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DISCRIMINATING WISDOM

Discriminating wisdom (DW) is an English word for a sanskrit word “vivek”. Before describing the meaning of DW it is more worthwhile to explain its second phrase i.e., wisdom. Wisdom has applied meaning and great impact on our daily lives. Wisdom helps people in taking decision and analysing any critical situation.

The Buddhist philosophy (Tondon, 1995) defines wisdom as Sampajañña (सम्पज्ज्ञा) and Pañña (पञ्ज्ञा). Sampajañña means an understanding, investigation, discernment, discrimination, differentiation, erudition, proficiency, skill, analysis, consideration, close examination, breadth, sagacity, guidance, insight, thorough understanding of impermanence, right view, etc. The plethora of nouns and metaphors also indicate that sampajañña is not awareness but wisdom. This word refers to an intensified kind of understanding and knowing correctly with wisdom. Pañña knows things from different angles in correct way. A person who knows in a right way impermanence (as well as suffering and egolessness) has wisdom, sampajañña. Sampajañña is complete understanding. It is insight into all aspects of the human phenomenon, mental as well as
physical. Tilleke (1980) also explains pañña (wisdom) as knowledge and insight.

The great Greek thinker Aristotle also explains wisdom (in Tomas & Patric, 1961) in two senses. On the one hand, it is attributed to ‘the perfection of art’, and on the other hand, says Aristotle we also speak of the wise without any limitation to a special sphere. Aristotle gave a term prudence, which means practical wisdom. It mainly concerns the individual, so that the person whose mind is fixed on his own private advantage is regarded as the true example of this kind of wisdom. Wisdom makes some kind of contribution to happiness. It is a part of complete virtues. Practical wisdom deals with what is good and profitable to man.

The Major Historical Dictionary (Grimm & Grimm, 1954, 1984) defines wisdom as “insight and knowledge about oneself and world”. On the other hand, the Oxford English Dictionary describes wisdom as “good judgment and advice in difficult and uncertain matters of life (Flower & Flower, 1964). Both definitions reflect a consensus that wisdom is fundamentally a practical, contextual and human concept rather than a philosophical and divine one. According to Assmann, Batten, Smith and Staudinger (1994, 1992) wisdom is a valuable and high level knowledge that is used by people in managing difficult life situation.

Some psychologists deal with psychological aspect of wisdom. Psychologists highlight intellectual, personality related, and developmental features of wisdom such as emergence of calm and meditative attitudes (c.f., Hall, 1922), impartiality, detachments, the
search for moderation between extremes of knowledge and doubt, and the well balanced coordination of emotion, motivation, and thinking in the later part of life. Wisdom concerns on high intellectual capacities and positive aspect of character (c.f., Dittmann, Kohli & Baltes, 1990).

All psychological studies on wisdom accept two approaches. The first approach centres on implicit notion about wisdom (Clayton & Birren, 1980) and second approach centres around measurement of wisdom (like style of thinking or problem solving) (Staudinger & Baltes, 1996). According to Sternberg (1985) implicit theory of wisdom can be studied by asking people about their wise knowledge and about wise people. Three conclusions of this work are (i) everyday notions of wisdom and of wise persons are closely related with wise persons viewed as the carriers of wisdom; (ii) wise people combine high intellect with qualities such as concern for others, good judgment about advice giving, interpersonal skill and intuitions; thus wisdom is more than intelligence and more than personality; and (iii) wisdom is implicitly viewed as interpersonal and social in its development and application, and is produced in the context of advice giving. Further, people show high level of consensus about these three features of wisdom. The explicit approach to wisdom tries to measure thinking and an individual's response to difficult life problems (Sternberg, 1990; Smith, Staudinger & Baltes, 1994). This approach shows that wise people have integrated oppositions and transcend their own personal agendas.

Postformal approaches (Alexander & Langer, 1990) to assessing wisdom are based on Piagetian traditions in study of cognitive
development. In this style, wisdom is viewed as a style of thinking or a way of processing information by mind. Wisdom is also characterized as the ability to specify broad problems in order to find solution as well an ability to adjust with uncertainty and lack of perfect knowledge and the integration of thinking, wanting and feeling (Sternberg, 1990). Another explicit approach to wisdom is an integrative one, which attempts to bring together life span developmental research on mind and personality and cultural and historical perspective on wisdom. In this approach, wisdom is viewed as "an expert knowledge system in the fundamental pragmatism of life permitting exceptional insight, judgment and advice involving complex and uncertain matters of the human conditions (Baltes & Smith, 1990). In this approach, wisdom involves the orchestration of intellectual ability, personality, personal experience and additional knowledge skill (Smith, Staudinger & Baltes, 1994; Staudinger, Hopez & Baltes, 1997).

The Berlin Wisdom Paradigm (Baltes & Smith, 1990) explains that wisdom develops as a consequence of the cooperation of several factors including intellect, personality, contextual factors and expertise specific factors associated with historical events or professional training and mentorship. The development of wisdom can be furthered by a motivation to learn about and master difficult problems in life.

