PART THREE

THE STUDY: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
The chapter, 'Samples, Collection and Presentation of Data', gives details regarding the subjects and the way the data are collected, organized, and presented. In the succeeding three chapters are discussed the results pertaining to the conceived values of the college students in general and of each of the three religio-cultural groups, the descriptions of the three religio-cultural groups in terms of value orientations as evident in ingroup and outgroup contexts, and the ingroup and outgroup compatibility and incompatibility of each religio-cultural group. This is followed by a chapter devoted to discussing the relation between some intracultural variations in environment and the
conceived values to cultural ideologies, on the one hand, and the ingroup and outgroup compatibility and incompatibility, on the other. Next, in the chapter on 'General Discussion', the implications of the conclusions of the earlier chapters are examined primarily with a view to pointing out the cultural similarities and differences in the conceived values in general, and also the relation of cultural similarities and differences in conceived values to intercultural acceptability.
Chapter VII

THE SAMPLES, COLLECTION AND PRESENTATION OF DATA
Chapter VII

THE SAMPLES, COLLECTION AND
PRESENTATION OF DATA

The Sample

The study was conducted with samples of male
students drawn from four colleges of the Karnatak
University, Dharwar: Karnatak Arts College, Karnatak
Science College, Kittel College, and Nehru College.
The total number of subjects included in this study was
461 students studying in the final year of B.A., and
B.Sc., degree classes during the academic year of
1970-71. This number represents all those students
who attended classes in their major subjects on the day
the Questionnaire was administered. The mean age of
the subjects was 21.5 years.

The break-up of the number of students in terms
of the religious-cultural groups is: Hindus 311; Muslims 87;
and Christians 91.
Collection of Data

The printed Questionnaire containing the "Ways to Live" Scale (Part One), the Desirability Scale (Part Two), the Attributability Scale (Part Three), and a few items of Personal Data (see Appendix A), was administered to students in batches of 20 to 25.

Before the administration of the Questionnaire, in a brief introductory talk, the students were requested to give their sincere responses to the various items of the Questionnaire. Every attempt was made to ensure that the subjects understood the instructions clearly. They were also encouraged to seek clarification of meanings of terms used in the Questionnaire in case of any doubt.

The subjects were told that they could take as much time as they required. However, most of them required about an hour to complete the Questionnaire.

Analyses and Presentation of Data

The responses of each subject to different items on the Questionnaire were scored and transferred to
The scores on each item were summarized into a frequency table from which mean and other statistical constants were calculated.

The findings as revealed from the data thus analysed are presented under the following headings:
(1) Value Orientations of Students; (ii) Descriptions of the Groups; (iii) Value Compatibility; and (iv) Intra-cultural Variables.

Preparation of Score Card for each individual with provision to record the ingroup and outgroup Compatibility scores generated for each social relationship in each value orientation was found to be a very convenient procedure in preparing the frequency tables of Compatibility Data. See Appendix 3.
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Chapter VIII
VALUE ORIENTATIONS OF STUDENTS

This chapter is divided into two sections: In section (i) are analysed the responses to the "Ways to Live" to identify (a) the conceived values of students in general and (b) the conceived values of each of the three religio-cultural groups—Hindus, Muslims, and Christians; in section (ii), the ratings on the Desirability Scale are analysed to identify the conceived values to three basic value orientations—Receptivity, Dominance, and Detachment—of each of the three religio-cultural groups in a set of social interactional contexts.

In both the sections, a comparative consideration of the value orientations of the three religio-cultural groups is included.
(i) Conceived Values to Cultural Ideologies: The "Ways to Live"

a. Conceived Values of Students in General

As given in Table 3, the Mean ratings on the "Ways to Live" reveal that there is a high favouring of Ways 1, 10, 3, and 5 in that order. Next in the rank order of favouring are the Ways 6, 11, and 12. Ways 7, 13, and 9 are also shown some degree of liking. Ways 4, 8, and 2 have been shown some degree of dislike.

Predominant emphasis is therefore placed on 'appreciation and preservation of tradition' (Way 1), 'controlling the self and holding firm to high ideals' (Way 10), 'acting and enjoying life through group participation' (Way 5), and 'showing sympathetic concern for others' (Way 3). This is closely followed by considerable liking for 'mastering the threatening forces by constant practical work' (Way 6), 'meditation on the inner life' (Way 11), and 'using the body's energy in daring and adventurous deeds' (Way 12).

On the other hand, the Ways with themes of 'festivity and sensuous enjoyment' (Way 4), 'enjoyment of simple easily obtainable pleasures' (Way 8), and
TABLE 9

Mean Scores of 13 "Ways to Live" and Their Rank Order for Students in General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways Nos.</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
'cultivation of independence and self-knowledge'—perhaps indicative of withdrawn individualism—(Way 5), are rejected.

The contents of the Ways which the students have liked suggest that while they favour most conserving the tradition (Way 1) and self-control (Way 10), they also show some degree of awareness of the need to improve the society (Way 6). The emphasis on group participation (Way 5) perhaps underscores the social character of most of the goals that the students are after. This appears to be consistent with the major preoccupation of the nation with economic and social reconstruction.

The recognition of the fact that 'constant practical work' (Way 6) and 'using body's energy in daring and adventurous deeds' (Way 12) as necessary aspects of living, together with the emphasis on group participation (Way 5), perhaps, indicates that they are aware of the importance of individual and social action in moving the society forward.

However, the emphasis that they have placed on the stoic control of the self (Way 10) and the need to
meditate on inner life with a view to gaining self-understanding (Way 11), is suggestive of the view that the individual's participation in society and its activities should be tempered with self-understanding; indiscriminate social participation should be avoided.

'Sympathetic concern for others' (Way 3), which the students value highly, appears to be consistent with their society-oriented value orientation in general.

Advocacy of the stoic control of the self and group-oriented goals perhaps explains the students' rejection of 'sensuous enjoyment' (Ways 4 and 6) and withdrawn individualism (Way 2).

The best inference from the ratings all taken together might be that the students favour the social changes to take place but predominantly within the traditional framework of their society. Sensuous enjoyment and withdrawn individualism are sought to be avoided.
Interpreted in terms of factors (only those factors which have emerged rather clearly in the ratings here), the value pattern of the students in general seems to be predominantly characterized by 'social restraint' (Ways 1, 10, and 3), closely followed by 'enjoyment and progress in action' (Ways 12, 5, and 6). 'Self indulgence' (Ways 3 and 4) is rejected.

If the value pattern of the students that has emerged in this study is compared with that found by Morris (1956b), Agrawal (1959), and Kilby (1963), a certain basic similarity can be observed. Morris, on the basis of ratings to the "Ways to Live" obtained during 1956-7, described the value orientation of Indian students to be primarily expressing 'social restraint and self-control' (reflected in the high ratings to "Ways 1 and 10"). 'Crowd participation' and 'practical work' (Ways 5 and 6) have

---

* The positive contents of the five factors that Morris (1956b) identified in the ratings to the original "Ways to Live" are given in pages 27-28. Since the revised version of the "Ways to Live" employed in the present investigation retains all the essential features of the Morris' original, the interpretation of results obtained here in terms of factors seems justified.
also figured prominently. In Agrawal's study, the Indian students seemed to place emphasis on self-restraint, moderation, and integration of action, enjoyment, and contemplation. Kilby found essentially the same value pattern that was evidenced in Morris' (1956b) study. The similarity in value orientations over an interval of 20 years indicates that the values studied through the Morris' "Ways to Live" are culturally stable.

b. Conceived Values of the three Religio-cultural Groups

Hindu Students on the "Ways to Live"

It is observed from column 1 of Table 10 that, except Ways 6 and 2, all the other Ways have some degree of positive appeal to Hindu students. However, among the highly liked are 'appreciation and preservation of the best in the tradition' (Way 1), 'acting and enjoying life through group participation' (Way 5), 'controlling the self and holding firm to high ideals' (Way 10), and 'showing sympathetic concern for others' (Way 3). Considerable degree of liking has been shown towards Ways with the themes of 'meditate on inner life' (Way 11), 'master threatening forces by constant
Mean Scores and Their Differences on 13 "Ways to Live" for the Three Religio-cultural Groups—Hindus, Muslims, and Christians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways Nos.</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>Muslims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

* : Significant at .05 level
** : Significant at .01 level
practical work' (Way 6), and 'use body's energy in daring and adventurous deeds' (Way 12). Ways 9, 4, 13, and 7, expressing 'wait in quiet receptivity for joy and peace', 'experience festivity and sensuous enjoyment', 'let oneself be used by great cosmic purposes', and 'admit diversity and account something from all walks of life' respectively, have been shown liking a little above indifference. Ways advocating 'enjoy the simple easily obtainable pleasures' (Way 6) and 'cultivate independence and self-knowledge' (Way 2) have occupied a region of slight dislike.

