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Divided into two chapters, the first, 'Materials and Methods', is concerned with explaining the instruments used in the present investigation—the "Ways to Live" Scale, the Desirability Scale, the Attributability Scale, and the Compatibility Model. Included also are the theoretical considerations and assumptions that guided the investigator in selecting the "Ways to Live" Scale, and in developing the Desirability and Attributability Scales, and the Compatibility Model. Finally, a note on the statistical analysis of data together with the tests applied is given. The succeeding chapter 'Validity and Reliability', which in many ways constitutes a logical extension of the 'Materials and Methods', examines the content validity.
of the Desirability and Attributability Scales to start with. Some hypotheses relating to the validity of the two scales from the standpoint of their potentiality to generate Compatibility data, and also those relating to the construct validity of the Scales and the Compatibility Model are formulated. These hypotheses are tested through the data obtained in a preliminary study. The validity of the "Ways to Live" is also examined. Finally, the reliability of the three Scales is indicated.
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(ii) The Compatibility Model

(iii) A Note on the Statistical Analysis of Data
The problem as outlined in the objectives requires collection of three types of data: data on the conceived values of the college students towards cultural ideologies; data on the conceived values of the three religio-cultural groups in different interactional contexts; and the data on the descriptions of the three religio-cultural groups in terms of value orientations as evidenced in the context of ingroup and outgroup perception of each group. Besides, it involves gathering of data pertaining to the value compatibility and incompatibility that each of the three religio-cultural groups is likely to experience towards its ingroup and towards the other two outgroups in different social interactional contexts.
(1) The Scales and the Questionnaire

a. The "Ways to Live":
Values Towards Cultural Ideologies

Included in the present investigation are the objectives of studying value orientations of college students towards cultural ideologies and also the cultural differences and similarities, if any, in such value orientations. Allport (1965, pp. 236-300), while referring to methods bearing on the study of value orientations, deals at length with his own approach through the "Study of Values" based on Spranger's ideal types: the theoretical, the economic, the aesthetic, the social, the political, and the religious; and that of Morris through the "Ways to Live" document. And, further in distinguishing Morris' "Ways to Live" approach from his own and the other approaches, Allport contends that the approach of Morris has the advantage of remaining close to existing cultural ideologies. As the present investigation is concerned with understanding the value orientations of different cultural groups operating in the Indian cultural context, Morris' approach appears to be the most adequate.
Morris' "Ways to Live" document consists of 13 conceptions of 'good life' or Ways-Of-Life and each Way is formulated in a paragraph. According to Morris (1956b, p. 14), each Way is an expression of 'philosophy of life', 'value-orientation', or 'world view'. The document may as well be taken as expressing different cultural ideologies.

The "Ways to Live" document is subjected to criticism for its use of poetic language and the complexity of the descriptions (Dempsey and Dukes, 1966). It is contended that each Way is exceedingly complex and the respondent is expected to weigh his overall feelings, synthesize his attitudes, and code these into a simple number which would constitute his response. Further, it is argued that there is incongruence between stimulus complexity and response simplicity (Dempsey and Dukes, 1966; Gorlow and Barocas, 1965; Winthrop, 1959).

Attempts to simplify the "Ways to Live" document have been in two directions: (1) to reduce the paragraphs to a number of propositions and, then, through factor analysis grouping them into a limited number of factors (Gorlow and Barocas, 1965); (2) to retain the paragraphs
by eliminating such confounding elements in each way as give rise to responses discordant with response trends to the paragraph as a whole (Dempsey and Dukes, 1963). The latter has the advantage of simplifying the ways without destroying the holistic approach of the instrument.

In the present investigation, the short form of the "Ways to Live," as revised by Paul Dempsey and William Dukes, is used as it retains, by and large, all the essential features of the Norris' original document. The full text of Dempsey and Dukes' revised "Ways to Live" is given in part one of Appendix A. The following is a brief characterization of each way in the short form (Dempsey and Dukes, 1963, pp. 831-832):