The full phrase discriminating wisdom or vivek is an ability to discriminate among different alternatives. Radhakrishnan (1988) also expounds that ‘na vivekam vinajnanam” (न निवेकम् बिना ज्ञानम्), means without discrimination there is no wisdom. It has control over the
actions of sense and action organs through mind. The Kathopnishad explains the relation between these as: "Know the self (atman) to be master of the chariot, and the body to the chariot. Know the discriminating intellect to be the charioteer, and the mind to be reins. The sense are the horses and the object of sense the paths. When the self is yoked with the mind and the senses, the wise call it the enjoyer. One whose mind is always unrestrained and has not discrimination, his sense are not uncontrollable like the vicious horses of a charioteer. But one whose mind is always under control and has correct understanding his senses are controllable like the horses of a charioteer, which are disciplined. But who is so devoid of a discriminating intellect, possessed of an unrestrained mind and is ever pure does not attain that goal but goes to mundane life. But who is possessed of a discriminating intellect and a restrained mind and is ever pure, attains that goal from which he is not born again (1-3.3 to 1-3.4).

Above philosophical passage throws light on two aspects: the first aspect is related to the behaviour and second aspect is related to the success of the behaviour. It explains that objects of our organs fascinate the organs. Indian philosophy also assumes that desire (kama काम), wrath (krodha क्रोध), affection (moha मोह), avarice (lobha लोभ), fear (bhaya भय) and envy (irshya इर्ष्या) are the six enemies that capture the mind. Interaction of captured mind and fascinated functions of organs generate various physical and psychological needs. However, at concrete level, needs are generated either by physiological process of organs or by demands of some external factors. Our organs tend to satisfy needs by involving in their loving
objects. In other words, objects are attractive goals for the organs. DW analyses the emerged need whether it is rational, and whether a specific course of action is rational to achieve the rational goal. It also assumes that DW exercises its control through manas (mind). If an evaluation by the DW is correct and rational in actual sense success is in hand. It is assumed that if all needs of an actor are satisfied then ultimately he becomes free from the needs (kamana कामना), and thus, from birth (life). It is forever that any need of the actor is not satisfied, and he (the actor) remains needy, then he goes to mundane life. Vivek uses analytical ability of intellect in the evaluations and analysis of alternatives. Above philosophical interpretation exhibits following ideas:

1. Necessities are the root cause of all behaviour,
2. Selection of alternatives which can satisfy a specific need depends on its attractiveness, and
3. A person tends to opt or choose an attractive alternative course of action that is related to an attractive goal.

But DW continuously evaluates the rationale of necessity and behaviour and, as a result, attraction of the goal is moderated, and decision to do or not to do the specific course of action is taken (Singh, 1997).

This explanation has philosophical ground but seems to be logically intuitive and practical. According to Mishra (1972) discrimination between consciousness and pure consciousness is called "vivek". Vivek is also a discrimination between consciousness and matter. Yoga philosophy (in Shastri, 1994) also defines 'vivek' as discrimination between matter and consciousness (3/55). A viveki
person perceives all materialistic pleasure as a root or cause of suffering (2/15) and vivek can change human inclination from materialistic sphere towards spiritual world or wisdom (2/126), and it may be the key to salvation (26/14). Sharma (1991) regards that 'vivek' is divine light, which discriminate true, and falsehood, loss and profit, appropriate and inappropriate, and necessity, etc. On the other hand, Shankara (in Jadunath Sinha, 1986) explains delusion as non-discrimination (aviveka अविभेक). He defines ajnana (अज्ञान) as non-discrimination or wrong cognition as what is duty and what is not. Shankara maintains that negligence in the quest of one’s real nature produces delusion. According to Shankara, non-discrimination (aviveka) or absence of right-knowledge of moral and immoral actions produce delusion. Delusion destroys discriminative knowledge (viveka), which is due to the distinct knowledge of the self (atman).

All these explanations are philosophical. There are some empirical studies on DW. Singh (1997) attempted to define Vivek or discriminating wisdom operationally. He also attempted to explore the function of the DW. His objectives were to examine (i) how and in which sense people use the concept of 'vivek', and (ii) what people evaluate by vivek before deciding to involve in an action. An interview schedule was administered on heterogeneous sample of teachers, student and other subjects of the society. Content analysis of the responses indicated that all subjects use their vivek in process of selection of alternatives and decision-making. Though, different people use vivek variedly but consistency was also seen which are the significant features of vivek. According to Singh (1997) vivek is an understanding an analytical mental ability that evaluates all
positive and negative influences of alternatives for self and others, situations, working procedure and obstacles and impediments related to the alternatives. Vivek is generally employed for all types of alternatives except habitual and emotionally toned behaviour. However, it controls and regulates habitual behaviours, emotions, moods and mind also. A list of 25 evaluative dimensions was emerged in the study. The list is as under:

1. Necessity of the behaviour,
2. Need for others,
3. Beneficial / harmful for self in future,
4. Importance of the work,
5. Beneficial / harmful for self,
6. Beneficial / harmful for others,
7. Right / wrong,
8. Appropriate / inappropriate,
9. Moral / immoral,
10. Good / bad,
11. Like / dislike,
12. Interesting / not interesting,
13. Useful / useless,
14. Violent - non violent,
15. Whether follow social norms,
16. Whether others like,
17. Importance of the instigator / person concerned,
18. Social approval,
19. Ability,
20. Suitability of time / situation,
21. Effective working (control over the procedure),
22. Knowledge,
23. Facilities available,
24. Difficulties, and

On the basis of the above contents, Singh (1997) has tried to classify these dimensions into 4 - 5 broader dimensions viz, needs and valence of behavioural goal, attitude towards the behaviour, social norms and social approval and difficulties, abilities, expectations and control.

