CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the relationship between congruence of perceived self-acceptance and ideal self-acceptance, and acceptance of others, in Indian College students as they are found in Bombay Colleges viz., boys and girls taken together. Further, as the degree of this relationship was expected to vary from one community to another, it was the purpose of the present study also, to investigate into these differences, and to attempt to explain them in terms of the various psychological factors which might be more characteristic of each community. Therefore, the present study was set to test the following hypotheses:

1) Congruence between perceived self-acceptance and ideal self-acceptance varies directly with objective acceptance of others.

2) The relationship of congruence between perceived self-acceptance and ideal self-acceptance to objective acceptance of others, is a function of various psychological factors as found in Indian College student communities.

The subjects used in the present study were 30 boys and 30 girls of each of the four communities: Hindu, Muslim,

Catholic, and Zoroastrian. In all the subjects were 240.

These subjects were Indian College students taken mostly from

the senior B.A. and senior B.Sc. classes. They all were either

of St. Xavier's College or of Sophia College. The age range

for the Zoroastrians was from 16 to 24 years, with a mean age

level of 19.1 years, and with a S.D. of 1.47 years. For the

Hindus the range was from 15 to 30 years, with a mean of

19.1 years, and a S.D. of 2 years. For the Catholics the

range was from 16 to 27 years, with a mean of 19.3 years, and

a S.D. of 2 years. For the Muslims the range was from 16 to

24 years, with a mean of 19.4 years, and a S.D. of 1.46 years.

All the students in each group had had a minimum of one year

and two months of College education. Their socio-economic

status was by no means homogeneous. The fact that only stu-

dents of St. Xavier's and Sophia were used, implies that 56%

of them had been educated in Catholic High Schools conducted

by Catholic Priests and Sisters.

The testing programme was explained to the students.

They were invited to take the tests, and were accepted as

they came. Three tests in all were administered. The first

two tests were constructed on Stephenson's Q-Technique, and

much help was taken also from Sheerer's study on Self-acceptance

and Acceptance of others. They consisted of 49 self-referent

statements expressing self-acceptance in various degrees

from most to least. In the preparation of the final copy of

these statements, help was taken from a Psychologist. These
first two tests were identical in content, the only differ-
ence being in the instructions given viz., in the first test,
the subjects were asked to rate themselves as they actually
were, by placing the 49 Q-sorts in a forced quasi-normal
distribution of 7 categories from most characteristic to
least characteristic of self. In the second test, they were
asked to rate themselves as they would most like to be, by
the same procedure.

The third test was a simple scale to measure the general
attitude of acceptance of others. It consisted of 38 self-
referent statements expressing either acceptance of others
or a complete lack of it. It was constructed with the help
of three Psychologists, and their agreement on the items was
the basis for selecting them. The subjects were asked to
rate themselves on a five point scale from "always true of
myself" to "never true of myself". In this manner a score of
acceptance of others was obtained for each subject.

Pearson's r was used in determining the correlation
between the Q-sorts reflecting perceived self-acceptance and
those reflecting ideal self-acceptance. The correlations
obtained had a mean of .42 for Hindus, .38 for Muslims, .29
for Catholics, and .46 for Zoroastrians. Obtained r's were
then transformed to to Fisher's z scores.

The scores obtained on the scale for acceptance of

others had a mean of 140.55 for Hindus, 139.40 for Muslims, 131.51 for Catholics, and 138.16 for Zoroastrians.

In order to test the first hypothesis in each community separately, the z's of the congruence of perceived self-acceptance and ideal self-acceptance of each community, were correlated by means of Pearson's r with the total scores of acceptance of others of the same community. It was found that the resulting r of .40 of Zoroastrians was significant at the .01 level of confidence; the resulting r of .29 of Hindus was significant at the .05 level; and the resulting r of .05 of Catholics, and the r of -.13 of Muslims failed to reach significance.

The second hypothesis was tested in the following manner: since the first hypothesis came true in the Zoroastrian and Hindu communities only, and the degree of significance was different for these two communities as it was expected, it was decided to interpret only Zoroastrian-Hindu differences in terms of psychological factors characteristic of them. To this purpose the eight Zoroastrians with the highest correlation of congruence between self-ideal acceptance, were compared with the eight Hindus who stood highest in the same correlation. Thus the best representatives of each community were used. These subjects made a self-appraisal on 49 Q-sorts expressing self-acceptance. Thus a variate was obtained for each person of his perceived self-acceptance. Eight Zoroastrian

variates were then correlated with eight Hindu variates to investigate in what measure self-acceptance was shared by Zoroastrians and Hindus. In this way a correlation matrix was obtained. The correlation matrix was then subjected to a centroid factor analysis by the Thurstone technique. One factor was extracted. The factorization results showed a large Zoroastrian-Hindu difference in the variances of their respective Factor loadings, which is significant at the .02 level. This striking Zoroastrian-Hindu difference indicates that, Zoroastrians clustered together round a pattern, while Hindus were scattered all over the field.

