CHAPTER – IV

DISCUSSION

In this chapter an attempts has been made to interpret the findings of the present investigation. This chapter has been divided into three section. Section one contains the interpretation of the findings of the present investigation with reference to the theoretical frame work. Section two contains suggestions for further researches. In the last section the concluding comments have been given.

In the framework of social psychological studies on altruism the social psychologists have tried to devote a fresh thinking to study not only altruism behaviour. But they have also tried to trace out the complex process involved in frustration tolerance.

This complexity of altruism stems from the characteristic of the interaction involved in altruism. Such interaction is connected by
natural dependence and by the characterization of the helper as an actor and of these help as passive recipient of outcomes (Schwartz and Howard, 1982). The theoretical explanations given about altruism are complex and interconnected as they focused on physiological arousal in which the individual may enjoy in altruistic behaviour, due to distress, frustration, due to the intention to mitigate or due to the social normative pressure, such as responsibility, equity and justice motive, or in attempt to reduce the painful and frustrating inconsistencies due to unfulfilled needs or as in Rey Kowsk, model, a number of psychologists established that it may be due to the confusion between existing and ideal states (Piliavined, 1982; Hornstein, 1976; Berkowitz, 1972; Rey Kowski, 1982).

Social psychologists developed some theories. These are as follows:

(1) Equilibration Theory

(2) Socio Historical Theory

(3) Evolutionary Theory

(1) **Equilibration Theory: Piaget (1926)** assumed that altruism develops due to the coordination of ideas on overcoming the
contradictions through the process equilibration, because there is always conflict between one’s own and other views, thereby the disequilibrium arises. Rogulf (1990) explained that generally when two individuals meet, each of them try to dominate the other, it may create frustration in the individual but there are the different situations. In one situation the individual may get dominated and may be vice-versa, which helps to maintain the equilibration, because the altruistic individual have some different strategies.

(2) Socio historical theory: Vygots (1981) had the view that social relations among people underlie all higher function and these relationship which becomes a base for altruism.

(3) Evolutionary Theory: Since the theory was first promulgated, some psychologists like Cherlesworth (1991) argumented that this is a motive. La Frenlire (1991) argumented that these motives are affected by reciprocity norms, because altruism depends on friendship traits.
INTERPRETATION OF THE RESULTS

Let us first interpret our findings in the light of their agreement with the findings of other investigators on that three variables selected in the study. In the present study, the three independent variables were selected for the investigation, were the religiosity (high religiosity and low religiosity) gender (male and female) and religious group (Hindu, Muslim, Sikh and Christian). This section has been divided in two parts; In the first part findings related to frustration tolerance have been given and in the second part findings related to altruism have been presented and interpreted.

**Effect of Religiosity on Frustration Tolerance:**

The first findings of the study is related to the effect of religiosity on frustration tolerance behaviour. A comparison of frustration clearly indicates that religiosity is an influential variable in determining the frustration tolerance. The experiment was designed to measure the frustration tolerance behaviour of the religious persons, i.e. high religious and low religious. The obtained results suggest that religious persons significantly differ in frustration tolerant behaviour, on both the
measures; i.e. in terms of devoting ‘time’ and in terms of attempts. Results clearly reveal that highly religious individuals are significantly high in frustration tolerance on both measures in comparison to the low religious respondents. The results further reveal that low religious are the least frustration tolerant in comparison to high religious individuals and high religious respondents are less in frustration tolerance in comparison to the highly religious subjects. It is visible in graphical terminology, then it can be said that there is bell – shaped relationship between the level of religiosity and frustration tolerance. The maximum frustration tolerance is found in highly religious subjects.

The findings that highly religious individuals are least frustration tolerant get support from the study of they found that highly religious scored high, so they are found to be high in tolerance power as they are calm and quite so have more power to tolerate frustration. There are a few researches, which studied, the personality characteristics of the religious individuals. Finally, numerous researches by Miller and his colleagues (Miller, 1941) suggest that frustration may lead to aggressive behaviour, as with all of the work on frustration, much
criticism has been directed against the frustration aggression hypothesis of Miller as if the individual posses the religiosity trait it will not invariable lead to aggression, the possibility that one of the responses to frustration can be aggression the religiosity is found in each and every individual and such individuals may well differ in the manner in which they have learned to cope with frustration. Moreover, the same individual may deal with frustration in different ways in different situations and at different points in his life. In short, much scientific work remains to be accomplished on the manner in which persons learn to deal with frustration and the conditions under which a variety of responses to frustration are likely to occur for religious subjects. Then people who are deprived of the gratifications of needs may be more religious, while their beliefs should form some kind of compensation for their frustration. This theory could be put forward as the sole explanation of religiosity. In which case there should be an exact correspondence between the degree of frustration and the amount of religious behaviour, or it could be put forward as one process amongst other in which case a significant correlation of undetermined size would be expected between frustration and religion.
There are some evidences that religious people may generally be more able to concentrate. The above discussion and findings of the previous investigations show that religiosity is a personality trait. It has been discussed in the previous chapter that there are many factors such as religiosity, gender, religion, age, anxiety, depression, social and cultural factors, status and education level which are found significant in affecting religiosity and frustration tolerance.