Singh (1997) continued his work to identify the hidden factors of DW. He further studied 300 subjects of different age, sex and occupations. A tool consisting of 18 items related to 9 family and 9 service related situations were prepared. Each situation represent a problem pertaining to decision-making with a question as what and how much one considers various factors before taking a decision in the situation. The questions were followed by 28 evaluative dimensions each of which was presented with a six point rating scale ranging from 'very much' to 'not at all'. Factor analysis of the responses for family and service related situations and their sum was done. Four factors, viz. subjective norms and social concern, control belief, valence and attitude were identified in the analysis. A brief description of the factors is presented as under:

1. Subjective Norm And Social Concern

Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) explained social norm as a belief about how other people will view one's performance of the behaviour. These
contain an expectancy elements (will this significant other be more or less likely to approve of me if I perform this behaviour) and a value element referred to as the motivation to comply (how much do I value this significant other approval ?). But subjective norm and social concern factors identified by Singh (1997) included not only the important others but also liking of the common member of one’s society and social approval. It also included the consideration of other’s needs and benefits. Violent vs non-violent nature of the action is also associated with subjective norm although violence has negative concern in society.

2. Belief of control

There are 10 variables, which had significant association with belief of control. These variables are self-ability, suitability of the time/situation, effective working, control over the procedure, knowledge, facilities available, and difficulties, expectation of success, standard of the working (thing), far/near (place) and value/cost of the work. These factors resembled the ‘perceived control’ of Aizen (1991), which required significantly the resources and opportunities. As Ajzen (1991) has explained that the perceived control is developed on the basis of past experiences and the second hand informations. Belief of control also considers the prerequisite resources (self-ability, effective working/control over procedure, knowledge, difficulties, far/near; cost of work, opportunities, suitability of time and situation and expectation about success, facilities and difficulties).
3. Valence of alternatives

There were four variables considered with factor named valance. These are necessity of the works, importance of the work, beneficial/harmful for self in present, beneficial/harmful for self in future. This concept is similar to the concept of Lewin’s (1953) valence.

Valence is very important factor responsible for behaviour in the field theory of Lewin (1953) and expectancy model of Vroom (1964). Intensity of the valence of a behavioural alternative depends on the intensity of the need to be satisfied by the behaviour. Need is an internal factor, while valence is external factor. According to the field theory, valence is a characteristic of external environment. There will be more than one alternative related to the one's need, and intensity of the different valences would be different and, hence, valence has an important role in selection of alternative. Furthermore, the important point in the study of Singh (1997) who holds the view that necessity, importance of work, advantages in the present situation are important determinants of the intensity of valance. Singh (1997) further remarks that not only the beneficence of the work at present but also in future is very important that determine the valence of the work/alternative.

4. Attitude

The fourth identified factor was attitude. An individual also evaluates his/her behaviour in the light of his/her attitude. Attitude is the degree to which a person has a favourable or unfavourable evaluation of an attitude object. Seven variables were found to be associated with this factor. These variables are right/wrong,
appropriate/inappropriate, moral/immoral, good/bad, like/dislike, interest/lack of interest, useful/useless. It is similar to the concept of attitude in the Planned Behaviour Theory of Ajzen (1991). Attitude towards an object is the most important factor in the selection of an alternative.

DISCRIMINATING WISDOM ORIENTATION

These are the four factors of discriminating wisdom. These factors involve various dimensions on the basis of which one can evaluate his/her accuracy of decision. The work of discriminating wisdom is to decide specific course of action. Some studies found that different persons have different orientations, while evaluating different alternatives. In the process of evaluation, students consider external influence, availability of financial aid and internal influence (Dimond, 1992), advice of friends, advice of teachers, prospect of learning a job, academic reputation and reasonable cost (Smith & Mathews, 1991), good examination result and good learning facilities (West, Varlaam & Scott, 1991), opinion of friends (Boatwright, Ching & Parr, 1992), reputation of school, personal contact, location and prospectus (Manus, Winds & Sprostom, et al. 1993) at the time of selecting their school for further studies. Parents consider some other factors like personal attention, good curriculum and small classes (Tanner & Griffeth, 1991), discipline, good examination result, quality of teachers, distance from home, pupil-teacher relationship and types of schools (i.e., single sex and mixed sex) (West & Varlaam, 1991; Hunter, 1991) while selecting of school for their children. People evaluate reputation, building, safety, quality of food, cost and activities, patient/respondent relationship and distance of hospital from home at the
time of taking decision regarding health care (Rrawitz, Lawrence, Draughn, & Wozinck, 1994). Similarly, people think about patient living arrangement, home assistance needs and personal assistance need at the time of discharging their patients (Weaver, Ross, Champmen & O'Brien, 1994). Decision regarding premarital relationship depends on evaluation of age, family structure, peer influence, commitment to partner and sexual attitude (Lock & Vincent, 1994). When teenagers use contraceptives they think about pregnancy risks, and knowledge about reproductive biology (Reschovsky & Grenner, 1991), partner’s influence, side effects of oral contraceptives (Weisman, Plichta, Nosthanson & Chase, 1991).

