Working Paper

(340)

विद्याविनियोगाद्विकासः

IIM
AHMEDABAD

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT
AHMEDABAD

SCHOOLS AND STUDENTS ACROSS CULTURES

By

D.M. Pestonjee

&

A.K. Singh

W P No. 340

December 1980

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT
AHMEDABAD

SCHOOLS AND STUDENTS ACROSS CULTURES[*]

by

D. M. Pestonjee

&

A. K. Singh

Dr. D.M. Pestonjee is Professor and Chairman, Organizational
Behaviour Area, Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad.
Dr. A.K. Singh is Lecturer, Dept. of Psychology, Sahkari Degree
College, Mehrawa, Jaunpur, U.P.

A B S T R A C T

This study attempt to explore the personality differences of the students who are studying in denominational and non-denominational institutions. The personality variables which are measured are dogmatism and security-insecurity. It also seeks to observe the possible effects of religion and sex on the two personality characteristics.

The sample comprises of 850 adolescent students belonging to the Hindu and Muslim religions and studying in denominational and non-denominational institutions. The average age of the boys is 17.50, and for the girls 16.35. Two standardised measuring devices were administered. A 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design has been used.

Obtained data have been statistically treated in terms of mean, S.D., ANOVA, and Duncan's Multiple Range Test. Main finding indicates that students in denominational atmospheres, Muslim students and boy students are more dogmatic and more insecure in comparison to non-denominational students, Hindu students and girl students.

INTRODUCTION

Factionalism in Indian society is endemic. Pessimists say it is 'in the blood'. The reasons however are several. Geographical vastness of the country, diversities of physical features, social stock, language, religions and ofcourse, chronic poverty all contribute to it. In spite of all these facts for at least 2500 years there has been a continuity in Indian culture and thought; a sense of Indianness to which Indian as well as foreign thinkers bear testimony.

Since the independence some efforts have been made to scan the problem of national integration, problem of group antagonism and the problem of conflicts. Some of the theories about conflict held in the past are considered too simplistic. It is naive to say that because men have always fought over one thing or another as history shows, this is what they are going to do any way. This is a gospel of despair to the educationists and social scientists. Equally unhelpful is the view that some individuals are born with or develop during infancy certain personality traits which tend to bring about social conflict. Personality configurations can be the basis of the hostility in the individual. An understanding of these characteristics may help understanding group antagonisms.

These personality characteristics, it is now accepted, are not stabilized, nor the personality fixed in infancy. The earlier Freudian view is disputed. Adolescence may bring, especially if there are well directed, vigorous and consistent educational programmes a qualitative

change in personality characteristics. Considerable evidence points
to the fact that the personality of a child is most plastic when he is
on the threshold of adolescence (Freud, 1946; ·Misbet and Entwhistle,
1966; Allport, 1967; May, 1950).

It can therefore be concluded that educational programmes which
aim at modification of attitudes and behaviour of boys and girls are
justified. These programmes however can be educative or miseducative.
It has been stressed by some, that educational institutions of a
parochial or denominational or sectarian nature, engender beliefs and
attitudes, and a kind of personality make-up, inimical to national
integration. For example, some are of the opinion that denominational
institutions which are dependent on any particular type of religion or
sectarian basis should not be allowed to function by the universities or
governments (Husain, 1965; Ganguli, 1958; Kaliprasad, 1958).

In 1962, the Ministry of Education Committee on Emotional Integra-
tion reported that the feeling of oneness can be strengthened by having
non-communal educational institutions. The committee further reported
that most persons who have answered the questionnaire (which was prepared
by the committee on Emotional Integration) are in favour of having non-
communal educational institutions and the banning of the communal or
denominational ones.

On the other hand a view is commonly expressed that minorities,
religious, linguistic or ethnic, join and are integrated with the main
national unit when they are given freedom to have educational institutions

of their own. Cultural particularism offers least resistance to integration when it is given freedom to exist.

The present investigation is an attempt to produce some empirical evidence in support of or against such thesis. It draws mainly upon the personality characteristics of dogmatism and security-insecurity of adolescents (boys and girls) belonging to two religious groups in denominational and non-denominational institutions. There are hardly any researches on the subject specially where the dogmatism and security factors are studied together.