In order to interpret objectively Zoroastrian and Hindu differences in the size and nature of obtained factors, a Factor-Array method was used, as explained by Stephenson. The array was approximated to Factor I both for Zoroastrians and for Hindus.

An Item Analysis was made on the scales which were used to measure acceptance of others. In order to test the discriminative power of each individual item of the scales, an Item Analysis was made on the responses of the Zoroastrians high and low groups given on each item, by means of the Chi Square. It was found that the items Nos. 22, 24 and 27 obtained an x^2 value of 4.27, 3.98 and 4.27 which are significant at the .05 level of confidence; and Nos. 5, 8 and 11 approached very closely the .05 level.

With regard to Hindus, no item difference reached the
.05 level of significance, though Nos. 6 and 10 obtained an
x^2 value of 3.58 and 2.91 respectively, which approached
very closely the .05 level.

In the difference between the Hindu high group and the
Zoroastrian low group, items Nos. 22, 24 and 23 with x^2 values
of 4.87, 4.87 and 3.95 respectively, were statistically sig-
nificant at the .05 level.

Finally, in order to interpret objectively Zoroastrian-
Hindu differences on the scales of acceptance of others, the
30 Zoroastrians and the 30 Hindus who stood highest in the
scores of acceptance of others, were compared on each item
of the scales by means of the Chi Square. It was found that
no item showed a difference which is significant at the .05
level. However, items Nos. 27, 12, 2, 13, 17, and 21 which
obtained the highest significance of them all, were used for
pointing to an area of further research in Zoroastrian-Hindu
differences.

***   ***   ***

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the above results the following conclusions may be drawn:

1. For the population used, the relationship between congruence of perceived self-acceptance and ideal self-acceptance, and objective acceptance of others, is positive and statistically significant in the Zoroastrian College student community. √

2. For the population used, the relationship between congruence of perceived self-acceptance and ideal self-acceptance, and objective acceptance of others, is positive and statistically significant in the Hindu College student community.

3. No significant relationship was found in the Catholic and Muslim College student communities, between congruence of perceived self-acceptance and ideal self-acceptance, and objective acceptance of others. It might be suggested that, if the subjects had been controlled with regard to intelligence-level and socio-economic status, and had been taken from an homogeneous milieu, perhaps, a positive and statistically significant relationship would have been found between congruence of perceived self-acceptance and ideal self-acceptance, and objective acceptance of others. Further research is required on this point.

4. A statistically significant difference was found

between Zoroastrian variance and Hindu variance in Factor I loadings. These findings pointed to a difference in the nature of Factor I viz., Zoroastrians clustered together to form a pattern, while Hindus scattered over a wide range.

This difference was interpreted by means of the Factor-array, and the contents of the Q-sorts. These suggested, that although Zoroastrians and Hindus share in common "self-confidence to face different situations", this self-confidence moves along different lines: for Zoroastrians, it moves in the line of relationship with other people, beginning with those at home, that is, the line of sociability; Hindu self-confidence, on the other hand, moves in the line of person-ality, that is, confidence in one's intellectual ability and endeavour for achievement.

5. In their general attitude of acceptance of others, some Zoroastrian-Hindu differences were observed; but, as the obtained results, on which these differences were based were not statistically significant, they will be mentioned here only as pointing to an area in which further research would be required.

The statement-items of the third test which showed the highest differences between Zoroastrians and Hindus suggest, that Hindus are motivated more than Zoroastrians by a sense of duty, by a sense of personal conviction and

a spirit of tolerance; and that Zoroastrians are motivated more than Hindus by a spirit of social service, by sympathy and self-enjoyment.

These differences are in agreement with the Zoroastrian-Hindu differences which were found in self-acceptance. For, with regard to Zoroastrians, sympathy, the spirit of social service, and a desire for self enjoyment, go together with the capacity to relate easily with others. With regard to Hindus, endeavour for achievement, and confidence in one's intellectual ability are part and parcel of a sense of duty, and a sense of personal conviction.

The findings of the present study show that the self-others acceptance relationship, which was found to be stat-istically significant in American subjects, holds good also in Indian subjects. As has already been pointed out, by controlling several variables which on purpose were not controlled in the present study, higher correlations would probably be found. The Q-sorts, too, could be adapted more to Indian customs and traditions, and made easy to under-stand for students who are not yet quite familiar with English.

56% of the subjects used in the present study had been educated in Catholic Schools, and were under the same influence at Catholic Colleges. This influence might be responsible to some extent for the common factor shared

by both Zoroastrians and Hindus. If this type of study were to be done on Hindus who had always been under Hindu influence, and on Zoroastrians who had always been under Zoroastrian influence in their education, more striking differences would probably be found.

Many culture groups are to be found in India. The present investigation suggests an unexplored and very useful field of research for Indian Psychologists.

***   ***   ***