In the case money investment, people evaluate stock price, price earning, ratio and stock price development (Antonides & Van der Ser, 1990), and in household investment, they think about underlying constructs, attribute, values, and strength of relationship (Grunest, 1989). Our religious behaviour decision is taken considering knowledge about social influence, social sanctions and influence of family (Ellison, 1995).

Career decision is taken considering intellectual ability, self confidence, family contingencies, school performance, experience, family and peer influences (Owens, 1992) while postponing, internship training, sense of limited fit with the programme or location, financial or partner concerns influences the internship training decision (Rodolfa, Hagnes & Kaplan, 1995).

Drink and drive decision behaviour is affected by various considerations like inappropriate knowledge about alcohol and
driving, lack of decision making skills and the tendency to ignore the increased risk driving (Barch, De’Licco & Malfett, 1989). Drug addicts’ decision seems to be related with perception of harm, use of drug as a matter of personal choice and perceived degree of instrumental embeddedness (Buchanan, 1990-1991).

While a decision is made to punish a person some important factors like, dangerousness of the crime, are taken into account (Maquire, Mike, Pinter, Frances, Collise & Cothrine, 1984). Before breaking abusive relationship people think about some variables like including employment outside the home, length of relationship, presence of child abuse, and number of previous separations (Strube & Michael, 1988).

A buyer at the time of purchasing a brand gives attention to price, discount and familiar vs unfamiliar brand (Moore & Olsharsky, 1989), performance/satisfaction, advertisement (Hoyer & Cobb-wolgren, 1988). Female evaluate their garments on the basis of intensity of interest, colour, pattern, styling and fabric, fit and appearance (Eckman, Damhorsf & Kadolph, 1990), brand stereotype (Stollman, Gentry, Anglin & Burns, 1990), and price and product (Deng & Wortzel, 1995). Even, when children select any brand they give emphasis on influences of parents, and advertisement (Hite and Sttite, 1995). Analysis of Singh (1997) indicates that people have different orientations at the time of evaluations of different alternatives. It may be concluded that people differ on orientation towards different aspects of evaluation. This has been termed discriminating wisdom orientation by Agrawal (1988).
Agrawal (1998) tried to find out some other aspect of DW. She raised some problems. First problem was whether use of DW style is enduring style. Results indicated that response of the subjects were consistent in all situation either related to family life or related to corporate life situations. It supported the hypothesis that subject would show consistency in their behaviour as a function of discriminating wisdom across various situations. It may be inferred that DW works in a consistent manner. It reveals that DW is a personality variable. Second problem raised by Agrawal (1998) was whether factors of DW are normally distributed. The results clearly revealed that all the four factors of DW are normally distributed. Another problem of Agrawal was to identify discriminating wisdom orientations. As we explained, Singh (1997) found out four factors of DW, Agrawal has explained that people use the four factors of DW differently. Some give sole importance to one factor while some more than one. There is individual differences regarding giving importance to one or more than one factor. On the basis of observation of using DW factors in decision making, Agrawal has identified 15 types of combination of these factors used by people differently. These combinations are as under:

(i) Valance (V)

(ii) Attitude (A)

(iii) Belief of Control (C)

(iv) Subjective Norm and Social Concern (S)

(v) VA
Agrawal’s (1998) study indicates that people use their discriminating wisdom in a stable manner across various situations. They vary from one another as the use of their Vivek. Agrawal (1998) defined the concept of DW orientation as under:

"Discriminating wisdom orientation is a style, an inclination of different levels towards four factors of discriminating wisdom (i.e., valence, attitude, control belief and subjective norm and social concern) because of which an individual considers various evaluative variables related to the factors of discriminating wisdom with different intensities and ways". (p. 47).

Agrawal (1998) has developed a Discriminating Wisdom Orientation Scale. There are 32 items in the test. Each item has a
statement possessing a problem related to various situation of one's real life. Each statement is followed by a question for the subjects to indicate what and how much they consider the four factors at the time of decision-making. The items are further followed by the four evaluative items related to the four factors of DW. Subjects have to rate their answer on a six point rating scale ranging from "not at all" to "very much". The test is a reliable scale as its reliability was established by three methods, i.e., test-retest (after four months), split-half, and internal constancy. Validity of the test was also established through factor analysis, item analysis and comparison with known groups. She also prepared a norm on 400 subjects for the use. To obtain the DW orientations of people raw scores on the four factors are converted into stanine, and arranged in the sequence of valence, attitude, control belief and subjective norm and social concern.