In the Indian context, some thinker says that Muslims feel insecure in India (Siddiqui, 1971; Brahmanand, 1970; Harman, 1976 and Gupta, 1976, etc.). Except for few (Kureshi, 1975; Pestonjee and Singh, 1979) no empirical studies are available on the problem of security-insecurity in relation to religion and educational climate. Needless to say, it may be very important from the standpoint of national integration and group conflicts.

METHODOLOGY

Design: In the present investigation there are three independent variables, namely, institutions, religions and sex. Personality variables of the students have been treated as dependent variables. Every independent variables has been treated at two levels. The first factor, institutions, had two levels, namely denominational and non-denominational institutions. The second factor was religion with two levels, Hindu and Muslims. The third factor sex had two levels, boys and girls. The study followed a 2x2x2 factorial design. Effect of these three factors is proposed to be examined on the two personality characteristics, namely, dogmatism and security-insecurity.

Measures:

(i) The Dogmatism Scale or D-Scale: Developed by Qamar Hasan (1974) to determine the 'open' and 'closed' mindedness of the subjects. This scale includes 34 items worded in Hindi. All the positive responses (+1 to +3) are combined in a single category of 'favourable' response. The odd-even reliability coefficient corrected by Spearman Brown formula for the Hindi version of the scale in +.82.

(ii) Maslow's Security-Insecurity Inventory: For the measurement of the feeling of the security-insecurity, Ansari's adoption of the original Security-Insecurity Inventory of Maslow has been used. This version was developed by Ansari (1964). It consists of 75 items. Each has three alternative answers, "Yes", "No" and "?" (indefinite or undecided).

Sample: In the present investigation sample is drawn from denominational and non-denominational institutions from three district towns of eastern U.P. All the institutions are from the town-areas or urban areas. The number of denominational institutions are seven in number, and non-denominational institutions are ten. Denominational institutions are defined here as those institutions which are managed by particular type of religious groups like minority institutions of Muslims or Sikhs or Christians. On the other hand non-denominational institutions are those institutions which are organized by or managed by government authority.

Adolescents of the intermediate classes and undergraduate served as subjects. The mean age for boys is 17.50 years and for the girls 16.35 years. Total number of the subjects studied in the present investigation are 850. The various subgroups alongwith the $\underline{n}$ in each are listed below:

Groups	$\underline{n}$
1. Denominational Hindu Boys (DHB)	200
2. Denominational Hindu Girls (DHB)	70
3. Denominational Muslim Boys (DMB)	120
4. Denominational Muslim Girls(DMG)	80
5. Non-Denominational Hindu Boys (N-DHB)	120
6. Non-Denominational Hindu Girls (N-DHC)	120
7. Non-Denominational Muslim Boys (N-DMB)	80
8. Non-Denominational Muslim Girls(N-DMG)	60
Total	850

R E S U L T S

The results obtained from the statistical analysis are recorded in Tables 1 to 4. In Table-1 we presented the mean scores. It may be observed from the table that the mean scores of students from denominational institution students are significantly higher than the mean scores of students of non-denominational institutions on the two personality variables. Similarly it may also be observed that the mean scores of Hindu students in comparison to Muslim and the mean scores of boys in comparison to girls are significantly higher. Thus we can conclude here on the basis of results that the denominational students, Muslim students and boy students are more dogmatic and more insecure in comparison to non-denominational students, Hindu students, and girl students.

Insert table 1 about here

Result presented in Table-2 show that the main effect of institution, religion and sex have significant F's, on the two personality variables measured here. On the basis of the mean values which is presented in Table-1 we can say that students in denominational environments, Muslim students and boy students are more dogmatic and more insecure than the students of non-denominational institutions, Hindu students and girl students. First two factors interaction between institution and religion are significant in both personality variables which indicates that the institutions' effect (denominational and non-denominational) is not independent of the religious factors (Hindu

and Muslim) on the two personality variables. Similarly, the second
two factor interaction between institution and sex also yields a
significant F on both the personality variables. This shows that the
effect of denominational and non-denominational institutions is not
independent for the two levels of sex. The third two-factor inter-
action between religion and sex is not significant in case of any
personality variables which shows that on the personality variables of
dogmatism and security-insecurity the differences between the means of
Hindus and Muslims for the first level of sex (boys) is not signifi-
cantly different from the differences between the means of Hindus and
Muslims for the second level of sex (girls). The three factor inter-
action effect (institution x religion x sex) was not found to cast a
significant influence on the personality variable of dogmatism. On the
security-insecurity variable, however, the three factor interaction
was significant.