Way 1: Appreciate and preserve the best that man has attained
Way 2: Cultivate independence and self-knowledge
Way 3: Show sympathetic concern for others
Way 4: Experience festivity and sensuous enjoyment
Way 5: Act and enjoy life through group participation
Way 6: Master threatening forces by constant practical work
Way 7: Admit diversity and accept something from all ways of life
Way 8: Enjoy the simple easily obtainable pleasures
Way 9: Wait in quiet receptivity for joy and peace
Way 10: Control the self and hold firm to high ideals
Way 11: Meditate on the inner life
Way 12: Use the body's energy in daring and adventurous deeds
Way 13: Let oneself be used by the great cosmic purpose

In the Morris' original "Ways to Live" Scale, the individual is asked to indicate his response to each Way on a seven-point scale: I like it very much (7), I like it quite a lot (6), I like it slightly (5), I am indifferent to it (4), I dislike it slightly (3), I dislike it quite a lot (2), and I dislike it very much (1). In the present investigation, a five-point scale is used with the following instructions (see part one of Appendix A):

* The numerals shown in the brackets are the values accorded to the respective response category. Morris (1956b, pp. 25-27) has shown that these response categories can for statistical purposes be treated as integers shown in the brackets.
Below are described thirteen ways to live which various persons at various times have advocated and followed.

You have to indicate how much you yourself like or dislike each of the ways by writing a number in the space provided alongside each way.

Remember that it is not a question of what kind of life you now lead, or the kind of life you think it prudent to live in our society, or the kind of life you think good for other persons, but simply the kind of life you personally would like to live.

Use the following scale of numbers, writing one of them in the space provided:

5 I like it much
4 I like it
3 I am indifferent to it
2 I dislike it
1 I dislike it much

Scoring

The scoring system used is as follows: 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 for the five response categories from positive to negative points of the rating scale (see, Morris, 1966b, pp. 20-27).

b. The Three Basic Value Categories: Their Nature and Source

In realising the objectives related to the study of the values of different groups in different social interactional contexts and the descriptions of groups
in terms of value orientations as evidenced in the
context of the ingroup and outgroup perception,
Morris' concepts of Receptivity,* Dominance, and
Detachment—three basic value categories—are used.
The descriptions of the concepts as given by Morris
(1948, pp. 36-37) are given below:

Receptivity

The need is for easy compliance with
the world and for a world that easily complies
with the body by not demanding too much effort.
The person depends, hangs on the physical and
social world, is receptive to it, believes in
it, does not retreat from it or attempt to
use it over, wishes sustenance, wishes a dependable
world—that is, a world on which he can depend.

Dominance

...the need to be dominant in a situation
(which is not necessarily the need to be
dominating). Not a dependable world but a
controllable world, a world in which effort
is efficacious, a world in which one can
initiate changes and lead them to a desired
eventuation. The need is for power over
persons and things, the excitement of
overcoming, the sense of domination.

* In most of his writings, Morris has referred
to this concept as 'Dependence'. He prefers now
to call it 'Receptivity' (personal correspondence
with Morris). See also, "Changes in Conceptions
of the Good Life by American College Students
from 1950 to 1970," (Morris and Small, 1971) for
this change in terminology.
Detachment

It is a movement away from excessive external stimulation, away from a demanding pushing world. A movement toward the inner man. Not comfort is wanted, not power, but awareness of oneself. Not involvement in the world, but the world at a safe distance. That one may listen to the self, protect the self, savor the self, live with heightened consciousness.

The contents of these three concepts have been utilized in the present investigation to serve two purposes: (1) as stimulus materials with reference to which the conceived values are obtained in different social interactional contexts; and (2) as stimulus materials with reference to which the descriptions of the three religio-cultural groups are obtained. In using these concepts for the purpose (1) above, the contents of these concepts are presented as value orientations of some hypothetical persons and the respondent is asked to indicate on a five-point rating scale the desirability or undesirability of such a person in a number of social interactional contexts. For the purpose (2) above, the contents are utilized to describe the 'general evaluative tendencies', and the subjects are asked to indicate on a five-point rating scale the attributability or non-attributability of the described tendencies to different cultural
groups. One of the assumptions made in this context is that these concepts embody value material which could be used to describe the value orientations of persons as well as the value orientations of groups.

The empirical contexts in which these concepts are utilized by Morris (1956b) primarily support their usability for describing the value orientations of individuals; however, their derivation and their known presence in the "Ways to Live" document which embodies the descriptions of cultural ideologies, support their applicability to describing the orientations of groups as well. Besides, anthropologists like Florence Kluckhohn and Ruth Benedict have used comparable concepts to describe value orientations.

