

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

Part I

The results of Chapter III, Part I, show a positive and statistically significant relationship between congruence of perceived self acceptance and ideal self acceptance, and acceptance of others, to a high degree in the Zoroastrian student community, and to a lesser though significant degree in the Hindu student community. Therefore, in these two communities, in terms of the first hypothesis, the individual, who accepts himself as he is, will be more understanding and accepting of others. This means that, he has allowed into awareness most of his organic strivings, and integrated them into a consistent system, and thus feels free to look upon others as they are and to accept them for what they are.

From these findings it can reasonably be inferred that those Zoroastrian and Hindu subjects, who fail to relate satisfactorily to others, will find a solution to their problem by adopting a more accepting attitude toward self. Any gain in this direction will reflect a more accepting attitude of others, and thereby better interpersonal relationships will be achieved.

The results, however, failed to reach significance in the Catholic community, and in the Muslim community. Further research would be required to give a proper explanation of these findings. If variables like "the socio-economic status"

and "the intellectual level" were to be controlled, perhaps, more meaningful results would be obtained.

## Part II

### Interpretation of Differences in Factor Loadings

In order to interpret Zoroastrian and Hindu differences in the size and nature of Factor I, a Factor-Array method will be used, as has been explained in Chapter IV, Part II.

It will be remembered as was said in Chapter III, that 49 self-referent statements expressing self-acceptance were sorted or ranged by the persons of the present study on the basis of the frequency distribution given in Table II. Table XII gives an idea of how those scores were laid out. All the 16 arrays have the same mean and the same standard deviation. If the 16 persons had equal "weight" with regard to Factor I, it would be sufficient to add the eight Zoroastrian scores for each statement as they stand; and the 49 totals would be the required estimated Factor I array. The same procedure would be followed for the eight Hindus. But, as Stephenson (1, p. 176) states: "the persons should be 'weighted' so as to provide the 'best-weighted pool', that is, an array which will have the best approximation to the factor  $a$ , and it is for this that the 'weights' of expression are required."

TABLE XII

ZOROASTRIAN AND HINDU SELF ACCEPTANCE SCORES

State- ments	Scores Provided by Zoroas- trians					Scores Provided by Hindus				
	1	2	3	...	8	9	10	11	...	16
1	5	2	4	...	6	3	4	5	...	3
2	3	4	2	...	3	3	3	2	...	2
3	6	6	5	...	4	5	5	5	...	4
4	4	3	3	...	5	4	2	4	...	5
.	.	.	.	...	.	.	.	.	...	.
.	.	.	.	...	.	.	.	.	...	.
49	4	4	2	...	4	3	4	2	...	3
Mean Score	4	4	4	...	4	4	4	4..	...	4
S.D.	1.44	1.44	1.44		1.44	1.44	1.44	1.44		1.44

In the present study, the array will be approximated to centroid Factor I for Zoroastrians and for Hindus. These factor-arrays will be composed of the same 49 statements but in a different order.

Table XIII presents Zoroastrian "weights" with reference to Factor I, expressed in terms of person No. 7, who has the lowest loading in the factor. Thus, for instance, person No. 6 was given approximately twice as much "weight" as No. 7. The same Table shows Hindu "weights" with reference to Factor I, expressed in terms of person No. 13, who has the lowest loading in the factor. Here, No. 9 was given nine times as much "weight" as No. 13.

TABLE XIII

FACTOR I LOADINGS WITH ZOROASTRIAN "WEIGHTS" EXPRESSED IN TERMS OF PERSON NO. 7, AND HINDU "WEIGHTS" EXPRESSED IN TERMS OF PERSON NO. 13, TOGETHER WITH THEIR APPROXIMATE "WEIGHTS"

Zoroas- trians	Factor I Loadings	w	Approx- imate w	Hin- dus	Factor I Loadings	w	Approxi- mate w
1	.784	1.777	1.8	9	.838	9.047	9
2	.707	1.235	1.2	10	.661	3.770	3.8
3	.771	1.664	1.7	11	.651	3.624	3.6
4	.765	1.612	1.6	12	.576	2.755	2.7
5	.737	1.408	1.4	13	.287	1.(basis)	1.
6	.822	2.210	2.2	14	.778	6.318	6.3
7	.654	1.(basis)		15	.540	2.438	2.4
8	.692	1.161	1.2	16	.365	1.345	1.3

These "weights" were then applied to the scores for each of the 49 statements in turn; for instance, the 49 scores for Zoroastrian No. 6 were multiplied by 2.2, and those for No. 1 by 1.8. The scores per statement were then added, as shown in Table XIV, for Zoroastrians, and in Table XV, for Hindus.