A person, whose cognitive development is normal, necessarily uses his/her 'Vivek' in the process of decision-making. As has been mentioned, a person having greater extent of discriminating wisdom evaluates all types of alternatives regarding a course of action to solve the problematic situation. It is necessary for a high Viveki (who have high DW) to use his/her Vivek or discriminating wisdom in an unbiased manner, but it would be ideal state. Majority of the people are not perfectly Viveki, and they use their vivek in a biased way. Since, decision-making is very much important process in one's daily life, it is similarly important to explore the factors affecting development of discriminating wisdom orientations. Indian religion warns people to avoid the effect of six enemies, i.e., desire, worth, affection, avarice, fear and envy. It gives massage that these are
important determinants of discriminating wisdom orientations. Our habits also seem to be closely related to discriminating wisdom orientations. Next important factor in this regard may be the "mood". The Reasoned Action Theory (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980) and the Planned Behaviour Theory (Ajzen, 1991; Ajzen & Driver, 1992) have underlined the impact of habit, as it may elect behaviour directly while one has to decide a specific course of action.

Hindu system assumes that the discriminating wisdom is the receptacle of impressions (Sansakaras), and as a result, it becomes "Sttvik or rajsik or tamsik". In the modern psychological language, it may be concluded that discriminating wisdom is receptacle of all the experience and habits. This is the reason why people show different discriminating wisdom orientations.

**TRI -GUN**

The word tri-gun is derived from Śāmkhya philosophy. Śāmkhya philosophy is the oldest school of Indian philosophy. The founder of Śāmkhya was Kapila. Before describing the Śāmkhya concept of tri-gun, it is necessary to know some other basic principles related to the tri-gun. As in Śāmkhya system, there are 25 basic principles, namely:

1. Pure consciousness (पुरुष),

2. Primordial materiality (मूल प्रकृति),

3. Intellect (बुद्धि या महत),

4. Egoity (आहंकार),

5. Mind (मानस),
6-10. Five capacities (ज्ञानेन्द्रियाँ),

11-15. Five action capacities (कर्मनिद्रियाँ)

16-20. Five subtle elements (पंच तन्मात्राएँ), and

21-25. Five gross elements (पंच महामूल)

According to Sāṃkhya philosophy, among the twenty-five principles only pure consciousness (पुरुष) and primordial materiality (प्रकृति) have independent existence. The “Purusa” is clearly distinguished from other basic principles in the sense of not being implicated in what is generating or generated. Sāṃkhya Kārika (Chaturvedi, 1994) and Sāṃkhyatattvakaumundi (in Musalgaonkar, 1992) regard primordial materiality as un-generated, and consciousness is neither a generating principle nor generated. Suvarnasaptati (in Larson & Bhattacharya, 1976) explains that intellect, egoity and the five subtle elements are both, generative principles and generative products. They are generated products because they are all produced from combination of purusa and prakriti. They are generating principles because intellect generates egoity, egoity generates the five subtle elements and the five subtle elements generate both the five gross elements and five sense capacities. The five gross elements, the five sense capacities, the five action capacities and the mind are all simply derived products.

As we know that according to Sāṃkhya philosophy (in Shastri, 1994) prakriti made up of three constituent processes (traits), i.e., intelligibility, activity and inertia constituent, in sanskrit it has three meanings (i) quality, (ii) rope, and (iii) not primary. In Sāṃkhya
Karika Īśvarkṛṣṇa (in Chaturvedi, 1994) explains that the constituent processes (गुण) are experienced as agreeableness (प्रीति), disagreeableness (अप्रीति) and oppressive (विष्णव). These constituents have their specific purposes: illumination (प्रकाश), activity (प्रवृत्ति) and restriction (नियम).

Vācaspati Mishra (in Pandey, 1967) regards that all three constituents mutually dominate (अन्योन्यव्रतवृत्तय), support (अन्योन्यश्रवयृत्तय), activate (अन्योन्यजननवृत्तय:) and interact (अन्योन्यभूमिशृङ्खल) with one another. The intelligibility constituent (सत्व) is lightweight and illuminating (प्रकाश), and the activity constituent (रजस) is stimulating (उपरेष्य) and moving (चल), and inertia constituent (तमस) is heavy (गुण) and enveloping (वरण).

In Sāṃkhya Kārikābhaṣya, Gaṇḍhapāda (in Larson & Bhattacharya, 1976) also regards that the three constituents mutually suppress, support, produce, consort and coexist with one another. They mutually suppress in the sense of successively dominating one another with, first the intelligibility constituent (सत्व) being dominant, second the activity constituent being dominant, and the inertia constituent being dominant. They mutually support one another like a binary. They mutually “produce”. They mutually “consort”. The constituents mutually “coexist” in the sense that each constituent produces a condition not only to it but also to the other two constituents.

