Deviation' and 't-test' to find out and measure the prejudiced behavior of college-going students belonging to Hindu, Muslim and Christian religions.

#### **5.5 DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION:**

The coefficient of reliability has been determined by using the following two methods: The test- rested method (N=100) has been employed to determine the temporal stability of the scale. The product moment correlation between test and rest scores has been found to be .69 and by applying the split-half method, the reliability coefficient of the scale has been found to be .94 (N=100). The validity of the scale has been also determined by two methods: Theoretical validity of the scale has been found to .83 (under root of reliability coefficient) and Construct validity of the scale has estimated with the prejudice scale of Jahan, Q. et. al., (1988) and that comes to .66.

### **6. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS:**

**H01:-** There exists no significant difference in the prejudiced behavior of male and female college going students.

SL NO.	GROUP	N	M	S.D.	"t"	REMARK
1	MALE	59	95.33	20.79	2.98	SIGNIFICANT
2	FEMALE	41	82.70	20.83		
p-value= 0.0035		df =98		p <0.05		

Thus, on the basis of the result, our proposed hypothesis is rejected. So, it can be concluded that there was a significant difference in the prejudiced behavior of male and female college going students.

**H02:-** There exists no significant difference in the prejudiced behavior of Hindu and Muslim college going students.

SL NO.	GROUP	N	M	S.D.	"t"	REMARK
1	HINDU	71	90.61	21.96	0.52	NOT SIGNIFICANT
2	MUSLIM	19	87.63	21.41		
p-value= 0.59		df = 88		p >0.05		

Thus, on the basis of the result, our proposed hypothesis is accepted. So, it can be concluded that there was no significant difference in the prejudiced behavior of Hindu and Muslim college going students.

**H03:-** There exists no significant difference in the prejudiced behavior of Hindu and Christian college going students.

SL NO.	GROUP	N	M	S.D.	"t"	REMARK
1	HINDU	71	90.61	21.96	-0.14	NOT SIGNIFICANT
2	CHRISTIAN	10	91.7	21.38		
p-value= 0.88		df = 79		p >0.05		

Thus, on the basis of the result, our proposed hypothesis is accepted. So, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in the prejudice Behavior of Hindu and Christian college going students.

**H04:-** There exists no significant difference in the prejudiced behavior of Muslim and Christian college going students.

SL NO.	GROUP	N	M	S.D.	"t"	REMARK
1	MUSLIM	19	87.63	21.41	-0.48	NOT SIGNIFICANT
2	CHRISTIAN	10	91.7	21.38		
p-value= 0.63		df = 27		p >0.05		

Thus, on the basis of the result, our proposed hypothesis is accepted. So, it can be concluded that there was no significant difference in the prejudiced behavior of Muslim and Christian college going students.

## 7. MAJOR FINDINGS:

The findings of the present study revealed that there was a significant difference in the prejudiced behavior between male and female college students. The findings also showed that there was an insignificant difference in the prejudiced behavior of college students on the basis of different religions like Hindu, Muslim, and Christian at 0.05 levels of significance.

## 8. CONCLUSION:

From the above-said findings, we can conclude that the male and female college students have a significant difference in their Prejudice behavior. It was also found that Prejudice behavior between Hindu & Muslim, Hindu & Christian, and Muslim & Christian college students did not differ significantly.

## REFERENCES:

1. Adinaranyan, S.P. (1935). *Before and after Independence. A Study of Racial and Communal attitudes in India.* British Journal of Psychology, 44.
2. Aggarwal, J.C. (2013). *Essentials of Educational Psychology*, Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., pp. 115-129, ISBN: 978-81259-2292-6.
3. Allport, G.W. (1954): *The nature of Prejudice.* Cambridge, Mass: Addison, Wesley.
4. Bera, S.N. and Sharma, A. (2015). *Prejudice Behavior of College Going Students Belonging To Hindu, Muslim, and Christian Religions: A Comparative Study.* International Research Journal of Commerce, Arts and Science, Volume 6, Issue: 7, 2015. Pages: 234-243.
5. Chekroud, A. M., Everett, J. A. C., Bridge, H., & Hewstone, M. (2014). *A review of neuroimaging studies of race-related prejudice: does amygdala response reflect threat?*. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 8, 179. Published online 2014 Mar 27, PMID: PMC3973920, Retrieved from <http://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00179>
6. Engstrom, C. M., and Sedlacek, W. E. (1991), *A Study of Prejudice Toward University Student-Athletes.* *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 70: 189–193. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.1991.tb01582.x
7. Gaertner, Samuel L.; Mann, Jeffrey; Murrell, Audrey; Dovidio, John F. (1989). *Reducing intergroup bias: The benefits of recategorization.* *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, PsycARTICLES [ Journal Article ], Vol. 57(2), Aug 1989, 239-249, Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.2.239>
8. Radloff, Timothy, D., and Evans, Nancy (2003). *The Social construction of prejudice among Black and White college students.* *NASPA Journal*, Vol. 40, 2003, Issue: 2, doi: 10.2202/1949-6605.1222. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2202/1949-6605.1222>
9. Saenko, IU.V. ( 2005 ). *The superstitions of Today's college students, Russian Education and Society*, 2005, Vol. 47, P. 76-89. doi: 10.1080/10609393.2005.11056939. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10609393.2005.11056939>