The final array was the best estimate that could be made of Factor I loadings.

TABLE XIV

State- ments	Zoroastrian Weighted Scores for Factor I Loadings					Weighted Totals
	1	2	3	.....	8	
1	9.	2.4	6.8	.....	7.2	56.8
2	5.4	4.8	3.4	.....	3.6	39.
3	11.	7.2	8.5	.....	4.8	63.5
.	.	.	.	.....	.	.
...	.	.	.	.....	.	.
49	7.2	4.8	3.4	.....	4.8	36.

TABLE XV

State- ments	Hindu Weighted Scores for Factor I Loadings					Weighted Totals
	9	10	11	.....	16	
1	27.	15.2	16.	.....	3.9	105.3
2	27.	11.4	7.2	.....	2.6	80.7
3	45.	19.	16.	.....	5.2	148.6
.	.	.	.	.....	.	.
.	.	.	.	.....	.	.
49	27.	15.2	7.2	.....	3.9	93.4

As Stephenson has pointed out (1, p. 201), Thurstone's methodology, in R-technique, has been to search for a clear-cut "simple structure" and to discard tests which break it. The Q-technique aims also at "simple structure", but without discarding any. In the present study, Zoroastrians and Hindus are not in a bipolar relationship, that is, neither Zoroastrians nor Hindus possess one factor as their own exclusively; rather, they share in common Factor I in different proportions, and these different proportions are responsible for their differences. Its factor-array begins as follows:

Zoroastrian Most Characteristic Statements

No.    Score

41        7    "I feel confident that I can face different situations, though some of my problems are not yet solved."

No.   Score

24	7	"I take things naturally and calmly at home. There are different ways of doing things, and mine is not necessarily the best."
----	---	---

Hindu Most Characteristic Statements

No.   Score

41	7	"I feel confident that I can face different situations, though some of my problems are not yet solved."
----	---	---

46	7	"I know that I am not very clever, but with the intelligence I have I feel I can do something in the world, and shall try to achieve it."
----	---	---

Zoroastrian Least Characteristic Statements

No.   Score

44	1	"I have lost faith in everything and condemn myself all the way through."
----	---	---

11	1	"I feel I can't get on with any one."
----	---	---------------------------------------

Hindu Least Characteristic Statements

No.   Score

44	1	"I have lost faith in everything and condemn myself all the way through."
----	---	---

35	1	"I feel that the kind of person I would like to be is very different from the one I actually am at present."
----	---	--

The reason for selecting the two most characteristic, and the two least characteristic statements is this: as shown in Table II, the persons under study were asked to place the two most characteristic statements in category 7, and the two least characteristic statements in category 1. These statements

placed at the opposite ends of the frequency curve, reveal at a glance the common, and the characteristic elements of Zoroastrians and Hindus.

From the above statements it appears that Zoroastrians and Hindus agreed to choose statement No. 41 as their most characteristic description of themselves. Therefore, "self confidence to face different situations" seems to be the nature of their common factor. But, as a sizable difference was found between Factor I loadings for Zoroastrians and for Hindus, it would seem that self confidence is possessed by Zoroastrians in a higher degree than by Hindus. They differ in the other choice. Zoroastrians picked No. 24, and Hindus chose No. 46. Comparing these two statements, it would seem 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, in the line of sociability; Hindu self confidence moves in the line of personality, that is, confidence in one's intellectual ability, and endeavour for achievement.

The two least characteristic statements placed at the opposite end of the frequency curve, confirm the above interpretation, for they express an attitude which is just



the opposite of the one chosen as being most characteristic of them. Zoroastrians and Hindus agreed to choose statement No. 44 as their least characteristic description of themselves. Therefore, "to lose faith and condemn oneself" being the least characteristic of them, confirms that "self confidence" is their asset. Again they differ in the other choice. Zoroastrians selected No. 11, and Hindus picked No. 35. Statement No. 11 expressing inadequacy to get on with people, and being the least characteristic of Zoroastrians, confirms the above interpretation of the nature of Zoroastrian Factor I, viz., the ability to relate with other people. Statement No. 35 expressing "self-rejection", and being the least characteristic of Hindus, confirms the above interpretation of the nature of Hindu Factor I, viz., "self-esteem and a sense of personal worth".