High liking of Ways 1, 5, and 3 by Hindu students reveals their emphasis on social life. They seek to preserve the best in their tradition, appreciate the group-oriented behaviour on the part of individual, and like to be sympathetically predisposed towards others. This social character of their value orientation is perhaps due to their traditional form of society with castes and subcastes still operative as well as the major preoccupation of the society as a whole with social and economic reconstruction. The stoic control of self is consistent with their religious and philosophic teachings. Their rejection of withdrawn individualism and sensuous enjoyment is understandable.
in the context of their emphasis on group-oriented behaviour and stoicism. However, it may also be noted that rejection of sensuous enjoyment is a traditional value of the Hindu.

Muslim Students on the "Ways to Live"

It may be observed from column 2 of Table 10 that all the Ways, except Way 4, carry some positive appeal to Muslim students. However, 'appreciation and preservation of the best in the tradition' (Way 1), 'acting and enjoying life through group participation' (Way 5), and 'controlling the self and holding firm to high ideals' (Way 10) are the most liked Ways.

Towards Ways which advocate 'meditate on the inner life' (Way 11), 'show sympathetic concern for others' (Way 3), 'master threatening forces by constant practical work' (Way 6), there is a considerably high degree of liking. And for Ways with the themes of 'use body's energy in daring and adventurous deeds' (Way 12), 'let oneself be used by great cosmic purposes' (Way 13), and 'wait in quiet receptivity for joy and peace' (Way 3), there is a slight degree of liking. They have expressed near indifference towards 'cultivate independence and self-knowledge' (Way 2), 'admit diversity' (Way 7), and
'enjoy the simple easily obtainable pleasures' (Way 6). A small degree of disliko is shown towards ’experience festivity and sensuous enjoyment' (Way 4).

Tradition- and group-oriented behaviour combined with self-control seems to be central in Muslim students' value orientation. On the negative side, they reject festivity and sensuous enjoyment.

Christian Students on the "Ways to Live"

From column 3 of Table 10 it is observed that Christian students have expressed a very high degree of liking towards 'controlling the self and holding firm to high ideals' (Way 10), 'showing sympathetic concern for others' (Way 3), 'appreciation and preservation of the best in the tradition' (Way 1), 'acting and enjoying life through group participation' (Way 5), and 'mastering the threatening forces by constant practical work' (Way 6).

They have also expressed a considerable degree of liking towards 'admission of diversity' (Way 7) and 'using the body's energy in daring and adventurous deeds' (Way 12), and a slight degree of liking towards
'meditation on inner life' (Way 11). Near indifference has been shown towards 'let oneself be used by great cosmic purposes' (Way 13).

The Christian students' ratings also indicate that they relatively dislike 'wait in quiet receptivity for joy and peace' (Way 9), 'cultivate independence and self-knowledge' (Way 2), 'enjoy the simple easily obtainable pleasures' (Way 8), and 'experience festivity and sensuous enjoyment' (Way 4).

For Christian students, therefore, the major emphasis falls on stoic control of the self and tradition- and group-oriented behaviour combined with sympathetic concern for others. While Christian students share the emphasis on tradition- and group-oriented behaviour as well as the self-control with Hindu and Muslim students, 'sympathetic concern for others' also figures as a very prominent value with them. However, it may be noted that 'sympathetic concern for others' seems to be in harmony with the religious teachings of Christians. Another Way which nearly reaches the order of importance of a major value is the advocacy of the mastery of the world through constant practical work. According to Norris (1950b; 1964), this is predominantly a western
value. However, this value might now be associated with the predominantly western religion—Christianity—which the Christian subjects of this study have accepted.

Therefore, the Christian students' dislike of simple pleasures and sensuous enjoyment together with their rejection of withdrawn individualism and passive submission to the cosmic forces is understandable in the context of their major likings.

c. Comparison of Conceived Values of the Three Groups: The "Ways to Live"

Hindu and Muslim Students

In considering the differences between the Hindu and Muslim students' ratings it is noticed (from Table 10, page 138) that 'sympathetic concern for others' (Way 3) is significantly liked more by Hindu than by Muslim students ($\bar{X}_d=2.75^{**}$). There are differences noticed with respect to 'cultivate independence and self-knowledge' (Way 2) which is disliked by Hindu students but shown indifference by Muslim students; 'festivity; 

---

$^{*}$ Two asterisks (**) indicate that the value of $X_d$ is significant at .01 level.
and consensual enjoyment (Way 4) is liked to some extent by Hindu students but slightly disliked by Muslim students. However, the differences are not statistically significant. The differences on the other Ways are negligible.

Considered in terms of the rank order of mean ratings (Table 11), it is noticed that there are only a few minor variations. The first three ranks coincide. However, the 13th rank goes to Way 2 for Hindu students and to Way 4 for Muslim students.

In summary, there is a significant differential emphasis on 'sympathetic concern for others', with Hindu students favouring it more. Apart from this, the two groups appear to be very close to each other in their conceived values to cultural ideologies.

Hindu and Christian Students

Significant differences between the mean scores of Hindu and Christian students occur with respect to Ways 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11 (Table 10, page 138). While the difference between these groups on Ways 3, 6, 7, and 11 is only in the relative degree of liking and the difference on Way 8 is only in the relative degree
TABLE 11

Mean Scores of 13 "Ways to Live" and Their Rank Order for the Three Religio-cultural Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways No.</th>
<th>Hindu Mean Rank Order</th>
<th>Muslim Mean Rank Order</th>
<th>Christian Mean Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.42 1</td>
<td>4.49 1</td>
<td>4.36 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.65 13</td>
<td>3.06 10</td>
<td>2.73 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.11 4</td>
<td>3.76 5</td>
<td>4.37 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.21 9</td>
<td>2.93 13</td>
<td>2.73 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35 2</td>
<td>4.38 2</td>
<td>4.14 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.51 6</td>
<td>3.69 6</td>
<td>3.90 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.14 11</td>
<td>3.05 11</td>
<td>3.61 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.87 12</td>
<td>3.00 12</td>
<td>3.53 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.25 6</td>
<td>3.30 9</td>
<td>2.79 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.31 3</td>
<td>4.37 3</td>
<td>4.41 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.83 5</td>
<td>3.90 4</td>
<td>3.24 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.49 7</td>
<td>3.37 7</td>
<td>3.49 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.19 10</td>
<td>3.32 8</td>
<td>3.03 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of dislike, the difference on 'ways 4 and 9 ranges
from liking to disliking.

'Habitat on inner life' is accorded a
significantly higher liking by Hindu than by
Christian students ($Z_d=4.34^{**}$). On the other hand,
significantly higher liking is expressed by Christian
students towards Way 3, 'sympathetic concern for
others', ($Z_d=2.55^{*}$); Way 6, 'master threatening
forces by constant practical work', ($Z_d=4.34^{**}$); and
Way 7, 'admit diversity', ($Z_d=3.33^{**}$).

While Hindu students show a slight degree of
liking towards 'sensuous enjoyment' (Way 4), it has been
shown a considerable degree of dislike by Christian
students, the difference being highly significant
($Z_d=6.44^{**}$). Again, Hindu students have expressed some
degree of liking towards 'wait in quiet receptivity for
joy and peace' (Way 9), whereas Christian students
have expressed a considerable degree of dislike, the
difference being highly significant ($Z_d=4.81^{**}$). Way 3,
which depicts the 'enjoyment of the simple easily
obtainable pleasures', is disliked by both the groups,
but Christian students dislike it to a significantly
greater degree than Hindu students ($Z_d=2.67^{**}$).