Yuktidipika (in Pandey, 1967) regards that any object is composed of three constituents and the quality of a certain constituents dominates while the other constituent assists it. Jayamāṅgala (Larson & Bhattacharya, 1976) also regards that mutual operation (अन्योन्यवृत्ति) of the three traits show that each constituent is the cause of the change in the other two constituents.
All the three traits have their own characteristics. Various qualities are mentioned as being characteristics of each trait. According to Sāmkhyasaptatīrtti (Larson & Bhattacharya, 1976) agreeableness (प्रीति) satisfaction (संतोष), propriety (विधाचार), kindness (दयालुता), truth (सत्य), honesty (ईमानवारी), modesty (विनय), intelligence (बुद्धि), purity (सुधि), patience (चेयर्य), compassion (अनुकूलण), knowledge (ज्ञान) etc are the characteristics of sattvik trait. Disagreeableness (अप्रीति), frustration (क्रुद्धता), hatred (क्रेश), malice (दोह), envy (मलसर), blame (निन्दा), pride (स्तंभ), sexual desire (उत्क्रण), dishonesty (निरूपति), murder (वध), binding (बंधन), cutting (छेदन) etc are the characteristics of rajas. Oppressive (विषाद), confusion (मोह), ignorance (अज्ञान), intoxication (मद), sloth (आलस्य), fear (मय), depression (देहन), heterodoxy (नास्तिक), insanity (उन्माद), sleep (द्रुप) etc are said to be the characteristics of tamasik trait. According to Mātharvṛtī (Larson & Battacharya, 1976), simplicity (साधगी), truth (सत्य), purity (निरूपति) intelligence (बुद्धि), forbearance (क्रया), compassion (अनुकूलण), knowledge (ज्ञान) are the main characteristics of sattvik trait. Hate (दुःष्ट), animosity (बैर), rigidity (कठोरता) anxiety (चिंता), jealousy (ईश्वरीया), wickedness (दुःखितता), deception (छल), bondage (आमत्व), killing (वध), cutting (छेदन) etc are the main feature of rajas. Ignorance (अज्ञान), vanity (मिथ्याप्रियता), sloth (आलस्य), fear (मय), misery (कृपणता), inactivity (निष्क्रियता), infidelity (असत्यसहनीता), sorrowfulness (दुःख), dream (स्वप्न) etc are the main features of tamasik trait.

Similarly, Krāmdipikā (Gupta, 1917) explains that Kindness (दया), pleasantness (सूक्षकर), affection (स्नेध), contentment (संतोष), endurance (सहनशक्ति), satisfaction (संतोष), etc are the numerous effect of sattvik trait. Misery (कृपण), anxiety (चिंता), anger (क्रोध), vanity (मिथ्याप्रियता), etc
are the some effect of rajasik trait. Veiling (आच्छादन), covering (आवरण), extreme idleness (अतिरंजित आलस्य), delusion (ध्रुम), etc are some effects of tamsik trait. Tattvavibhākara (Bhandari, 1921) explains that essential nature of sattvik trait is satisfaction, satisfaction stands for tranquility, lightness, cantonment; the essential nature of rajasik trait stands for grief and essential nature of tamsik trait is confusion, confusion stands for sleep.

As we know, every trait supports, activates dominates and interacts with one another. So combination of traits makes new characteristics. Some combinations are given below:

(a) Perseverance, a combination of rajas with tamas.
(b) dutiful, faith in conventional religious practice, a combination of rajasik with sattvik.
(c) the desire for satisfaction, a combination of sattvik and tamsik.
(d) the desire for wisdom, the activity of rajasik as the act of thinking is dominant, and
(e) the desire for the cessation of act of thinking, where in the reification of the pure tamas becomes dominant.

Matharvṛtti (in Larson & Bhattacharya, 1976) explains that the suppression of rajsik trait and tamsik give rise to the peaceful tendency of meritorious behaviour, which belongs to sattvik trait. The suppression of sattvik trait and tamsik trait give rise to the violent tendency of de-meritorious behaviour, which belongs to rajasik trait. The suppression of sattvik trait and rajasik trait gives rise to the delusion tendency of ignorance, which belong to tamsik trait.
Sāṃkhya-candrika (in Nararayncharaya, 1977) explains that the intellect possesses merit, knowledge, non-attachment and power when it is dominated by sattva. The intellect comes to possess demerit, ignorance attachment and importance when it is dominated by tamasik trait.

Patañjali’s Yoga Philosophy also throws light on the concept of tri-gun. According to Yoga philosophy the sattvik trait is the nature of illumination, rajasik trait is the nature of energy and the nature of tamasik trait is inertia (Shastri, 1994). They are evolving. They have the characteristics of conjunction and separation. The traits entities are infinite in number; each has an individual existence, but always acting in cooperation with others. Those, who behave in the way of intellection, are called sattvik trait, those who behave in the way of producing effort of movement, are called rajasik trait, and those, who behave differently from these and obstruct their process are called tamasik trait (Shastri, 1976). Patanjali regards that tri-gun have no purpose of their own to serve, but they all are always evolving for the experience and liberation of purusa (Shastri, 1994).

In Rajīmaartanda Vṛtti; Bhojdeva explains that when rajsik and tamsik traits are dominated by sattvik trait then it’s illuminating and develops knowledge but when rajsik trait and tamsik trait are activated then it causes delusion (Bhattacharya, 1979).

Upanisads also discussed about prakriti and tri-gun. Maitri Upanisad (in Dasgupta, 1968) said that the tri-gun being distributed by the supreme (परमात्मा). The Svetasvatara Upanisad (Verma, 1984) told that a little of rajasik trait mixed with a predominance of sattvik
trait leads to action for the sake of knowledge of salvation. A little of sattvik trait mixed with a predominance of rajasik trait leads to action for the sake of heaven. A little of rajsik trait mixed with a predominance of tamasik trait leads to action the fruits whereof is hell.