This comparison of Zoroastrian and Hindu factor-arrays might be followed statement by statement, interpreting Zoroastrian and Hindu differences on the basis of the contents of the statements. But, as differences will naturally be noticed most at both ends of the frequency curve, it will suffice to compare the two categories placed at one end, and the two placed at the other end of the curve. Now, as shown in Table II, each of these two sets of categories contains 8 statements. Therefore, for the present study, it is thought sufficient to compare only those 8 statements.

Zoroastrians and Hindus agree again on their third choice of No. 37, which reads:

"I usually try to live up to my ideals, even when I feel that my friends may slight me for it."

But they part company in their fourth choice. Hindus adhere to what refers to the individual. Their choice is No. 6, which says:

"When I hear criticism about me, I don't allow myself to get excited; I just see how much truth there is in it, and accept it."

Zoroastrians approach Hindus along the line of personality in choosing No. 46, as follows:

"I know that I am not very clever, but with the intelligence I have I feel I can do something in the world, and shall try to achieve it."

In their fifth choice, Zoroastrians stick to the relationship with other people:

No. 9: "If I want to feel free to say things, I think that I should realize that there is no reason to feel afraid of what they will say."

Hindus stress the sense of belonging to a group in choosing:

No. 7: "I realize that I am a member of a group, and that just as they have short comings so have I, and thus I feel free in the group."

In the sixth choice, Hindus approach the line of relationship with others:

No. 9: "If I want to feel free to say things, I think that I should realize that there is no reason to feel afraid of what they will say."

While Zoroastrians drift towards the line of personality:

No. 6: "When I hear criticism about me, I don't allow myself to get excited; I just see how much truth there is in it, and accept it."

In the seventh choice, Hindus approach home life and the relationship with relatives:

No.24: "I take things naturally and calmly at home. There are different ways of doing things, and mine is not necessarily the best."

Zoroastrians dwell on the relationship with people outside the home:

No.26: "When people praise me, I usually feel that they mean it."

It is in the eighth choice that a remarkable difference exists. Hindus select the influence of their past life on the present condition:

No.42: "I feel I cannot deny that part of my past life (childhood) which gives me many answers to what I am now."

While Zoroastrians choose the sense of belonging to a group:

No. 7: "I realize that I am a member of a group, and that just as they have shortcomings so have I, and thus I feel free in the group."

Zoroastrian and Hindu differences as noticed above, will be confirmed by the comparative study of those statements which Zoroastrians and Hindus chose as least characteristic of them.

The third least characteristic statement of Zoroastrians runs:

- No. 5: "When in a group, I feel I have nothing to say for fear of ridicule."

That really reflects their tendency to relate to other people. While Hindus selected as third least characteristic

No. 40:

- "When I am mixed up with a problem, I feel that if I asked for suggestions or help, I would come down in the eyes of the people."

That expresses the Hindu endeavour towards the solutions of problems by himself, that is, accomplishment.

The other statements least characteristic of Zoroastrians are in the following order:

- No. 23: "I have not got what it takes to be a normally acceptable person."  
No. 10: "I can't take any criticism about me."  
No. 8: "I often feel that I have not got what it takes to be respected by my friends."  
No. 22: "I think I am seeing rather clearly that most of the pain I suffer is because I am following a pattern that has been introjected in me by my parents, and that is not really 'me'. "  
No. 49: "I am just rushing through things and I need more thinking. I am not clever enough, and I can't quite reconcile myself to accepting that."

The other statements least characteristic of Hindus are as follows:

- No. 11: "I feel I can't get on with any one."  
No. 10: "I can't take any criticism about me."  
No. 2: "I realize that it has been difficult for me to keep up friendships because I am too engrossed in my own interests."

- No. 14: "I have made myself realize that I can't love a certain person whom I like very much. If I did not accept this idea I would be very unhappy."
- No. 19: "At home I am very irritable but can't see reasons for this irritability which I don't want to have."