* One asterisk (*) indicates that the value of $Z_d$
is significant at .05 level.
Both Hindu and Christian students dislike Way 6 in about the same term. Ways 1, 10, 12, and 13 have been liked by both the groups to more or less the same extent.

In terms of ranks based on the mean ratings to Ways (Table 11), Hindu students have the first four ranks given to Ways 1, 5, 10, and 3 in that order, while Christian students' first four ranks go to Ways 10, 3, 1, and 5 in that order. It is worth noting, however, that though there is variation in ranks, the Ways which are given the first four ranks in the two groups are the same. There are differences in the ranks given to other Ways. However, one of the important differences between the two groups is with respect to Way 7: for Hindu students it carries 11th rank whereas for Christian students it has 6th rank.

Muslim and Christian Students

Column 6 of Table 10 reveals that differences in mean ratings reaching statistical significance between Muslim and Christian students are observed with respect to the following Ways: 3, 4, 7, 9, and 11. Between these groups, there is difference in the degree of liking only on Ways 3, 7, and 11, and difference in
the degree of dislike only on Way 4. On Ways 3 and 9, the difference ranges from liking to disliking.

Christian students like significantly more than Muslim students do, Way 3, 'show sympathetic concern for others', ($Z_d=4.20^{**}$) and Way 7, 'admit diversity', ($Z_d=3.08^{**}$). On the other hand, Way 11, 'meditate on inner life', is significantly liked more by Muslim students ($Z_d=3.40^{**}$).

To Way 8 which depicts the 'enjoyment of simple easily obtainable pleasures', Muslim students have shown indifference, but Christian students, active dislike, and the difference is significant ($Z_d=2.13$). Again, Way 9, 'wait in quiet receptivity for joy and peace', has been shown some degree of liking by Muslim students but is shown considerable dislike by Christian students, and the difference is significant ($Z_d=2.77^{**}$). On the other hand, while both the groups dislike Way 6, 'sensuous enjoyment', Christian students dislike it to a significantly greater degree ($Z_d=3.33^{**}$).

To Ways 1, 5, 10, and 12, both the groups have expressed more or less the same degree of liking.
Considered from the standpoint of rank order differences between the two groups (Table 11, page 145), Muslim students have their first three ranks accorded to Ways 1, 5, and 10 in that order; whereas the first three ranks of Christian students are given to Ways 10, 3, and 1 in that order. Striking differences in rank order occur with respect to Ways 7 and 11: Way 7 has 11th rank for Muslim students and 6th rank for Christian students; Way 11 carries 4th rank with Muslim and 8th rank with Christian students. However, it is worth noting that Ways 10 and 1 figure as common ways which both the groups highly favour.

Comparison of Ratings of all the Three Groups

As stated earlier, between Hindu and Muslim students, except for a relatively stronger emphasis on 'sympathetic concern for others' by Hindu students, there are no major differences.

On the other hand, Christian students differ from both Hindu and Muslim students in a notable manner. Compared to Hindu and Muslim students, Christian students have placed a relatively stronger emphasis on Ways 3, 5, and 7. While the Ways 3 and 6 have been liked considerable
by all the groups. Christian students have liked them relatively more. Way 7 has been shown a considerable degree of liking by Christian students whereas both Hindu and Muslim students have shown indifference. In terms of rank, Way 7 has 6th rank for Christian students but 11th rank for Hindu and Muslim students.

The ratings of the three groups to ways 3, 6, and 7 suggest that 'sympathetic concern for others' and 'master threatening forces by constant practical work' occupy a more prominent place in the value orientation of Christian students than those of Muslim and Hindu students. 'Admission of diversity' finds a place only among Christian students and it has no place among Hindu and Muslim students.

Way 11, on the other hand, has been shown a high degree of liking by Hindu and Muslim students but it is shown only a slight degree of liking by Christian students. 'Meditation on inner life', therefore, appears to be only peripheral to Christian students and nearly central to both Hindu and Muslim students.

Way 9, depicting 'wait in quiet receptivity for joy and peace' has been shown some degree of liking by
both Hindu and Muslim students; whereas Christian students reject it. Differing from both Hindu and Muslim students, Christian students exhibit an active rejection of 'sensuous enjoyment' (Way 4) and 'enjoyment of simple pleasures' (Way 8).

It is of interest to note that the Ways, with the exception of Way 5, on which Hindu and Christian students differ are also the Ways on which Muslim and Christian students differ; and also the direction in which Hindu and Muslim students differ from Christians is the same. See Figure 1, between pages 152 - 153.

However, it is important to note that all the three groups have in their upper region of liking important place for Ways 1, 3, 5, and 10.

To summarise, the ratings of the three groups suggest that while each group emphasises 'social restraint and self-control' and to a lesser extent 'enjoyment and progress in action', the latter factor appears to have a slightly higher appeal to Christian students. On the negative side, there appears to be
a more active rejection of 'self-indulgence' by
Christian students than by Hindu and Muslim students.
'Sympathetic concern for others' has been differentially
emphasized, with Christian students favouring it most,
followed by Hindu and Muslim students in that order.
Hindu and Muslim students, similar in ratings to cost
of the Wayo, have differed notably from Christian
students in their ratings to 'admission of diversity':
both the groups have expressed nearly indifference as
compared to a considerable degree of liking by Christian
students. Again, 'meditation on inner life' appears to
be almost central to both Hindu and Muslim students,
but it is only peripheral to Christian students.

Hindu and Muslim students appear to be nearer to
each other in their conceived values to cultural
ideologies. See Figure 1, between pages 152 - 153.
Fig. 1: Evaluation of 13 Ways-of-Life by the Three Religio-cultural Groups.
(ii) Conceived Values to Three Basic Value Orientations in Social Interactional Contexts: The Desirability Scale

(a) Conceived Values of the Three Religio-cultural Groups

The Hindu Students’ Appraisal of Value Orientations

Receptivity

It may be observed from column 1 of Table 12 that Receptivity value orientation is positively appraised in all the social relationships and, except in 'Neighbour', significantly: 'Intimate friend' ($Z=8.64^{**}$), 'Close kin' ($Z=3.57^{**}$), 'Room-mate' ($Z=2.95^{**}$), and 'Co-employee' ($Z=2.26^*$.)

Dominance

From column 2 of Table 12, it is observed that Dominance orientation is more or less negatively appraised in all the interactional contexts except in 'Intimate friend'. However, it is considered as significantly undesirable in 'Close kin' ($Z=3.25^{**}$), 'Room-mate' ($Z=2.84^{**}$), and 'Neighbour' ($Z=3.66^{**}$). In 'Co-employee' also there is a small degree of negative appraisal. On the other hand, Dominanc
TABLE 12

'Desirability' Mean Scores of Hindu Students on the Three Value Orientations for Different Social Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Relationships</th>
<th>Receptivity</th>
<th>Dominance</th>
<th>Detachment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close kin</td>
<td>+.054*</td>
<td>-.254*</td>
<td>+.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate friend</td>
<td>+.346*</td>
<td>+.118</td>
<td>+.306*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room-mate</td>
<td>+.183*</td>
<td>-.186*</td>
<td>+.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-employee</td>
<td>+.147*</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>+.098</td>
<td>-.266*</td>
<td>+.110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

* : Significant at .05 level
** : Significant at .01 level
orientation is found to be desirable to some extent in 'Intimate friend'.

Detachment

Column 3 of Table 12 indicates that appraisal of Detachment is positive except in 'Co-employees'. However, Detachment is considered as significantly desirable only in 'Intimate friend' ($Z=4.21^{**}$). It is rated as desirable in other relationships also, but it is not statistically significant.

Summary

Hindu students have accorded positive appraisal to Receptivity orientation in all the relationships and so also to Detachment except in 'Co-employees'. On the other hand, Dominance orientation is negatively appraised except in 'Intimate friend'.