* These concepts are derived from an intensive analysis of the religio-cultural systems of the world (Morris, 1948 and 1956a).
of groups."

Then, what about their relevance in the Indian cultural context? The embeddedness of those concepts in the "Ways to Live" document, in whose derivation and development the Indian religio-ethical systems were also included, indicates their relevance for the present study. And also, insofar as they are

* Florence Kluckhohn (1962, pp. 342-347) reports certain similarities between Morris' concepts 'Dionysian', 'Apollonian', and 'Promethean', and her own, the 'Being', the 'Being-in-Becoming', and the 'Doing' orientations of the valued personality types—one of the constants in comparing the value orientations of different groups. Ruth Benedict (1934) uses such categories as 'Apollonian' and 'Dionysian' to characterize the Zuni Indian and other North American Indian tribes. Charles Morris (1956b, pp. 27, 197-198) shows that the concepts of 'Receptivity', 'Dominance' and 'Detachment', are related to his categories of 'Dionysian', 'Apollonian', and 'Promethean' types. Therefore it is possible to work out the relation between Morris' concepts used in the present investigation and those of Florence Kluckhohn and Ruth Benedict. The similarities pointed out above would support the utilization of Receptivity, Dominance, and Detachment in obtaining the descriptions of groups.
basic, it follows that their coverage, though not exhaustive, is adequate enough to include some of the important orientations operating in the Indian cultural context.

The Desirability Rating Scale: Values in Social Interactional Contexts

In measuring the values to specified interactional contexts, the concepts of 'Receptivity', 'Dominance', and 'Detachment' were rendered into the following forms:

Receptivity*
Person 1

This person has a need for easy compliance with the world; depends much on the physical and social world for enjoyment and comfort; is receptive to the world around and belongs to it; neither withdraws from the world nor attempts to change it; wishes sustenance, and wishes for a dependable world.

Dominance
Person 2

This person has a need to be dominant; wishes for a world which is controllable and changeable by individual effort into any desired form; needs to have power over persons and things, to have the excitement of overcoming obstacles, and to have the sense of domination.

* The labels of value orientations—Receptivity, Dominance, and Detachment—are not printed in the Questionnaire (see Appendix A).
Detachment
Person 3

This person has a need to move away from excessive external stimulation, from a demanding, pushing world towards the inner self; wants neither power nor comfort; wishes to stand at a safe distance from worldly affairs without any involvement; is interested in listening to the inner self and in living with a heightened consciousness of self.

Without any modification introduced into form's conceptions of these orientations, the content of each concept is presented as the description of a person so that the appraisal of a given category should occur, more or less, as taking place in a real life situation.

The appraisal of each of the categories of stimulus persons is studied in the present investigation with respect to each of the following interactional contexts:

1) as a 'Close kin' by marriage;
2) as an 'Intimate friend';
3) as a 'Room-mate' to live with;
4) as a 'Co-employee' to work with; and
5) as a 'Neighbour'.

The appraisal of a given value category is made on the dimension of 'desirability-undesirability', here expressed on a five-point rating scale. The five points of the scale are: 'Highly Desirable', 'Desirable', 'Neutral', 'Undesirable', and 'Highly Undesirable'. The explanation of these points of responses is included in the instructions given to the respondents.
The instructions given to the respondents (see part two of Appendix A):

Find below a description of one type of person and also a list of social relationships. Against each relationship a five-point scale is given. Read the description carefully. Then indicate how much you yourself consider it desirable or undesirable to accept the described person for each of the given social relationships.

You have to indicate your response by placing a cross mark (X) under one of the points of the scale which most accurately reflects your reaction. For example, if you intensely desire to accept the person as a close kin by marriage, then mark in the column Highly Desirable; if you just desire to accept the person, mark in the column Desirable. Similarly, mark either in the column Undesirable or Highly Undesirable according to the degree of undesirability. If you feel that the person is neither particularly desirable nor undesirable, mark in the column Neutral.

Scoring

The Scoring system used is as follows: +2, +1, 0, -1, and -2 for the five response categories from positive to negative points of the rating scale.