To sum up this comparative study of factor-arrays, it can be said that both Zoroastrians and Hindus possess in common "self confidence to face different situations". The amount of self confidence, however, possessed by Zoroastrians seems to be larger than the one possessed by Hindus, for Zoroastrians took a bigger size of the common variance than Hindus did. They differ, however, in the way in which they put into operation this self confidence. Zoroastrians use it for relating to other people, that is, for sociability; while Hindus use it for endeavour towards accomplishment, that is, for personality development. This Zoroastrian-Hindu difference in the nature of their personality make-up, is disclosed by the significant difference which was found between Zoroastrian variance and Hindu variance in Factor I loadings. Zoroastrian variance being very small, Zoroastrians cluster together round the same pattern. And this pattern has been found, by means of the Q-sorts contents, to be sociability. Hindus, having a much larger variance, scatter over a wide range, that is, each one follows his own individualistic way which is distinct from the way of other individuals, and this individualistic way has been found, by means of the Q-sorts contents, to be an individualistic

personality.

Thus we have a concrete and real interpretation of various psychological factors as found in the two Indian College student communities under study, which lie at the root of Zoroastrian-Hindu differences in their obtained relationship between "congruence of perceived self-acceptance and ideal self-acceptance, and acceptance of others." Therefore, the second hypothesis of the present study viz., "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", has been verified. For, differences were obtained in the "congruence between perceived self-acceptance and ideal self-acceptance, and objective acceptance of others", in Zoroastrians and Hindus. And these differences have been found to rest upon different psychological factors characteristic of each community. Zoroastrian culture seems to motivate self in the self-others relationship, along the line of sociability; while Hindu culture seems to motivate self in the self-others relationship, along the line of personality.

Part III

Interpretation of Obtained Differences  
in Item Analysis Results

In interpreting Zoroastrian and Hindu differences in the scores of acceptance of others, only those items which showed the greatest discrepancy in the comparison of Zoroastrian scores with Hindu scores, will be considered. Those items were the following: Nos.: 27, 12, 2, 13, 17 and 21. The  $X^2$  values obtained by these items failed to reach significance as has been reported in Chapter IV, Part III. This means that the differences obtained in the scores on the above items may be attributed to chance. Hence no valid interpretation can be given of Zoroastrian and Hindu differences in the scores of acceptance of others.

However, if we examine the contents of those statements which showed the greatest discrepancy in the comparison of Zoroastrian scores with Hindu scores, an area of Zoroastrian-Hindu differences may be detected in which further research alone could tell if obtained differences are valid or not. It is only with this end in view that such differences are mentioned here.

The first difference that appears between Zoroastrians and Hindus is this: Hindus seem to be motivated by a sense of duty and by a sense of personal conviction:

Item No. 12: "I feel it is my duty to cooperate with others for a good cause."

Item No. 2: "My keenest wish is to devote myself to the service of others just as they are."

The Hindu scores on these two statements were 14 and 15 points respectively, higher than the corresponding Zoroastrian scores.

Again, Hindus show more tolerance towards other people than Zoroastrians do:

Item No. 21: "I can be very intolerant at times with some people."

Item No. 17: "I hate those people who wish to appear good. Their behaviour is so artificial that it annoys me."

These statements expressing intolerance, are more characteristic of Zoroastrians than of Hindus by a difference of 13 and 14 points respectively.

Zoroastrians on the other hand seem to be motivated more by the spirit of social service. Thus:

Item No. 13: "X is a very neurotic person and causes a lot of trouble. Why should I put up with X?"

This statement expressing a lack of sympathy towards a handicapped person, is more characteristic of Hindus than of Zoroastrians by 16 points. Therefore, Zoroastrians seem to possess more sympathy for the handicapped than Hindus do.

Comparing this No. 13 with Nos. 12 and 2 given above, it would seem that Zoroastrians are motivated more by sympathy, and that Hindus are motivated more by a sense of duty and



of personal conviction.

Item No. 27: "At parties I am active to help others have a good time."

This statement is more characteristic of Hindus than of Zoroastrian by 20 points. This may indicate that consideration for others at parties may be stronger in Hindus than in Zoroastrians.

To sum up, Hindus are motivated more than Zoroastrians by a sense of duty, a sense of personal conviction, and a spirit of tolerance; and Zoroastrians are motivated more than Hindus by a spirit of social service, by sympathy and self-enjoyment. These differences may be due to chance; further research is required to prove that they are valid. However, as they stand, they do not contradict the Zoroastrian-Hindu differences which were found in the attitude of self-acceptance as reported above in Part II, rather they agree with them. 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 of a sense of personal conviction.

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

REFERENCES

- (1) Stephenson, W. The Study of Behaviour. Chicago:  
University of Chicago Press, 1953.