The Muslim Students' Appraisal of Value Orientations

Receptivity

It is seen from column 1 of Table 13 that Receptivity value orientation is considered as significantly desirable in all the social interactional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Relationships</th>
<th>Receptivity</th>
<th>Dominance</th>
<th>Detriment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close kin</td>
<td>+.423*</td>
<td>+.033</td>
<td>+.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate friend</td>
<td>+.694**</td>
<td>+.423*</td>
<td>+.593*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room-mate</td>
<td>+.355*</td>
<td>+.203</td>
<td>+.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-employee</td>
<td>+.506*</td>
<td>+.084</td>
<td>+.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>+.322*</td>
<td>+.136</td>
<td>+.151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

* : Significant at .05 level
** : Significant at .01 level
contexts: 'Close kin' ($Z=2.36^*$), 'Intimate friend' ($Z=4.28^{**}$), 'Room-mate' ($Z=2.32^*$), 'Co-employee' ($Z=2.99^{**}$), and 'Neighbour' ($Z=2.12^*$).

Dominance

Column 2 of Table 13 indicates that Dominance orientation too carries a positive appraisal to Muslim students. However, it is considered as significantly desirable only in 'Intimate friend' ($Z=2.35^*$). In 'Room-mate' and 'Neighbour', Dominance is rated to be desirable to a considerable degree.

Detachment

It is seen from column 3 of Table 13 that Muslim students accord positive appraisal to Detachment orientation in all the social interactional contexts. It is considered as significantly desirable in 'Intimate friend' ($Z=3.73^{**}$). There is a considerable degree of positive appraisal expressed in other relationships too.

Summary

Muslim students have expressed positive appraisal in varying degrees towards all the three value orientations in all the interactional contexts.
The Christian Students' Appraisal of Value Orientations

Receptivity

A reading of column 1 of Table 14 indicates that Christian students consider Receptivity value orientation as significantly desirable in 'Neighbour' ($Z=3.10^{**}$) and significantly undesirable in 'Close kin' ($Z=3.66^{**}$). In other relationships, this orientation is positively appraised to a small degree.

Therefore, mixed appraisal is accorded to Receptivity by Christian students; nonetheless, the tendency to positively appraise it in social interactional contexts is discernible.

Dominance

Column 2 of Table 14 indicates that Dominance orientation is considered as significantly undesirable in all the interactional contexts: 'Close kin' ($Z=5.03^{**}$), 'Intimate friend' ($Z=4.03^{**}$), 'Room-mate' ($Z=5.68^{**}$), 'Co-employee' ($Z=2.41^{*}$), and 'Neighbour' ($Z=2.35^{*}$).

Detachment

It is observed from column 3 of Table 14 that the appraisal of Detachment, as that of Receptivity, is
### TABLE 14

*Desirability* Mean Scores of Christian Students on the Three Value Orientations for Different Social Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Relationships</th>
<th>Value Orientations</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receptivity</td>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>Detachment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close kin</td>
<td>-.401*</td>
<td>-.791*</td>
<td>-.598*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate friend</td>
<td>+.066</td>
<td>-.516*</td>
<td>+.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room-mate</td>
<td>+.022</td>
<td>-.328*</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-employee</td>
<td>+.055</td>
<td>-.297*</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>+.307*</td>
<td>-.297*</td>
<td>+.840*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

* : Significant at .05 level  
** : Significant at .01 level
mixed, varying from being considered as significantly desirable in 'Neighbour' ($Z=2.54^*$) to significantly undesirable in 'Close kin' ($Z=4.39^{**}$). The mean scores in other relationships are negligible.

Summary

Christian students have expressed positive appraisal towards Receptivity in varying degrees except in 'Close kin'. Dominance orientation is highly negatively appraised in all the interactional contexts. Detachment is considered as desirable in 'Neighbour' and 'undesirable' in 'Close kin'. In other relationships indifference is accorded to it.

(b) Comparison of Conceived Values of the Three Groups: The Desirability Scale

Hindu and Muslim Students

Receptivity

It can be observed from Table 15 (columns 1, 2, and 3) that while both Hindu and Muslim students consider Receptivity as highly desirable in social interactional contexts, Muslim students consider
TABLE 15

Comparison of 'Desirability' Mean Scores of Hindu and Muslim Students and the Differences Between Them on the Three Value Orientations in Different Social Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Relationships</th>
<th>Receptivity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Dominance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Detachment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close kin</td>
<td>+.284</td>
<td>+.425</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>-.234</td>
<td>+.055</td>
<td>-.257</td>
<td>+.120</td>
<td>+.152</td>
<td>-.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate friend</td>
<td>+.640*</td>
<td>+.694*</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>+.113</td>
<td>+.425</td>
<td>-.505</td>
<td>+.305*</td>
<td>+.595*</td>
<td>-.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room-mate</td>
<td>+.133*</td>
<td>+.355*</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>-.180*</td>
<td>+.005</td>
<td>-.383*</td>
<td>+.084</td>
<td>+.329</td>
<td>-.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-employee</td>
<td>+.147*</td>
<td>+.503*</td>
<td>-.361*</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>+.084</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>+.203</td>
<td>-.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>+.006</td>
<td>+.322*</td>
<td>-.226</td>
<td>-.260*</td>
<td>+.136</td>
<td>-.446*</td>
<td>+.110</td>
<td>+.152</td>
<td>-.042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
* : Significant at .05 level
** : Significant at .01 level
Receptivity more desirable than Hindu students do, though the trend is significant only in 'Co-employee' ($Z_d=2.00^*$).

Dominance

From columns 4 and 5 of Table 15, it is seen that while Hindu students have considered Dominance as undesirable in all the relationships except in 'Intimate friend' in which they have considered it as desirable to a small degree, Muslim students have considered this orientation as desirable in all the relationships. However, the differences between these two groups (column 6) are significant in 'Room-mate' ($Z_d=2.01^*$) and 'Neighbour' ($Z_d=2.47^*$).

Detachment

It can be observed from columns 7 and 8 of Table 15 that Hindu students consider Detachment as desirable in all the relationships except in 'Co-employee' in which they have considered it as undesirable to a small degree; whereas Muslim students consider this value orientation as desirable in all the relationships. There are no significant differences observed in the ratings of these two groups (column 9).
Hindu and Christian Students

Receptivity

From columns 1, 2, and 3 of Table 16, it can be seen that, between Hindu and Christian students, one important difference is with respect to 'Close friend'. In this relationship, Hindu students have considered Receptivity as highly desirable while Christian students have considered it as highly undesirable, the difference being significant ($\overline{Z}_d=4.76^{**}$). In other relationships, both the groups have considered Receptivity as more or less desirable; however, Hindu students have rated it as considerably more desirable in 'Room-mate' and 'Co-employee', and significantly more desirable in 'Intimate friend' ($\overline{Z}_d=3.88^{**}$) while Christian students have rated it as more desirable in 'Neighbour'.

Dominance

It is seen from Table 16 (columns 4, 5, and 6) that both Hindu and Christian students consider Dominance orientation as undesirable in all social interactional contexts except in 'Intimate friend' in which Hindu students have rated it as desirable to a considerable degree. In 'Intimate friend' the difference in the mean ratings of the two groups is also significant ($\overline{Z}_d=4.36^{**}$).
### Table 16

Comparison of 'Desirability' Mean Scores of Hindu and Christian Students and the Differences Between Them on the Three Value Orientations in Different Social Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Relationships</th>
<th>Receptivity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Dominance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Detachment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close kin</td>
<td>+.254*</td>
<td>-.467*</td>
<td>+.715*</td>
<td>-.254*</td>
<td>-.791*</td>
<td>+.537*</td>
<td>+.120</td>
<td>-.505*</td>
<td>+.625*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate friend</td>
<td>+.640*</td>
<td>+.063*</td>
<td>+.574*</td>
<td>+.118*</td>
<td>-.513*</td>
<td>+.631*</td>
<td>+.303*</td>
<td>+.004</td>
<td>+.304*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-employee</td>
<td>+.185*</td>
<td>+.052*</td>
<td>+.131*</td>
<td>-.185*</td>
<td>-.338*</td>
<td>+.443*</td>
<td>+.034</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>+.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker</td>
<td>+.147*</td>
<td>+.055*</td>
<td>+.092*</td>
<td>-.036*</td>
<td>-.237*</td>
<td>+.311*</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>+.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>+.096*</td>
<td>+.307*</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.096*</td>
<td>-.497*</td>
<td>+.107*</td>
<td>+.120</td>
<td>+.240*</td>
<td>-.130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Toto:*

* = significant at .05 level
** = significant at .01 level
Further, compared to Hindu students, Christian students have considered this orientation as considerably more undesirable in 'Co-employee', and significantly more undesirable in 'Close kin' ($Z_d=3.53^{**}$) and 'Room-mate' ($Z_d=3.43^{**}$).