Using the concepts—i.e., Receptivity, Dominance, and Detachment—for studying the values in different social interactional contexts may raise the problem of relevance of these concepts for this purpose. Moreover, if these concepts could be used to describe some of the important value orientations of persons, then, it would be reasonable to assume that such orientations do form
some important aspects of the social stimulus environment with reference to which the preferential behaviour of the responding individual would take place. Again, as the different social relationships vary ordinarily in terms of the frequency as well as the quality of interaction, differential appraisal of these value orientations in different interactional contexts could be expected.

One more general consideration which also supported the construction of the Desirability Scale may be noted: It has been demonstrated by a number of investigators that the acceptability of a person for a social relationship, inter alia, depends on the value attributed of the stimulus person (e.g., Rokeach, 1961; Friesen, 1961).

d. The Attributability Rating Scale: Descriptions of groups

For studying the descriptions of groups as evidenced from the standpoint of ingroup and outgroup perception, the contents of the concepts of 'Receptivity', 'Dominance', and 'Detachment' were rendered into the following form:

Receptivity
I Set of Qualities

Having a need for easy compliance with the world; depending much on the physical and social world for enjoyment and comfort; being receptive to the world around and belonging to it; neither withdrawing from the world nor attempting to change it; wishing sustenance, and wishing for a dependable world.

Dominance
II Set of Qualities

Having a need to be dominant; wishing for a world which is controllable and changeable by individual effort into any desired form; needing to have power over persons and things, to have the excitement of overcoming obstacles, and to have the sense of domination.

Detachment
III Set of Qualities

Having a need for withdrawal from excessive external stimulation from a demanding, pushing world towards the inner self; not wanting either comfort or power; wishing to stand at a safe distance from the worldly affairs without involvement; being interested in listening to the inner self and living with a heightened consciousness of self.

Except the deletion of reference to person, the concepts are used in the same form as in the Deceptivity Scale. In deleting the reference to person, they are modified to appear as general characteristics or tendencies so that they could be used to characterize the orientations of groups.
The descriptions of groups from the standpoint of ingroup and outgroup perception are obtained through ratings on perceived attributability or non-attributability of these qualities to groups. A five-point rating scale is used here to measure the attributability or non-attributability of the described qualities to groups. The rating scale permits obtaining the responses with two degrees of certainty on each of attributability and non-attributability. A neutral point is also provided to express indecision. The five points of the rating scale are: 'Certainly Attributable', 'Attributable', 'Cannot say', 'Not Attributable', and 'Certainly Not Attributable'.

The groups whose descriptions were obtained in the present investigation are: Hindus, Muslims, and Christians.

The instructions given (see part three of Appendix A):

Find below a description of one set of qualities or characteristics, and a list of three Indian groups. Against each group a five-point scale is given. Read the description carefully and indicate with what degree of certainty the described qualities are attributable or not attributable to each of the given groups. Remember that your responses should reflect your impression of the group as a whole.
You have to indicate your response by placing a cross mark (X) under one of the points of the scale. For example, if you think that the qualities are certainly attributable to a given group, mark in the column *Certainly Attributable*; if you are less certain, mark in the column *Attributable*. Similarly, to indicate that the qualities are not attributable, mark either in the column *Not Attributable*, or *Certainly Not Attributable* according to your judgement. If you think that you cannot decide whether the qualities are attributable or not, mark in the column *Cannot Say.*

**Scoring**

The Scoring system used is as follows: +1, +1, 0, -1, and -2 for the five response categories from positive to negative points of the rating scale.

The Attributability Scale, as designed here, assumes that each set of qualities is either found or not found in a given group. But Morris' usage of these concepts, both in the theoretical and empirical contexts, suggests that though they can be used to represent major value orientations, all the three are present in any given individual with different degrees of predominance. Extending these concepts to describing the value orientations of groups, as is done in the present investigation, we should expect to find all the three sets of qualities in each group to some extent. Logically, then, the design would be getting the three groups
arranged on each set of qualities in terms of relative predominance of the given set of qualities or, alternatively, getting each group described in terms of the relative predominance of the sets of qualities.