The Kurma purana also gives some explanation about prakriti and tri-gun. According to Kurma purana prakriti possessing three qualities (Sattva, rajas and tamas), which are the sources of the entire universe. When prakriti is disturbed then (creation of word begins prakriti is the seed of tri-gun which are associated with wealth, wisdom, nonattachment and piety (Swarrup, 1972).

The Matsya-purana explained that the creation springs from prakriti which posses tri-gunas. The presence of the tri-gun in unequal strength originates Mahatatva (which is also known as intellect). Egoism originates from Mahatatva, and the five organs of perception and other five organs of action originated from egoism (Akhtar, 1972).

According to Vayu Mahapuranam each trait supports, activates, interacts and dominates other trait. Rajas is necessary to give impetus to sattva and tama to perform their function (Tripathi, 1950).

The Brahma purana explained some characteristics of tri-gun. Main characteristics of sattvik trait are agreeableness, satisfaction, purity, and knowledge etc. Jealousy, grief, anger, rigidity and anxiety are the main features of rajasik trait, and confusion, ignorance, fear and sorrowfulness are the main features of tamasik trait (Jha, 1976).

According to Manu Smriti, Param-atma created prakriti from Hirnaya-garbha and from prakriti mahat (mind), ahamkara (ego),
tri gun (sattva, rajas, tamas), five subtle elements, five gross elements, five sensory organs and five motor organs have originated (Patwardhan, 1968)

Mahabharata also traces some characteristics of tri gun. In Āsvamedhika pārva Lord Brahma explained that it is impossible to separate three traits from one another. All traits are interdependent and followed by one another. These traits are not isolated and never exist alone (36.1.6). These traits also compete with each other (31.4). Sattvik trait competes with tamsik trait and a rajak trait (31.6). When tamsik trait dominates then there is preponderance of rajak trait and when rajak trait dominates then the sattvik trait is activated (31.7). Lord Brahma told that another name of tamsik trait is delusion. This trait performs non-religious actions, and rajak trait activates all evolution (31.7-9). Āsvamedhika pārva of Mahabharata describes some characteristics tamsik trait. These characteristics are delusion, nondiscernment, deep sleep, fear, grief, lack of sound memory, cruelty, drowsiness, inactive, cunning, laziness, violence, anger, envy, oversight, languor, fatigue, inelegance, indolence, depression and inclination towards materialistic objects (36.12.70).

On the other hand main characteristics of rajak trait are anxiety, ego, cruelty, frustration, hatred, malice, envy, blame, pride, desire, dishonesty, murder, binding, cutting, thirst, malice, struggle, victory, lust, love or affection, boast, firmness, etc (37.1.7). Satisfaction, desirability, non-affection, non-anger, non-greed, non-egoism, non enmity, forgiveness, compassion, purity, tranquility, endurance, gladness, cheerfulness, forbearance, contentment, and friendship are the main characteristics of sattvik trait (38.2.3; 6-8).
Bhagavad Gita is the part of great Hindu epic Mahabharata. Gita is the collection of preaching of lord Krishna. Though there are large number of commentary on the Gita by thousands of commentators, however, one reference (Gupta, 1997) is enough to quote here. Shri Krishna explains Arjuna that material nature consists of the three modes: goodness, passion and ignorance. The mode of goodness is purer than the others. It is illuminating and develops knowledge (14.6). The mode of passion arises unlimited desires and longings (14.7). The mode of ignorance causes delusion for human being. The result of this mode is madness, indolence and sleep (14.8). Each trait supports, interacts and dominates one another. Shri Krishna says that when the mode of passion is prominent, the mode of goodness and ignorance are defeated. When the mode of goodness is prominent, passion and ignorance are defeated (14.10). When the mode of action activates the symptoms of great attachment, uncontrollable desire, hankering and intense endeavor are developed (4.12). While the mode of ignorance activated madness, illusion, inertia and darkness are developed.

Our activities are also affected by these tri-gun. The Bhagavad-Gita says that any activity performed under the mode of goodness is purified. Activities in the mode of passion are simply miserable and action performed in the mode of ignorance results in foolishness (14.16). From the mode of goodness real knowledge develops; from the mode of passion grief develops; and from the mode of ignorance foolishness, madness and illusion develop (14.17). The supreme personality described different kinds of worshipers according to their external activities. Men in the mode of goodness worship the demons;
and those in the mode of ignorance worship ghosts and spirits (17.4). There are differences in the manner of eating, performing sacrifices, austerities and charity. Food in the mode of goodness increases the duration of life purify, one's existence and gives strength, health, happiness and satisfaction. Such nourishing food is sweet, juicy, fattening and palatable. The people in the mode of passion like foods that are too bitter, too sour, salty, pungent, dry and hot. Such food causes pain, distress and disease. People in the mode of ignorance like food cooked more than three hours before being eaten, which is tasteless, stale, putrid, decomposed and unclean. While sacrifice performed according to duty and scriptural rules, and with no expectation of reward, is of the nature of goodness, but sacrifice performed for some material gain or benefit or out of pride, is of the nature of passion, and sacrifice performed in defiance of scriptural injunctions, in which no spiritual food is distributed, no hymns are changed and no remunerations are made to the priests, and which is faithless that sacrifice is of the nature of ignorance (17.8-13).