**Detachment**

From columns 7, 8, and 9 of Table 16, it can be seen that while Hindu students consider Detachment as desirable to a considerable degree in 'Close kin', Christian students consider it as highly undesirable, the difference being significant ($Z_d=4.46^{**}$). Though both the groups consider this orientation as desirable in 'Intimate friend', Hindu students consider it as significantly more desirable ($Z_d=2.17^{*}$). It can also be observed that Hindu students have rated it as more desirable in 'Room-mate' while Christian students have rated it as more desirable in 'Neighbour', though the differences are not statistically significant.

**Muslim and Christian Students**

**Receptivity**

It is seen from columns 1, 2, and 3 of Table 17 that while Muslim students consider Receptivity as
Comparison of 'Desirability' Mean Scores of Muslim and Christian Students and the Differences Between Them on the Three Value Orientations in Different Social Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Relationships</th>
<th>Recentivity Means</th>
<th>Recentivity Difference</th>
<th>Dominance Means</th>
<th>Dominance Difference</th>
<th>Detachment Means</th>
<th>Detachment Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslims Christians</td>
<td></td>
<td>Muslims Christians</td>
<td></td>
<td>Muslims Christians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close kin</td>
<td>+.423*</td>
<td>-.461*</td>
<td>+.384*</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.791*</td>
<td>+.824*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate friend</td>
<td>+.694*</td>
<td>+.006</td>
<td>+.333*</td>
<td>-.423*</td>
<td>-.546*</td>
<td>+.339*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room-mate</td>
<td>+.355*</td>
<td>+.022</td>
<td>+.333*</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.686*</td>
<td>+.379*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-employees</td>
<td>+.306*</td>
<td>+.055</td>
<td>+.455*</td>
<td>+.034</td>
<td>-.297*</td>
<td>+.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>+.322*</td>
<td>+.307*</td>
<td>+.010</td>
<td>+.136</td>
<td>-.397*</td>
<td>+.433*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*: Significant at .05 level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#: Significant at .01 level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
highly desirable in 'Close kin', Christian students consider it as highly undesirable, the difference being significant ($\bar{Z}_d=4.01^{**}$). In all other relationships, though both groups consider this value orientation as desirable, Muslim students rate it as considerably more desirable in 'Room-mate', and significantly more desirable in 'Intimate friend' ($\bar{Z}_d=2.93^{**}$) and 'Co-employee' ($\bar{Z}_d=2.27^*$).

**Dominance**

From columns 4 and 5 of Table 17 it is seen that Christian students have considered Dominance orientation as highly undesirable in all interactional contexts, while Muslim students have rated it as more or less desirable in all interactional contexts. Further, it is seen (column 6) that the differences in the ratings of these two groups are significant in all the relationships except 'Co-employee': 'Close kin' ($\bar{Z}_d=5.5^{**}$), 'Intimate friend' ($\bar{Z}_d=4.39^{**}$), 'Room-mate' ($\bar{Z}_d=3.34^{**}$), and 'Neighbour' ($\bar{Z}_d=2.41^*$).

**Detachment**

It may be observed from columns 7, 8, and 9 of Table 17 that Muslim students rate detachment as
desirable to a considerable extent in 'Close kin', while Christian students consider it as highly undesirable, the difference being significant ($Z_d=3.28^{**}$). In 'Intimate friend' Muslim students consider this value orientation as significantly more desirable ($Z_d=2.54^{**}$). In 'Room-mate' and 'Co-employee' also the differences between the mean ratings of these two groups are considerable.

A Comparative Consideration of the Three Groups in Terms of Their Conceived Values for Different Social Relationships

In 'Close kin', Hindu students consider Receptivity as highly desirable, Detachment as desirable to a considerable degree, and Dominance as highly undesirable. Muslim students have rated all the three orientations as desirable to a greater or lesser degree. On the other hand, Christian students consider all the three orientations as highly undesirable. See Figure 2, between pages 169 - 170.

In 'Intimate friend', both Hindu and Muslim students have rated all the three orientations as desirable in varying degrees; whereas Christian students have rated Dominance as highly undesirable and Receptivity
and Detachment as desirable to a little extent. See Figure 3, between pages 169 - 170.

In 'Kooa-mato', while Muslim students consider the three orientations as desirable in different degrees, Hindu students have rated each of Receptivity and Detachment as desirable and Dominance as highly undesirable, and Christian students have rated Receptivity as desirable and Dominance and Detachment as undesirable. See Figure 4, between pages 169 - 170.

In 'Co-employee', both Hindu and Christian students have rated Receptivity as desirable in different degrees, and Dominance and Detachment as undesirable; whereas Muslim students have considered all the three orientations as desirable in the decreasing order of Receptivity, Detachment, and Dominance. See Figure 5, between pages 169 - 170.

In 'Neighbour', all the three groups consider Receptivity and Detachment as desirable; while "I\ldots" and Christian students consider Dominance as highly undesirable, Muslim students consider this orientation also as desirable to some extent. See Figure 6, between pages 169 - 170.
Fig. 2 Appraisal of the Three Value Orientations by the Three Religio-cultural Groups in 'Close kin'.

- Hindus
- Muslims
- Christians

Graph showing the appraisal of three value orientations (Receptivity, Dominance, Detachment) for three religious-cultural groups (Hindus, Muslims, Christians) with values ranging from -0.80 to 0.45.
Fig. 3 Appraisal of the Three Value Orientations by the Three Religio-cultural Groups in 'Intimate friend'.
Fig. 4 Appraisal of the Three Value Orientations by the Three Religio-cultural Groups in 'Room-mate'.
Fig. 5 Appraisal of the Three Value Orientations by the Three Religio-cultural Groups in 'Co-employee'.
Fig. 6 Appraisal of the Three Value Orientations by the Three Religio-cultural Groups in 'Neighbour'.
Summary

A highly simplified statement regarding the 'desirability' of the value orientations in social interactional contexts would be that Hindu and Muslim students and to some extent Christian students have accorded positive appraisal to Receptivity in interactional contexts. While Hindu and Christian students have shown predominantly a negative appraisal of Dominance in interactional contexts, Muslim students have shown a positive appraisal. Detachment has been accorded a positive appraisal by Hindu and Muslim students but predominantly a negative appraisal by Christian students.

Viewed from the standpoint of statistical significance, it may be noted that the differences in the ratings of Hindu and Muslim students are not, by and large, statistically significant. Significant differences occur only with respect to 'Room-mate' and 'Neighbour' in Dominance, and 'Co-employee' in Receptivity. On the other hand, Hindu and Christian students differ significantly in 'Close kin' and 'Intimate friend' in all the three orientations; besides, the two groups differ in 'Room-mate' in Dominance orientation. Again, Christian students
differ from Muslim students in 'Close kin' and 'Intimate friend' in all the orientations. Further, these two groups significantly differ in 'Co-employee' in Reactivity, and in 'Room-mate' and 'Neighbour' in Dominance.