Insert table 2 about here

For the purpose of intergroup comparison Duncan's Multiple Range
Test was applied and results obtained by this test on the two personality
variables are presented in Table 3.

Insert table 3 about here

Institution - religion - and sex-wise results on the two personality
variables are summarised in Table 4:A and the mean values of these groups
are presented in Table 4:B. Keeping the religion and sex factor constant
the four groups of denominational institutions are compared with four

groups of non-denominational institutions to find out the effect of particular type of educational atmosphere on the dogmatism and security-insecurity variables. It is found that the types of institutional atmosphere does not influence the dogmatism and security-insecurity levels of denominational and non-denominational Hindu boys, but in the case of Hindu-girl students it may be observed that girls from denominational atmosphere are more dogmatic and feel greater insecurity than the Hindu girls of non-denominational institutions. However, table also indicates that the mean scores of Muslim students (boys as well as girls) of non-denominational institution are significantly higher than the mean scores of those Muslim students (boys as well as girls) who were studying in denominational institutions on the two personality variables of dogmatism and security-insecurity.

Similarly, the four groups of Hindu students are compared with the four groups of Muslim students keeping the institution and religion factor constant. It was found that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of Hindu (boys as well as girls) and Muslim (boys as well as girls) students on any personality variables. But when we compared the mean scores of Hindu and Muslim students in non-denominational institutions then it is found that Muslim students (boys as well as girls) are more dogmatic and more insecure in comparison to Hindu (boy as well as girl) students.

To study the possibility of sex differences on the two variables the four groups of boys are also compared with the four groups of girls.

It can be seen that the significance of difference was not found to exist between the mean scores of Hindu boys and girls of denominational institutions. However in other three conditions (Table 4:A) the mean scores of boys were significantly higher than the mean scores of girls.

Insert Table 4:A & 4:B about here

D I S C U S S I O N

The study under report aimed to find out the effect of particular types of educational atmosphere, the Hindu and Muslim religion and the two sexes on the personality variables of dogmatism and security- insecurity. First we compared the four groups of denominational institution with the four groups of non-denominational institutions to scan out the effect of particular types of educational atmosphere. It was observed that dogmatism and security-insecurity levels of Hindu boys in two types of educational atmosphere is similar, but in the case of Hindu girls it is observed that Hindu girls if they are studying in denominational institutions (which are Muslim in character), then they are found more dogmatic and also more insecure than Hindu girls who are in non-denominational institutions.

The main findings given in the preceding paragraph are discussed below:

Hindu girl students in denominational institutions are very few, but Hindu boys in these institutions are not so few. Girls are, it is common knowledge, more sensitive and they do not feel self-protected as

as boys do. In these institutions Hindu girls are surrounded by
other girls, teachers and authorities all of the different religion.
The educational atmosphere in which they have been studying for more
than two years may infuse more insecurity and increase their dogmatism
level; a sort of defence mechanism, even if evoked by imaginary
apprehensions.

The Muslim student scores in two types of educational atmosphere
have also been compared. It has been found that Muslim students (boys
as well as girls) if they are in non-denominational institutional
environment, have a highly higher level of dogmatism and insecurity
than Muslim students who are in denominational institutional atmosphere.

The situations for Muslim students in non-denominational insti-
tutions is perhaps the same as it was for Hindu girl students in
denominational institutions where the girls resorted to the defence
mechanism. When people go to reside in a foreign country they may not
only retain their own cultural traditions but also cling to these more
tenaciously than when they were in own country. In such situations
persons may not like to adapt a rational outlook and would not subject
their belief to argument. They become insecure and dogmatic.

Finding from investigations carried out abroad may also throw
light on the foregoing discussion. In some investigations it has been
found that students differ enormously in the belief and attitude in
terms of the institutions in which they enrol (Astin, 1965a; 1965b;
1970a; Darley; 1962, McConnel & Heist, 1959; Libeiman 1960; Meng 1959).

On the basis of above quoted studies it can be generalised that although the students own characteristics is an important factor as regards dogmatism and insecurity attitudes and behaviours, the types of institutional and atmosphere therein also will affect the personalit and the response of the students to persons and situations.

In the Indian context Sodhi (1972) conducted a study on the studen in religious institutions and secular institutions. He observed that students of religious schools had developed a fairly different patterns of personality as compared to secular school students.