However, the design of the Attributability Scale assumes that each group could be judged independently for the possession or non-possession of each orientation. The scale is so designed in view of the attempt in the present study being to obtain the characterization of groups as evident in the perception of the respondents. Since it is known that in the framework of ingroup and outgroup perception there is a likelihood of attributing qualities which a group may not possess and denying qualities which a group may possess (Hardin, et al., 1969), the range of responses should make allowance for such tendencies to operate. Therefore, in order to allow the factors which are likely to influence the attributing behaviour of an individual in the ingroup and outgroup contexts to operate, the five-point rating scale used in the Attributability Scale is extended to include expression of non-possession of the value orientations by groups.
The Questionnaire used in the final study consisted of the "Ways to Live" Scale, the 'Desirability Scale', and the 'Attributability Scale', in that order. The last page contained items pertaining to the personal data (see Appendix A).

Besides the name, age, and religion of the respondent, the following personal data were collected: the occupation and the annual income of parents (see page 10 of the Questionnaire, items 5 and 3), the educational level of parents (item 7), the composition of the early religious environment of the respondent (item 9), the early social environment—urban—rural—(item 8), a rough measure of the involvement of the respondent and his family in the religious practices (items 10 and 11), and the religion of the respondent's friends (item 12).

Writing the name of the respondent on the Questionnaire was optional in the final study.
(ii) The Compatibility Model

The objective concerned with the understanding of ingroup and outgroup Compatibility, that groups are likely to experience in the contexts of a specified set of social relationships, was realized through developing a methodological framework, called the 'Compatibility Model'. This model is based on a certain phenomenological understanding of the interaction between the responses on the Desirability Scale and the Attributability Scale.

In the present design, the materials used as the 'descriptions of persons' and the 'sets of qualities' are the same; through the Desirability Scale is obtained the appraisal of each value orientation in each of the specified social relationships and through the Attributability Scale, the perceived presence or absence of each value orientation (appraised in the contexts of social relationships) in each of the given groups. Reasoning with the phenomenological understanding...

* It may be recalled that the term 'Compatibility' (with the initial capital letter) is used to refer to both 'compatibility' and 'incompatibility'. 
that behaviour of an individual would be in tune with the perception of the event, the interaction between the points of the two Scales could be conceived of as indicating certain behavioural tendencies.

If an individual likes a certain value orientation in a social context and reports it to be present in a group, then, given a real social context under consideration, that individual in all probability will experience compatibility. On the other hand, if a liked value orientation is perceived to be absent in a group, he is likely to experience incompatibility.

Similarly, if a disliked value orientation is reported to be present, then it might lead to experiencing incompatibility; and if a disliked value orientation is reported to be absent, then

*S.E. Asch (1952, pp. 64-65) points out, "we act and choose on the basis of what we see, feel, and believe...when we are mistaken about things we act in terms of our erroneous notions, not in terms of things as they are." Similar views are expressed by M. Sherif and C.W. Sherif (1956, p. 72) and J. Murray (1947, p. 354).
it might lead to experiencing compatibility. If an individual finds himself in a neutral position with respect to desirability or attributability or both, then, no inference as to the behavioural implications of such a situation can be drawn.

The Compatibility Model, therefore, assumes that a value orientation must possess both the property of being evaluated in interactional contexts and of being perceived to be attributable or not attributable to groups or individuals, if it is to have behavioural implications in interactional contexts. In case, either of these properties does not show towards a value orientation, then no behavioural implications in interactional contexts can be associated with such a value orientation.

In the present study the behavioural implications of value orientations are studied in the form of value compatibility and incompatibility in interactional contexts. The ratings obtained independently on each of the Desirability and Attributability Scales are used to derive value compatibility and incompatibility.
through the Compatibility Model. Therefore, if compatibility and incompatibility are found to be operating in interactional contexts, the score on the Desirability Scale must possess some degree of appraisive property (in the sense that the value orientations used must be conceived to possess positive or negative evaluation in interactional contexts) and also the score on the Attributability Scale must possess some degree of 'attributability' property (in the sense that the value orientations used must be perceived to be attributable or not attributable to groups).

Stated in the framework of interaction between the scale-points of the Desirability and Attributability Scales, compatibility is conceived of as interaction between the positive scale-points and also between the negative scale-points of the two Scales; incompatibility is conceived of as interaction between the scale-points in the opposite range of the two Scales, i.e., between the positive-scale points of one Scale and the negative scale-points of the other Scale.