In summarizing the similarities and differences between the cultural groups, it may be suggested that Hindu and Muslim students are closer to each other in their conceived values to social interactional contexts. The conceived values of Christian students vary considerably from those of Hindu and Muslim students. This is particularly evident in such social relationships as 'Close kin' and 'Intimate friend'. 
Chapter IX

DESCRIPTIONS OF THE GROUPS

(i) Ingroup and Outgroup Descriptions by Each of the Three Groups

(ii) Comparison of Ingroup Description of Each Group with the Descriptions by the Outgroups
Chapter IX

DESCRIPTIONS OF THE GROUPS

The ratings on the Attributability Scale are analysed in this chapter to obtain the descriptions of the three religio-cultural groups (Hindus, Muslims, and Christians) in terms of three value orientations (Receptivity, Dominance, and Dotachment) as evident from the perception of each group—i.e., how each student group describes its ingroup and the two outgroups in terms of the value orientations. Included also is a comparison of the ingroup perception of each group with how it is perceived by the other two outgroups.
(i) Ingroup and Outgroup Descriptions by Each of the Three Groups

Hindu Students and the Descriptions of Groups

Receptivity

Table 18 (column 1) reveals that according to Hindu students Receptivity value orientation is significantly attributable to Hindus ($Z=12.30^{**}$) and Christians ($Z=4.38^{**}$). Furthermore, the mean scores of those two groups indicate that this orientation is far more certainly attributable to Hindus than to Christians. On the other hand, Muslims are perceived to be lacking in Receptivity.

Dominance

Column 2 of Table 18 indicates that all the three groups are significantly Dominance-oriented: Hindus ($Z=2.93^{**}$), Muslims ($Z=5.59^{**}$), and Christians ($Z=7.03^{**}$). However, the mean scores place Christians first, Muslims second, and Hindus third.

Detachment

From column 3 of Table 18 it may be observed that Hindus are significantly Detachment-oriented ($Z=11.58^{**}$).
### Table 18

'Attributability' Mean Scores of Hindu Students to the Three Religio-cultural Groups on the Three Value Orientations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religio-cultural Groups</th>
<th>Value Orientations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receptivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>+.345*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>-.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christians</td>
<td>+.311*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
- *: Significant at .05 level
- **: Significant at .01 level
While both Muslims and Christians are perceived to be not attributable with Detachment, Christians are perceived to be significantly lacking in it ($\bar{z}=2.73^*$).

Summary

For Hindu students, Hindus are predominantly Detachment- and Receptivity-oriented and to a lesser degree Dominance-oriented. Muslims are described as primarily Dominance-oriented with Receptivity and Detachment lacking. Christians are perceived to be primarily Dominance-oriented closely followed by Receptivity but lacking significantly in Detachment value orientation.

Muslin Students and the Descriptions of Groups

Receptivity

It may be observed from column 1 of Table 1) that Muslim students perceive Receptivity orientation to be significantly attributable to Hindus ($\bar{z}=3.76^{**}$) and Christians ($\bar{z}=3.54^{**}$). For the ingroup also it is perceived to be attributable, but not significantly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religio-cultural Groups</th>
<th>Value Orientations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receptivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>+.506**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>+.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>+.510**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
* : Significant at .05 level
** : Significant at .01 level
Dominance

The attributability ratings of Dominance value orientation by Muslim students (column 2 of Table 19) reveal that only Christians are significantly Dominance-oriented (Z=2.49*). Though both Hindus and the ingroup are perceived to be Dominance-oriented, it is not statistically significant.

Therefore, though all the groups are attributable with Dominance according to Muslim students, only Christians are perceived to be significantly Dominance-oriented.

Detachment

According to column 3 of Table 19, Muslim students perceive Detachment orientation to be significantly attributable to Hindus (Z=5.11**) and Muslims (Z=4.02**); whereas Christians are perceived to be not attributable with this value orientation.

Summary

Muslim students describe Hindus to be primarily Detachment- and Receptivity-oriented and to a lower
degree Detachment-oriented. Muslims are reported to be predominantly Detachment-oriented and to a lesser degree Receptivity- and Dominance-oriented. Christians, on the other hand, are perceived to be predominantly Receptivity- and Dominance-oriented, but lacking in Detachment orientation.

Christian Students and the Descriptions of Groups

Receptivity

It may be observed from column 1 of Table 20 that Christian students perceive Receptivity value orientation to be attributable to all the groups, but significantly to Hindus ($\bar{z}=2.54^*$), and to a considerable degree to Christians, and to a negligible extent to Muslims.

Dominance

Column 2 of Table 20 indicates that Christian students perceive Dominance orientation to be significantly attributable to Christians ($\bar{z}=4.51^{**}$) and Muslims ($\bar{z}=5.06^{**}$), while it is attributable to a negligible degree to Hindus.
### TABLE 20

'Attributability' Mean Scores of Christian Students to the Three Religio-cultural Groups on the Three Value Orientations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religio-cultural Groups</th>
<th>Value Orientations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receptivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>+.205*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>+.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christians</td>
<td>+.120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

* : Significant at .05 level  
** : Significant at .01 level
Detachment

A reading of column 3 of Table 20 would show that Christian students perceive Hindus as significantly attributable with Detachment ($Z=4.76^{**}$). Muslims are also perceived to be significantly Detachment-oriented ($Z=2.25^{*}$). However, the mean scores indicate that between these two groups Hindus are far more certainly attributable with Detachment value orientation. On the other hand, Christians are perceived to be negligibly Detachment-oriented.

Summary

Christian students perceive Hindus to be predominantly Detachment-oriented, and to a lesser extent Receptivity-oriented, and to a negligible degree Dominance-oriented. Muslims, on the other hand, are perceived to be primarily Dominance-oriented, and secondarily Detachment-oriented, and to a negligible extent Receptivity-oriented. Christian students perceive their ingroup to be primarily Dominance-oriented, and secondarily Receptivity-oriented, and negligibly Detachment-oriented.
(ii) Comparison of Ingroup Description of Each Group with the Descriptions by Outgroups

The preceding results of the 'attributability' ratings to different groups are reformulated here to indicate how each student group perceives its ingroup and how its ingroup is perceived by the students of outgroups—i.e., to indicate the similarities and differences between the ingroup perception of a given group and its perception by the outgroups. These results are represented in Figures 7 to 9.

As stated earlier the ingroup perception of Hindu students reveals that Hindus are predominantly Detachment- and Receptivity-oriented and to a lesser extent Dominance-oriented. In the perception of Muslim and Christian students also, Detachment and Receptivity figure prominently as value orientations of Hindus. Dominance orientation is, however, thought by these groups to be much less attributable to Hindus than what Hindu students think it is attributable to Hindus. It is worth noting, however, that there is a considerable degree of similarity between how Hindus are perceived by Hindu students and how Hindus are perceived by Hindus.
and Christian students. The pattern of attribution of the three value orientations to Hindus by Hindu students and by Muslim and Christian students is essentially the same. See Figure 7, between pages 183 - 184.

Muslim students think that Muslims are primarily Detachment-oriented, but both Hindu and Christian students perceive Muslims to be primarily Dominance-oriented. Furthermore, Hindu students report that Muslims are lacking in Detachment-orientation and Christian students think that Muslims are Detachment-oriented to a lesser extent than what Muslim students perceive Muslims to be. See Figure 8, between pages 183 - 184. Regarding the attributability of Receptivity orientation also there is some discrepancy; while Muslim students think that Muslims are Receptivity-oriented to a considerable extent, Christian students think that Muslims are Receptivity-oriented only to a negligible extent, and Hindu students think that Muslims are lacking in Receptivity orientation.

The ingroup perception of Christian students reveals that Christians are primarily Dominance-oriented. It is worth noting that Christians are
perceived to be so by Hindu students also. Regarding receptivity, it may be noted that though all the three groups perceive this value orientation to be attributable to Christians, Christian students perceive it to be attributable to Christians to a lesser degree than what the outgroups think it is attributable to Christians. Detachment orientation is thought of by Christian students to be attributable to a negligible degree to the ingroup whereas both Hindu and Muslim students perceive Christians to be lacking in detachment orientation. It may be noted, however, that Christian students themselves perceive their ingroup to be only negligibly detachment-oriented. See Figure 9, between pages 183 - 184.