In Bhagvad Gita, Shri Krishna regards that those who are situated in the mode of goodness, who neither hate inauspicious work nor are attached to auspicious work, have no doubts about the work (18.10). In accordance with the three modes of material nature, there are three kinds of knowledge and action. The knowledge by which one undivided spiritual nature is seen in all existences, undivided in the divided, is knowledge in the mode of goodness and with the destruction of the body, the consciousness is also destroyed is called the knowledge in the mode of passion and knowledge concerned only with keeping the body comfortable is said to be in the mode of ignorance (18.20-22).
The worker who is free from all material attachments and false ego, who is enthusiastic and resolute and who is indifferent to success or failure, is a person in the mode of goodness, but the person who is attached to the fruits of his labour and who passionately wants to enjoy them, who is greedy, envious, impure and influences by happiness and distress is a person in the mode of passion, and the person who is always engaged in work against the injunction of the scripture, who is materialistic, obstinate, cheating and expert in insulting others, who is lazy, always morose and procrastinating is a worker in the mode of ignorance (18.26-28). The action in accordance with duty, which is performed without attachment, without love or hate, by one who has renounced furtive results is called action in the mode of goodness, but action performed with great efforts by one seeking to gratify his desires and which is enacted from a sense of false ego, is called action in the mode of passion, and that action performed in ignorance and delusion without consideration of future bondage of consequence, which inflict injury and is impractical is said be action in the mode of ignorance (18.23-25).

The kinds of understanding and our determination are also decided by the tri-gun. In the Bhagavad Gita, Shri Krishna regards that understanding by which one knows what actions that deserved to be performed and actions which not so deserved are not to be performed. Understanding which discriminates by intelligence is situated in the mode of goodness. Intelligence in the mode of passion is always working perversely. All views and activities are misguided. Men of passionate intelligence understand a great soul to be a common man and accept a common man as a great soul. They think
truth to be untruth and accept untruth as truth. In all activities they simply take the wrong path; therefore, their intelligence is in the mode of passion. That understanding which considers irreligious to be religious and religious to irreligious under the spell of illusion and darkness, and strives always in the wrong direction is in the mode of ignorance (18.30-32). The determination, which is unbreakable, controls the mind, life and acts of the senses by Yoga, is in the mode of goodness. Any person who is always desirous of fruitful religious or economic activities, whose only desire is sense gratification, and whose mind, life and senses are, thus, engaged is in the mode of passion. Determination, which cannot go beyond dreaming, fearfulness, lamentation, moroseness, and illusion-this unintelligent determination are in the mode of darkness (18.34-35).

EMPIRICAL STUDIES ON TRI-GUN

Tri-gun is a philosophical concept and a few empirical studies are available in the field of psychology. Kuppuswamy (1959) was one of the important promoters of concept of tri-gunas. He tried to conceive personality in term of tri-gunas. Krishna (1960) gave a typological consideration to the Indian view of personality; Krishnamurthy (1961) gave the Samkhya based concept of personality. Krishnamurthy (1971) constructed a personality inventory based on tri-gunas; Laxmibai et.al (1975) studied the role of rajas and tamas in psychological disturbance in a sample of 30 normal, 15 neurotic and 15 psychotic subjects with the help of an inventory and found that rajas and tamas were significantly higher in the patient group, especially the psychotics than in the normal. Mohan and Sandhu (1986) developed a scale to measure sattvik,
rajasik and tamsik traits and administered this 40 items scale to 54 boy and 57 girl college students. Results showed that both males and females rated sattvik as the highest desired trait followed by rajsik and tamsik, and they also found a significantly negative situation of sattvik trait with both the other traits in both male and female sample.

Mairal (1992) tried to find out the relation of tri-gunas with sex and mental condition. She raised some problems like whether sex as a variable is capable of creating differential variance in the tri-gun. Second problem was whether mental condition has any bearing upon the variance of tri-gunas, and third problem was whether mental condition and sex jointly influenced the magnitude of each of the tri-gun. In the study, tri-gun was dependent variable, and sex and mental condition were independent variables. There are several types of mental condition but in these study only three types namely, neurotic, psychotic and normal mental condition has been considered. Results showed that sex has shown insignificant bearing upon the magnitude of tri-gunas. Both male and female adults, irrespective of their mental condition, showed significantly greater degree of sattva, then rajas that is turn showed significantly greater magnitude than the tamas. Mental condition has shown its insignificant effect upon the magnitude of sattvik trait. On the normal sample the sattva, rajas and tamas scale has been confirmed but neurotic and psychotic mental conditions have been found to disturb this orthogonality among the tri-gunas by exhibiting significantly positive relation of sattva with rajas and significantly negative relation with tamas. Mental condition has shown its insignificant effect upon the magnitude of sattvik trait.