Operationally, therefore, compatibility means the 'going together' of the conceived value (positive or
negative) towards a given value orientation and the perceived presence or absence of the given value orientation in a given group; on the other hand, incompatibility means the discordance between the conceived value towards a value orientation and the perceived presence or absence of the value orientation in a given group. Conceptually, compatibility may be understood as the possibility of a conceived value being in harmony in the context of interaction with a given group; whereas incompatibility means the possibility of a conceived value being in conflict in the context of interaction with a given group.

Since the positive and the negative ranges of both the Scales are formulated at two levels of intensity, it is also possible, in the present schema, to infer the degrees of compatibility or incompatibility. For this purpose the interaction between the responses on the two Scales needs to be conceived of as interaction on multiplicative basis. The logic of this kind of conceptualization is simple: the intensity of the appraisal (positive or negative) of a value
orientation, the greater is the degree of compatibility or incompatibility that is produced in the perceived presence or absence of the appraised value orientation in a group. And the degree of compatibility or incompatibility is also conditioned by the perceived degree of certainty of the presence or absence of the value orientation in a given group. The higher the degree of certainty of attributability or non-attributability of a value orientation, the greater is the degree of compatibility or incompatibility that is produced in relation to that value orientation. In other words, the degree of compatibility or incompatibility is a multiplicative function of (1) the intensity of appraisal (positive or negative) of a value orientation, and (2) the perceived degree of certainty of presence or absence of the value orientation. Therefore, the interaction conceived of between the points of the Desirability and Attributability Scales on multiplicative basis would generate the Compatibility Scores shown in the following Score Chart of the Compatibility Model:
Score Chart of the Compatibility Model for Different Levels of Intensity of Ratings on the Desirability and Attributability Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desirability Scale</th>
<th>Attributability Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certainly Attributable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Desirable (+2)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desirable (+1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (0)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesirable (-1)</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Undesirable (-2)</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
The positive signs indicate compatibility and the negative signs indicate incompatibility.
Derivation of Compatibility Scores

It may be useful to recall briefly some facts about the Desirability and Attributability Scales because it is the ratings on these Scales that form the basis of the Compatibility scores. In the Desirability Scale, there are three value orientations, and each value orientation is appraised in the context of each of five social relationships. Therefore each subject would give 15 ratings, five for each value orientation. In the Attributability Scale, there are, again, the same three value orientations, and each value orientation is judged to be attributable or not attributable to each of the three groups. Therefore, for each subject there would be nine ratings, three for the ingroup and three each for the two outgroups.

In deriving the ingroup and outgroup Compatibility scores for a given individual, the following procedure is followed: The 'desirability' score of the given individual towards a given value orientation in the context of a given social relationship is multiplied by his 'attributability' score of the given value orientation to a given group. The product score is termed as ingroup Compatibility score if the
attributability score refers to the ingroup; it is termed an outgroup Compatibility score if the attributability score refers to the outgroup.

For example, if a Hindu subject has rated Receptivity value orientation as 'Highly Desirable' (+2) in 'Close kin' and if he has judged the Receptivity orientation as 'Certainly Attributable' (+2) to Hindus, and further, if he has judged the Receptivity orientation to be 'Certainly Not Attributable' (-2) to Muslims, then his ingroup Compatibility score in 'Close kin' in Receptivity orientation would be +4 and his outgroup Compatibility score (i.e., towards Muslims) in 'Close kin' in Receptivity orientation would be -4. Therefore, the Compatibility score for the ingroup and the outgroup is derived as product of the 'desirability' score of a subject to a given value orientation in a specified social relationship and the same subject's 'attributability' score of the given value orientation to the ingroup and the outgroup.

Since each of the three value orientations (Receptivity, Dominance, and Detachment) is given a 'desirability' rating in each of the five social relationships ('Close kin', 'Intimate friend',...
each value orientation is given an 'attributability' rating with respect to each of the three groups (Hindus, Muslims, and Christians), the ratings on each value orientation in the Desirability and Attributability Scales would generate 15 Compatibility scores—five for the ingroup and five each for the two outgroups. Therefore, in every value orientation, for each relationship, there would be one ingroup Compatibility score and two outgroup Compatibility scores. Since there are three value orientations, each subject's ratings on the Desirability and Attributability Scales would generate 45 Compatibility scores—15 for the ingroup and 15 each for the two outgroups.