Summary

The foregoing discussion suggests that Hindu and Christian students have ingroup perceptions regarding the attributability of value orientations which, by and large, are similar to those held by the outgroups. On the other hand, the ingroup perception of Muslim students is at considerable variance with the perception of Muslims by Hindu and Christian students.
Fig. 7 Description of Hindus by Hindu Students (HH), Muslim Students (MH), and by Christian Students (CH).
Fig. 8 Description of Muslims by Muslim Students (MM), Hindu Students (HM), and by Christian Students (CM).
Fig. 9. Description of Christians by Christian Students (CC), Hindu Students (HC), and by Muslim Students (MC).
Chapter X

VALUE COMPATIBILITY

(i) Ingroup and Outgroup Compatibility:
   a. Hindus
   b. Muslims
   c. Christians

(ii) Intercultural Compatibility

(iii) Generalization and Discussion of Compatibility Data
This chapter is divided into three sections. In section (i) are presented the findings of ingroup and outgroup value Compatibility of each of (a) Hindu students, (b) Muslim students, and (c) Christian students. For each group, the ingroup and outgroup Compatibility in each value orientation is reported. Also, under each value orientation, the following aspects are covered: the ingroup Compatibility of the given group, Compatibility towards the two outgroups separately; acceptability of the ingroup relative to each of the two outgroups; and relative acceptability of the two outgroups. This is followed by a consideration of Compatibility data combined on all the three value orientations in order to study the general trend of
ingroup and outgroup Compatibility, which in a way constitutes the summary of the Compatibility data of a given group.

In section (ii), 'Intercultural Compatibility', the Compatibility of the three religio-cultural groups with each other is compared—i.e., for example, the Hindu students' Compatibility towards Muslims and Christians is compared with Muslim and Christian students' Compatibility towards Hindus.

In section (iii), 'Generalization and Discussion of the Compatibility Data', the generalizations emerging from the Compatibility data of the three groups are stated and discussed.

(1) Ingroup and Outgroup Value Compatibility:
   a. Hindus

Receptivity Value Orientation

Ingroup Compatibility of Hindu Students

It is observed from column 1 of Table 21 that, within the framework of Receptivity value orientation,
The Hindu Students' Ingroup and Outgroup Compatibility
Mean Scores and Their Differences on Receptivity in Different Social Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Relationships</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>Outgroups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close kin</td>
<td>+0.614**</td>
<td>-0.080 +.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate friend</td>
<td>+1.040**</td>
<td>-.140 +.290**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room-mate</td>
<td>+0.535**</td>
<td>+.006 +.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-employee</td>
<td>+0.302**</td>
<td>-.050 +.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>-0.030 +.130</td>
<td>+.237**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

IH : The Hindu Students' Ingroup Compatibility
HM : The Hindu Students' Compatibility towards Muslims
HC : The Hindu Students' Compatibility towards Christians
* : Significant at .05 level
** : Significant at .01 level
Hindu students are significantly compatible with their ingroup in all the relationships except in 'Neighbour', 'Close kin' (Z=5.74**), 'Intimate friend' (Z=3.45**), 'Room-mate' (Z=3.46**), and 'Co-employee' (Z=3.23**). In 'Neighbour', there is a negligible degree of incompatibility.

Outgroup Compatibility (Receptivity): Hindu students Towards Muslims

It may be observed that in the Compatibility scores generated for Muslims by the ratings of Hindu students, presented in column 3 of Table 21, there is a considerable positive score in 'Neighbour' indicating that Hindu students would find themselves compatible with Muslims in this relationship. In 'Room-mate' the score is negligible indicating neither compatibility nor incompatibility. In other relationships, a considerable degree of incompatibility is expressed towards Muslims. None of the scores, however, is statistically significant.

Therefore, while a considerable degree of compatibility is expressed towards Muslims in 'Neighbour', a considerable degree of incompatibility is expressed towards them in 'Intimate friend', 'Close kin', and 'Co-employee'. 
Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Muslims to Hindu Students (Receptivity)

The differences between the Compatibility scores of Hindu students towards the ingroup and those towards Muslims (column 4 of Table 21) are significant and positive in all the relationships except in 'Neighbour' in which there is a negative score. This indicates that, except the 'Neighbour', to Hindu students, Muslims are significantly more acceptable than ingroups: 'Close kin' ($Z_d=5.14^{**}$), 'Intimate friend' ($Z_d=0.30^{**}$), 'Room-mate' ($Z_d=4.59^{**}$), and 'Co-employee' ($Z_d=2.34^{**}$). In 'Neighbour', Muslims appear to be a little more acceptable than the ingroup, but it is not significant.

If the differential acceptability of the ingroup and Muslims to Hindu students is interpreted in terms of the data presented in columns 1 and 2 of Table 21, it may be noted that the significantly higher acceptability of Hindus to Hindu students is primarily due to very high ingroup compatibility rather than due to incompatibility towards Muslims.

Outgroup Compatibility (Receptivity): Hindu Students Towards Christians

The Compatibility scores of Hindu students towards Christians (column 3 of Table 21) are all positive.
indicating that Hindu students have only different degrees of compatibility towards Christians, while the degree of compatibility is high and significant in 'Intimate friend' ($Z=2.88^{**}$) and 'Neighbour' ($Z=2.38$), it is considerable in 'Close kin' and 'Room-mate'. In 'Co-employee', there is only a small degree of compatibility.

Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Christians to Hindu Students (Receptivity)

The differences between the Hindu students' compatibility scores towards the ingroup and those towards Christians (column 5 of Table 21) are significant and positive in all the relationships except in 'Neighbour' in which there is a negative score. Except in 'Neighbour', therefore, to Hindu students, Hindus are significantly more acceptable than Christians: 'Close kin' ($Z_d=3.52^{**}$), 'Intimate friend' ($Z_d=5.03^{**}$), 'Room-mate' ($Z_d=4.02^{**}$), and 'Co-employee' ($Z_d=2.05^{*}$). In 'Neighbour', Christians appear to be more acceptable to Hindu students than the ingroup, though it is not statistically significant.

Therefore, within the framework of receptivity value orientation, Hindu students would find their
ingroup significantly more acceptable than Christians in all the relationships except in 'Neighbour'. It may also be noted that Hindu students have only different degrees of compatibility towards Christians and no incompatibility. Therefore, the higher acceptability of the ingroup to Hindu students relative to the acceptability of Christians, is solely due to the Hindu students' very high ingroup compatibility.

Relative Acceptability of Muslims and Christians to Hindu Students (Receptivity)

The differences between the Hindu students' Compatibility scores towards Muslims and those towards Christians (column 6 of Table 21) are all negative indicating that Christians are more acceptable to Hindu students than Muslims in all the relationships. While the higher acceptability of Christians compared to the acceptability of Muslims to Hindu students is significant in 'Intimate friend' ($Z_g=3.13^**$), it is considerably high in 'Close kin' and 'Neighbour'.

It appears, therefore, that, within the framework of Receptivity, Christians are more acceptable to Hindu students than Muslims in different social interactional contexts but this is more manifest in 'Intimate friend'.
'Close kin', and 'Neighbour'.

Summary

In summarising the ingroup and outgroup Compatibility data generated by the ratings of Hindu students within the framework of Receptivity value orientation, it may be noted that Hindu students find themselves highly compatible with their ingroup. The outgroup Compatibility data suggest that while Hindu students find themselves generally compatible with Christians, they find themselves rather incompatible to some extent with Muslims. See Figure 10, between pages 191 - 192. Furthermore, though both Christians and Muslims are generally much less acceptable than the ingroup to Hindu students, Christians appear to be more acceptable than Muslims.

Dominance Value Orientation

Ingroup Compatibility of Hindu Students

The ingroup Compatibility scores of Hindu students in Dominance value orientation (column 1 of Table 10) are all positive and, except in 'Neighbour', they are also significant. In other words, except in 'Neighbour',
Fig. 10. The Hindu Students' Compatibility towards the Ingroup (HH), towards Muslims (HM), and towards Christians (HC) in Receptivity.
TABLE 22

The Hindu Students' Ingroup and Outgroup Compatibility
Mean Scores and Their Differences on Dominance in Different Social Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Relationships</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>Outgroups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close kin</td>
<td>+.572*</td>
<td>-.330*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate friend</td>
<td>+.672*</td>
<td>-.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room-mate</td>
<td>+.408*</td>
<td>-.293*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-employee</td>
<td>+.270*</td>
<td>-.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>+.030</td>
<td>-.030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
- HH : The Hindu Students' Ingroup Compatibility
- IT : The Hindu Students' Compatibility towards Muslims
- TC : The Hindu Students' Compatibility towards Christians
- * : Significant at .05 level
- ** : Significant at .01 level
Hindu students are significantly compatible with the ingroup: 'Close kin' (Z=5.38**), 'Intimate friend' (Z=6.43**), 'Room-mate' (Z=5.44**), and 'Co-employee' (Z=2.59**).