In a study Tripathi & Pandey (1979) found that scheduled caste students perceived the educational climate less supportive in the majority school than in minority school.

The findings are not all similar but they do not necessarily contradict each other. One thing is common, as pointed out already, namely, the personality traits which students possess when they come to schools, the schools atmosphere may modify. The dogmatism and insecurity may increase or decrease or remain unaffected will depend upon whether they perceive or do not perceive a threat to their cherished religious beliefs, values and culture because of atmosphere in the institutions they attend.

To find out the effect of two religions the dogmatism and security-insecurity scores of the total sample divided. It is found that Muslims are more dogmatic and more insecure than the Hindu students. When the scores of Hindu and Muslim students are compared keeping the

institution and sex factor constant, it is found that Muslim students (boys and girls) are found to be more dogmatic and more insecure than Hindu students only in non-denominational institutions. In denominational institution, however, Muslims are not found to score more than Hindus.

In our country empirical studies are hardly available on dogmatism in relation to Hindu and Muslim religions. In an earlier investigation significant differences were not found to exist between the Hindu and Muslim girl students on the dogmatism variables (Pestonjee & Singh, 1979). But in another study the significant differences were found to exist between the mean scores of Hindu and Muslim students on dogmatism variable (Pestonjee & Singh, 1980).

Prof. Ranjeet Gupta (1968) has stated that educated Muslim youth in India is increasingly turning to communal dogmatism.

Similarly some other thinkers also suggested that Muslims feel unsafe and insecure in India (Husain, 1965; Siddiqui, 1971; Brehmanand, 1970; Harman, 1976; Gupta, 1976). In an empirical investigation Kureshi (1975) observed no significant difference on the security insecurity motive between Hindu and Muslim students.

In our earlier study (Pestonjee & Singh, 1979), we found that Muslim girls were found to be more insecure than Hindu girls.

Here in the present investigation, when the total sample of 850 students was divided in two groups as Hindus and Muslims, it was found that Muslim students were more insecure than Hindu students. But, when we further divided the date of the Hindu and Muslim students on the basis

of their institutions where they are studying, we clearly observed the influence of their institutions where they had been studying since the last two years. Muslim students are certainly found more dogmatic and insecure, only in non-denominational institutional atmosphere. In denominational institutions, however, where they are comparatively the majority community they do not feel more dogmatic and feel more safe and secure.

While comparing the results of boys and girls, it was found that boys were more dogmatic than girls. Results of boys and girls are compared on the basis of their religion and institutions, it has been inferred that in denominational institutions the scores of Hindu boys and girls on the two personality variables do not differ significantly. However, boys have greater mean scores than girls. Whereas in other three situations (Table 4-a) boys are found to be more dogmatic and insecure than girls.

In some other investigations the influence of sex on the dogmatism and security-insecurity variables was studied by Mlott & Mlott (1975). It was found that females were more dogmatic than males. Similarly in Indian context Raina (1974) on the sample of University teachers (males and females) found that female teachers were more dogmatic than male ones.

On the security-insecurity variables the only Indian study comes to our mind is that of Kureshi (1975) who reports that boys and girls do not differ significantly on the security motive. However, in the present investigation results have led us to believe that boys are more dogmatic and insecure than girls. Clearly our finding do not corroborate the

Table 1

Mean, S.D. and Critical Ratio (C.R.) of the two students
of two institutions, two religions and boys and girls
on the dogmatism and security-insecurity variables

| | | DOGMATISM | | | | SECURITY-INSECURITY | | |
	Groups	N	M	S.D	C.R	M	S.D	C.R
INSTITU- TIONS	D.I.	470	157.01	18.88	2.16*	33.60	8.94	2.31*
	N.DI	380	153.46	24.001		31.45	10.08	
RELIGION	HINDUS	510	151.31	21.79	3.31**	31.79	9.53	5.02**
	MUSLIMS	340	156.37	21.93		35.05	9.29	
SEX	BOYS	520	156.06	22.33	5.93**	35.36	9.51	2.67**
	GIRLS	330	148.88	21.43		34.24	8.99	

*Significant at .05 level P < .05

**Significant at .001 level < .001

Table 2

Main Effect of Institution, Religion, Sex and their interactions on dogmatism and security-insecurity variables. ANOVA