As an illustration of the procedure adopted in working out ingroup and outgroup Compatibility scores for a given subject, a sample sheet containing the scored ratings of a Hindu subject on the Desirability Scale and the Attributability Scale together with the Compatibility scores generated from his ratings is given in Appendix B.

The average Compatibility score for a given group is calculated from the individual Compatibility scores
of the subjects of that group. It is possible to obtain the average Compatibility score of a group for a given social relationship as a product of the average 'desirability' and average 'attributability' scores if appraisal of a value orientation and its perceived attributability are independent. Since this independence cannot be assumed, the average Compatibility score of a group is calculated from the individual scores of Compatibility.

To conclude, the Compatibility Model is a methodological framework whose content is a set of relationships posited between the two independently measured elements, i.e., the 'desirability' and 'attributability' of value orientations. By utilizing the individual ratings the Model enables derivation of Compatibility scores. The scores thus derived reflect the potential for harmony (compatibility) or conflict (incompatibility) existing in the context of ingroup and outgroup interaction of a given group.

Interpretation of Compatibility Data

As shown earlier, the Compatibility Model permits generating positive and negative scores. The positive
It was pointed out that compatibility may be thought of as conceived value being in harmony in the context of an interaction with a given group, and incompatibility, as the conceived value being in conflict in the context of an interaction with a given group. The possibility of value harmony suggests that the members of the given group would be shown some selective favour or choice, and the possibility of value conflict suggests that the members of the given group would be shown some selective disfavour.

From the standpoint of behavioural implications, then, the Compatibility data may be thought of as expressing preference-potential. The preference-potential may be positive or negative: positive preference-potential indicating the tendency to bestow selective favour to the members of the referent group in a given interactional context within the framework of a given value orientation; negative preference-potential indicating the tendency to accord selective disfavour to the members of the referent group in a given interactional context within.
the framework of a given value orientation. Therefore, the differences in the degree of compatibility or incompatibility may be thought of as indicating the differences in the intensity of the tendency to accord selective favour or selective disfavour respectively.

For each group, its ingroup and two outgroup Compatibility scores are generated for each social relationship. By comparing the Compatibility scores thus generated for different groups in the context of a given relationship, it is possible to find out how the ingroup stands with respect to the outgroups. Such comparisons require that the differences between the Compatibility score generated towards the ingroup and the Compatibility score generated towards the outgroup, or between the Compatibility scores towards two outgroups, be treated as indicating the distance between the acceptability of two groups. Such an interpretation requires that the total range of the Compatibility data, both positive and negative, be treated as indicating the differences in the degree of acceptability. And this interpretation does not violate the meaning of Compatibility data as preference-potential. It is reasonable to assume that the extreme
point of incompatibility—i.e., the tendency to accord maximum selective disfavour—to be indicative of the referent group under consideration to be least acceptable, and the extreme point of compatibility—i.e., the tendency to accord maximum selective favour—to be indicative of the referent group under consideration to be most acceptable.
The data collected through the Questionnaire pertained to responses on the "Ways to Live," the Desirability Scale, the Attributability Scale, and a few items of personal data as well as the Compatibili
ty scores generated for each group. The scores obtained on each item for a given group were summarized into a frequency table. Such frequency tables were prepared for all items of each religio-cultural group. From the frequency tables, the following statistical constants were computed:

1. Mean ($X$);
2. Variance ($V$);
3. Standard Deviation ($\sigma$);
4. Estimated Standard Deviation of the Population from Sample Scores ($\sigma_{p}$);
5. Standard Error of Mean estimated from Sample Scores ($\sigma_{M}$);
6. Standard Error of Difference between two Means ($\sigma_{d}$).

Besides the above, it was necessary to calculate the coefficient of correlation ($r$) between two variates.
The following statistical tests were applied in this study:

1. F test for testing the homogeneity of variances;
2. Z test* for testing the significance of a mean score as well as pooled mean scores for being higher or lower than zero;
3. $Z_d$ test** for testing the significance of difference of two means and difference of two pooled mean scores.

The formulae used for computing the statistical constants and the procedures followed in applying the tests of significance are given in Appendix C.

* The Z test is applied in the present investigation, instead of 't' test, as the sample size ($n$) of the groups is larger than 30.

** When the Z test refers to the testing of the significance of difference between two means, the ratio $Z$ is denoted by $Z_d$. 