The important fact is when the individual fails continuously and find no solution then only solution is God as Marquant (1948) suggested that the individual due to failure may be inclined to be aggressive but it does not mean that he will be fixed under frustration and the personality differences usually are at least in part responsible for individual variation found in reactions to frustration tolerance. Malavia (1977) found that extroverts are found to be avoiding aggression to some extent. The religiosity is an important personality trait, and the religious individual is supposed to be more frustration tolerant and the findings show first similar results that highly religious subject are found more tolerant in frustration.
At this juncture the important question is why do highly religious individuals differ in degree of frustration tolerance in comparison to low religions respondents? A possible explanation can be advanced to account for the differences in frustration tolerance between highly religious and low religious individuals.

The religion is a highly complex phenomenon for which a single theory will be adequate. This theory states that religious behaviour, beliefs and experiences are simple part of the culture, and are regularly transmitted from generation to generation, in the same way as any other customs. This view has of course been widely held, and there is much obvious evidence for it. The fact that children reared in different parts of the world tend to acquire the local religious beliefs, To some extent may assume this theory but when we talk of the different religions of different countries, for it is assumed that these are relatively unchanging and will persist in time. This is clearly a same-level explanation, postulating that religion is learnt by the same processes of socialization as are other attitudes and beliefs.
It is found that children acquire much the same beliefs as their parents, particularly if they like them and continue to live at home the same is true, to much the same extent, of attitudes on political and other matters. Religious attitudes and beliefs are modified by membership of educational and other social groups, in the same way that other attitudes are affected. There is some evidence that the content of mystical experiences depends on the beliefs which are hold beforehand, (Thurston 1951).

**Effect of gender of subjects on frustration tolerance:**

The second findings of the study indicates the role of gender in determining the frustration tolerant. As predicated, the result of the study reveal that gender is an influential variable in affecting the degree of frustration tolerance. In this connection the findings of the study are showing that male are least frustration tolerant on both the measures in terms of ‘time’ and in terms of number of ‘attempts’ while females are found more frustration tolerant.

Hence the question now arises, how it is so? These findings are in the agreement with the study (Rosenzweig, 1969, Feiring and Levis, 1979,
According to them females show higher frustration tolerance than males because it is already established that women are less aggressive as compared to men’ both learning and biological factors seem to play significant role in enducing this difference women have a fairly strong wish to behave in a similar way to the cultural definition of their sex role, which discourages them to behave aggressively. Female students become relatively anxious guilty as a result of aggression, because in Indian families they are trained to feel ashamed over aggressive responses. So they show more frustration tolerance than men. Rani (1989) also explained these result due to difference in social restrictions imposed from society for men and women differ.

Thus the present set of findings that females are found more frustration tolerant than men is quite reasonable from theoretical point of view.

**Effect of Religious Group on Frustration Tolerance:**

The third findings of the study is related to the effect of being related to different religious groups, i.e. Hindu, Muslim, Sikh and Christian on frustration tolerance. In India, people belonging to different religious
group are living together, it shows that Hindus should have high tolerance power to adjust others, this is the result that the number of joint families is very high even in India. **Preet and Jain (1988)** found that perceived stress as well as perceived social support is developed, when the children live with family members. There are studies, also which show that family and especially mother has a significant role and is more responsible ofr development of ability to tolerate frustration (**Tsubouchi and Jenkins, 1969; Malavia, Thompson, 1978; Bonds 1984**). In this study Hindu and Christian subjects are found high in frustration tolerance than Muslim and Sikh, Christian subjects. These results can be interpreted in the light of the findings established by the psychologists. **Malavia (1977)** established in a study that Indian society discourages open aggression through its child rearing patterns, it would seem that a person would under emphasize aggression as a response to grustration when normative standards are hold before the individual. **Thompson (1978)** also provided that in some cultures children are kept in such atmosphere where they learn to tolerate frustration more than the children of other religions. So this is alright as in the present finding Hindu subjects are found high in frustration tolerance.
Effect of religiosity on Altruism:

In most existing studies altruism is explained as caused by religiosity, categorized in high tolerance low religiosity. In the present study experiment 2 was designed to measure the altruism behaviour of the individuals, who are high in religiosity and low religious. The obtained results suggest that high in religiosity respondents are found high in religiosity respondents are found high in frustration tolerance in comparison to the subjects low in religiosity. Here it is also remarkable that the subjects whether Hindu or Muslim, high in religiosity are found more altruistic in comparison to the subjects low in religiosity. There is significant difference in high religious Hindu and Muslim subjects in altruism and similarly significant difference in high and low religious Hindu and Muslim subjects. The important findings emerges that these is no significant difference in altruism male and female subjects high in religiosity. It indicates that religious attitude is found an important Factor in determining the altruism behaviour of individuals; Zeldin, Samul and Savine (1983) found no significant differences in altruistic behaviour of boys and girls similar findings may be established on the
basis of findings of the present study. It can be interpreted in the light by the knowledge obtained in animal study as well as by human study suggested by Darwin that animals might contribute to the survival of their species due to the altruistic feature found in them. It is also established that altruism reaches its greatest potential only in human beings. It is not something that is imposed by reward and punishment in the growing human child, because it is fortuned during growth, but due to his intellectual and emotional characteristic human beings have a greater importance in its developments, though it is established in the studies on human altruistic behaviour which reveal that altruistic behaviour is related with several variables such as family pattern, social values and mental set etc. (Shrivastava and Gupta; 1983 Bernett and Occones, 1982).

Effect of Gender of Subjects on Altruism:

The fifth findings of the study is related to the effect of gender of subjects on altruistic behaviour. The results indicate that gender has significant role in determining the nature of altruism. The study shows that female subjects are found more altruistic in comparison to male
subjects; Thus these results reveal the effect of gender on altruistic. The findings show low altruism is visible in male subjects. At this juncture, we can say that altruism is visible in male and female subjects but the degree of altruism is higher in female subjects it makes no difference, whether high religious or low religious but female subjects are found more in altruism. The one important finding emerges that female subjects whether Hindu, Muslim, Sikh and Christian are found high in altruism than male subject.

Effect of Religious Group on Altruism:

As we have already discussed that religion of the subjects has an important role to affect human altruism behaviour. It is found in the study that it has great role in affecting the nature of altruism behaviour. The Hindu subjects high in religiosity are found higher in altruism. It is the fact that the organism always acquire the attitude, norms, behaving pattern in his family and it is the ultimate responsibility of parents, teachers, peers to teach the basic norms according to society. It is natural that they transmit the social values according to their family structure God is one but religious faith is different for the subjects
belonging to different religions. Some religions group are liberal in their faith and some are very rigid as Hindu religion is known very liberal which accommodate to all the individuals of different religious groups.

The religiosity of individual should be positively correlated with frustration tolerance and altruism. Because it is a general observation that the individuals are always scared of their religion but the degree of religiosity may differ; but where both factor frustration tolerance and altruism have been undertaken in relation to religiosity and gender among different religious groups, both frustration tolerance and altruism will be affected it is sure. Though the present work may be considered a pioneer work, but it will be an asset to grow knowledge in this field.

The present study provides evidence for the importance of religiosity and gender belonging to different religious groups, i.e., Hindu, Muslim, Sikh and Christianity on frustration tolerance and altruism.

The female is the more dominated part of the society. Though we are going towards modernization, but still there are dual norms for male
and female subjects. The result is that when the female get so much suppressed, they are under frustration, how the society can expect them having helping attitude. Some how the person will be altruistic, it depends on a lot of factors, as what role the society is expecting from the person. In fact one of the basic function of culture is to channelize and direct the interactional processes. In Indian society the emphasize is on altruistic behaviour; but there are some important factors also as suggestion, praise and blame and certain related factors which serve to frustration tolerance and helping behaviour to be accepted as motives, but no one has specified the evolutionary basis for development of these motives. The result of present investigation can be explained on the basis of equilibration theory suggested by Piaget (1926) that this helping behaviour starts evolving since childhood and get developed in the process of learning. Research on Altruistic behaviour has widened it’s field taking into account personal and situational variables.

A general agreement seems to reach on two points: helping behaviour can be potentially be performed on any one, but the frequency and modes of such behaviour is learnt.
**Suggestions For Further Research:**

(1) The present study however has its own limitations. In this study the researcher has selected very limited variables, so the investigation may be carried out taking more other variables, which influence the frustration tolerance and altruism. The number of subjects may be increased, so that generalization may be done with more confidence on the basis of findings.

(2) In the present study the researcher has tried to find out the effect of religiosity on frustration tolerance and altruism. Though it is one aspect of personality but a significant factor related to frustration tolerance and altruism as the people are generally found scared due to religious faith but there are many personality variables as loneliness, impulsivity achievement, aspiration level, type of personality, stress, may be significantly related to the frustration tolerance and altruism. So further research may be conducted on frustration tolerance and altruism in relation to personality.
(3) The age definitely affect the frustration tolerance and altruism as previous studies established that frustration tolerance and altruism behaviour increases with maturity. In the present study age group ranging (19-25 years) has been selected. So the comparative study may be done taking two or three age groups at a time.

(4) The socio-economic status is an important determining variable in frustration tolerance and altruism, which need to be studied. It may also be suggested that similarly a study could be made amongst socially and economically weaker section of the society and those who are economically better.

Though there are a number of suggestions more for further investigation. The present study provides a solid background and source material against which further investigations can be carried out.