Source of variation	df	Dogmatism		Security-insecurity	
		Ms	F	Ms	F
A. Institution	1	31.53	7.82*	16.82	120.14*
B. Religion	1	63.63	15.81*	28.57	204.07*
C. Sex	1	131.55	32.64*	17.17	122.68*
A x B Institution x Religion	1	93.85	23.29*	51.61	368.64*
A x C Institution x Sex	1	29.34	7.08*	3.08	21.97*
B x C Religion x Sex	1	12.66	3.14	.46	3.29
AxBxC Ins. x Reli. x Sex	1	4.18	1.04	2.25	16.07*
Error Within Treatment	842	4.03	–	.14	

*Significant at .01 level

Table 3

Intergroup Differences obtained from Duncan's Range Test on
dogmatism and security-insecurity variables

Group Number	Groups	DOGMATISM		SECURITY-INSECURITY	
		Significant at .05 level with group No.	Not Signifi- cant with group No.	Significant at .05 level with group No.	N.S. with Group No.
1	DHB	4,6,7	2,3,5,8	4,6,7,8	2,3,5
2	DHG	6,7	1,3,4,5,8	4,5,6,7,8	1,3
3	DMB	4,6,7	1,2,5,8	2,4,6,7,8	1,5
4	DMG	1,7,8	2,3,5,6	1,2,3,5,6,7,8	—
5	N-DHB	6,7	1,2,3,4,8	2,4,6,7,8	1,3
6	N-DHG	1,2,3,5,7,8	4	1,2,3,4,5,7,8	—
7	N-DMB	1,2,3,4,5,8	—	1,2,3,4,5,6,8	—
8	N-DMG	4,6,7	1,2,3,5	1,2,3,4,5,6,7	—

Table 4 : A

Intergroup Differences: Institution - Religion - Sex-wise
on Dogmatism and Security-Insecurity variable

	Group Number	D O G M A T I S M	SECURITY - INSECURITY
INSTITUTION	1	D H B vs N-D H B (Not significant)	D H B vs N-D H B (Not significant)
	2	D H G vs N-D H G (Significant at .05 level)	D H G vs N-D H G (Significant at .05 level)
	3	D M B vs N-D M B (Significant at .05 level)	D M G vs N-D M B (Significant at .05 level)
	4	D M G vs N-D M G (Significant at .05 level)	D M G vs N-D M G (Significant at .05 level)
RELIGION	1	D M B vs D M B (Not significant)	D H B vs D M B (Not significant)
	2	D H G vs D M G (Not significant)	D H G vs D M G (Not significant)
	3	N-D H B vs N-D M B (Significant at .05 level)	N-D H B vs N-D M B (Significant at .05 level)
	4	N-D H G vs N-D M G (Significant at .05 level)	N-D H G vs N-D M G (Significant at .05 level)
SEX	1	D H B vs D H G (Not significant)	D H B vs D H G (Not significant)
	2	D M B vs D M G (Significant at .05 level)	D M B vs D M G (Significant at .05 level)
	3	N-D H B vs N-D H G (Significant at .05 level)	N-D H B vs N-D H G (Significant at .05 level)
	4	N-D M B vs N-D M G (Significant at .05 level)	N-D M B vs N-D M G (Significant at .05 level)

Table 4 : B

Mean Dogmatism and Security - Insecurity Scores for
D-I and N-DI

	DENOMINATIONAL INSTITUTION				NON-DENOMINATIONAL INSTITUTIONS			
	HINDUS		MUSLIMS		HINDUS		MUSLIMS	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
DOGMATISM (Mean)	153.15	151.20	154.28	147.66	153.53	143.08	167.51	156.08
S-I (Mean)	33.12	32.01	32.40	31.13	33.24	27.53	40.56	37.93

R E F E R E N C E S

Allport, C.W.
1967

: <u>Patterns of Growth in Personality.</u>
New York: Holt.

Ansari, A.
1964

: <u>Adaptation of Maslow's Security-</u>
<u>Insecurity: A preliminary Report,</u>
(unpublished) Deptt. of Psychology,
A.M.U., Aligarh.

Astin, A.W.
1965 a

: "College preference of very able students",
<u>College and University,</u> 40, 282-297.

Astin, A.W.
1965 b

: <u>Who goes where to college?</u> Chicago,
Science Research Associates.

Astin, A.W.
1970

: Campus Disruption 1968-1969: An Analysis
of causal factors. <u>Psychology and the</u>
<u>problems of the society,</u> Washington D.C.,
American Psychological Association.

Brahmanand,
1970

: "Meaning and relevance of national
integration". In M.R. Khan (Ed.) <u>National</u>
<u>Integration:its meaning and relevance.</u>
Rajghat,Vranasi: Navchetana Prakashan.

Darley, J.G.
1962

: <u>Promise and performance: A study of ability</u>
<u>and achievement in higher education.</u>
Berkeley Centre for Study of Higher
Education, University of California.

Druckman, D.
1967

: "Dogmatism prenegotiation experience and
simulated group representation as
determinants of dyadic behaviour in a
bargaining situation". <u>Journal of</u>
<u>Personality and Social Psychology,</u>6,279-290.

Freud, A.
1946

: <u>The Ego and the Mechanism of Defence.</u>
New York : Int. University Press.

Gahagan, J.,
Horaj, J.,
Berger S &
Tedesehi, J.
1967.

: "Status and authoritarianism in the prisoner's dilemma game". <u>Paper read at the meeting of South Eastern Psychological Association</u>, Atlanta, April

Ganguli, B.N.
1958

: "Emotional Integration and Economic and Serial disparities". <u>In Report of Seminar on National Integration</u>, April 16-17, pp 51-57, U.G.C. New Delhi.

Gupta, R.
1968

: "The Problem". <u>Seminar</u>, No.16, 10-15.

Gupta, R.
1976

: <u>Hindu Muslim Relation</u>. Lucknow: Folk Cultural Society.

Harman, S.
1976

: <u>The Plight of Muslim in India</u>. London, D.L. Publication.

Husain Q.
1974

: <u>Dogmatism and Personality</u>. Calcutta: Minerva.

Husain S.A.
1965

: <u>The Destiny of Muslim in India</u>. Bombay: Asian Publication.

Kaliprasad,
1958

: "Role of Universities in National Integration". <u>In Report of Seminar on National Integration</u>. April 16-17, pp. 75-79, U.G.C. New Delhi.

Kureshi, A.
1975.

: Adolescent Fantacy. Calcutta; Minerva.

Liberman, M.
1960

: "Parochial School and Public leadership." <u>Nath Cath. Education Association</u>, B.H.U. 57, 239-248.

Maslow, A.H.

: <u>Motivation and Personality</u>.
New York: Harper & Row.

Maslow, A.H.
1970

: <u>Motivation and Personality</u> (2nd ed.)
New York. Harper & Row.

May, W.
1975

: <u>Moral Education</u>, London: George Allen &
Univer Ltd.

Mc Connell, T. &
Haist, P.
1959.

: "Do students make the College", <u>College</u>
<u>and University</u>, 34, 4, 442-452.

Meng, J.J.
1957

: American Thought: Contribution of
Catholic thought and thinkers; <u>Nath</u>:
Cath Educ. Associ. Bull, 53, 120-133.

Mlott, S.R. &
Mlott, Y.D.
1975

: "Dogmatism and locus of control in
individuals who smoke, stopped smoking
and never smoked." <u>Journal of Community</u>
<u>Psychology</u>, 3, 53-57.

Misbet, J.D. &
Entwhistle, M.J.
1966

: <u>Age of Transfer to Secondary Education.</u>
London: University London Press.

Pestonjee, D.M. &
Singh, A.K.
1979

: "Dogmatism and Security in two religious
groups." <u>Psychological Studies</u>, 24 (1)1-4.

Pestonjee, D.M. &
Singh, A.K.
1980

: School climates and personality.
Unpublished manuscript.

Raina, T.N.
1974

: "Dogmatism of Indian student, teachers "
<u>Psychological Studies</u>, 18, 57-61.

Rokeach, M.
1954

: "The nature and meaning of dogmatism".
<u>Psychological Review</u>, 61, 194-204.

Rokeach, M.
1960

: <u>The Open and Closed Mind.</u> New York:
Basic Book, Inc.

Siddiqie, A.H.
1971

: <u>National Integration in India</u>: <u>A Socio-</u>
<u>logical Approach.</u> Aligarh:Threeman
Publications.

Sodhi, R.S.
1972

: Impact of Religious Education on
Personality Patterns of students. A
Comparative Study. Ludhiana: Mukand
Publications.

Tripathi, R.C. &
Pandey N.
(1979)

: "Motivational consequences of educational
climate". Centre for the Psychological
Study of Social Change and National
Development, Allahabad University,
Allahabad.