Outgroup Compatibility (Dominance): Hindu Students Towards Muslims

Column 5 of Table 22 shows that the compatibility scores of Hindu students towards Muslims are all negative indicating that Hindu students have only incompatibility towards Muslims in interactional contexts. It may also be observed that while the degree of incompatibility expressed towards Muslims is significant in 'Close kin' (Z=3.34**) and 'Room-mate' (Z=3.83**), it is considerably high in 'Intimate friend' and 'Co-employee'.

Therefore, in Dominance value orientation, Hindu students would find themselves incompatible with Muslims in all the social relationships. However, in 'Neighbours' the incompatibility expressed towards them is moderate.
Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Muslims to Hindu Students (Dominance)

A reading of column 4 of Table 22 pertaining to the differences between the Hindu students' Compatibility scores towards the ingroup and those towards Muslims would show that the ingroup to Hindu students is significantly more acceptable than Muslims in all the social relationships except in: "neighbour", 'Close kin' ($\frac{X_d^2}{d}=6.22^{**}$), 'Intimate friend' ($\frac{X_d^2}{d}=6.35^{**}$), 'Roommate' ($\frac{X_d^2}{d}=6.17^{**}$), and 'Co-employee' ($\frac{X_d^2}{d}=2.70^{**}$). In 'Neighbour' also the ingroup is considerably more acceptable than Muslims.

It may be noted that the significantly higher acceptability of Hindus to Hindu students, compared to the acceptability of Muslims, is due both to high ingroup compatibility of Hindu students and also their incompatibility towards Muslims.

Outgroup Compatibility (Dominance): Hindu Students Towards Christians

The Compatibility scores towards Christians (column 5 of Table 22) are all negative except in 'Co-employee' in which there is a positive score. However, though the degree of incompatibility towards
Christians is considerable, in no relationship does it reach the level of significance.

Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Christians to Hindu Students (Dominance)

As the differences between the Hindu students' Compatibility scores towards Hindus and those towards Christians (column 5 of Table 22) are all positive, the ingroup to Hindu students is more acceptable than Christians. Further, while the higher acceptability of the ingroup is significant in 'Close kin' ($Z_d=4.66^*\ddagger$), 'Intimate friend' ($Z_d=5.11^*\ddagger$), and 'Room-mate' ($Z_d=4.33^*\ddagger$), it is considerable in 'Neighbour' and 'Co-employee'.

Further, it may also be noted that both the ingroup compatibility and incompatibility towards Christians appear to have contributed to the higher acceptability of Hindus to Hindu students.

Relative Acceptability of Muslims and Christians to Hindu Students (Dominance)

The differences between the Hindu students' Compatibility scores towards Muslims and those towards
Christians (column G of Table 22) are all negative except in 'Neighbour'. This indicates that, except in 'Neighbour', Christians are relatively more acceptable than Muslims to Hindu students. It may also be observed that the higher acceptability of Christians is notable in 'Co-employee', 'Room-mate', and 'Close kin'. In 'Neighbour', Muslims appear to be relatively a little more acceptable than Christians. However, none of the scores is significant.

It may also be noted that the higher acceptability of Christians to Hindu students, compared to the acceptability of Muslims, is due to the Hindu students' higher incompatibility towards Muslims than towards Christians.

Summary

Hindu students find themselves highly compatible with the ingroup. With both Muslims and Christians, Hindu students find themselves incompatible, but more incompatible with Muslims than with Christians. Consequently, Christians appear to be generally a little more acceptable than Muslims to Hindu students. See Figure 11, between pages 196 - 197.
Fig. 11 The Hindu Students' Compatibility towards the Ingroup (HH), towards Muslims (HM), and towards Christians (HC) in Dominance.
Detachment Value Orientation

Ingroup Compatibility of Hindu Students

It is observed from column 1 of Table 23 pertaining to the Hindu students' ingroup Compatibility scores that Hindu students find themselves significantly compatible with the ingroup in all the social relationships except in 'Co-employee': 'Close kin' ($Z=4.40^{**}$), 'Intimate friend' ($Z=7.18^{**}$), 'Room-mate' ($Z=4.03^{**}$), and 'Neighbour' ($Z=3.08^{**}$). In 'Co-employee' also the degree of ingroup compatibility is considerable.

Outgroup Compatibility (Detachment): Hindu Students Towards Muslims

The Hindu students' Compatibility scores in Detachment orientation towards Muslims (column 2 of Table 23) indicate that Hindu students have incompatibility towards Muslims in all the relationships except in 'Co-employee' in which there is a small degree of compatibility. Furthermore, they reveal that Hindu students are incompatible with Muslims significantly in 'Intimate friend' ($Z=2.43^{**}$) and considerably in other relationships.
### TABLE 23
The Hindu Students’ Ingroup and Outgroup Compatibility
Mean Scores and Their Differences on Detachment in Different Social Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Relationships</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>Outgroups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close kin</td>
<td>+.53**</td>
<td>-.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate friend</td>
<td>+.73**</td>
<td>-.220*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room-mate</td>
<td>+.40**</td>
<td>-.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-employee</td>
<td>+.130</td>
<td>+.032*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>+.33#</td>
<td>-.073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
- IH: The Hindu Students’ Ingroup Compatibility
- IM: The Hindu Students’ Compatibility towards Muslims
- HI: The Hindu Students’ Compatibility towards Christians
- *: Significant at .05 level
- **: Significant at .01 level
Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Muslims to Hindu Students (Detachment)

The differences between the Hindu students' Compatibility scores towards Hindus and those towards Muslims (column 4 of Table 23) reveal that the ingroup to Hindu students is significantly more acceptable than Muslims in all the social relationships except in 'Co-employee': 'Close kin' ($\bar{z}_d=4.25^{**}$), 'Intimate friend' ($\bar{z}_d=7.02^{**}$), 'Room-mate' ($\bar{z}_d=4.11^{**}$), and 'Neighbour' ($\bar{z}_d=2.91^{**}$).

The higher acceptability of the ingroup, as may be noted from columns 1 and 2 of Table 23, is due both to high ingroup compatibility of Hindu students and their incompatibility towards Muslims.

Outgroup Value Compatibility (Detachment): Hindu Students Towards Christians

The Hindu students' Compatibility scores towards Christians (column 3 of Table 23) reveal that Hindu students are incompatible with Christians in all the relationships except in 'Co-employee'. The degree of incompatibility is particularly noticeable in 'Close kin', 'Intimate friend' and 'Neighbour'. In 'Co-employee' there is some degree of compatibility towards them. However, none of the mean scores is significant.
Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Christians to Hindu Students (Detachment)

It may be observed from column 5 of Table 23 pertaining to the differences between the Hindu students' Compatibility scores towards the ingroup and those towards Christians that Hindu students find their ingroup significantly more acceptable than Christians in all the relationships except in 'Co-employee', 'Close kin' ($Z_d=1.42^*$), 'Intimate friend' ($Z_d=6.19^*$), 'Room-mate' ($Z_d=3.82^*$), and 'Neighbour' ($Z_d=3.01^*$).

As may be seen from columns 1 and 3 of Table 23, very high ingroup compatibility of Hindu students together with their incompatibility towards Christians seems to have produced the significantly higher acceptability of the ingroup to Hindu students.

Relative Acceptability of Muslims and Christians to Hindu Students (Detachment)

The differences between the Hindu students' Compatibility scores towards Muslims and those towards Christians (column 6 of Table 23) are uniformly low except in 'Intimate friend'. In 'Intimate friend', Christians appear to be a little more acceptable than Muslims to Hindu students.
Generally, it appears that, within the framework of Detachment, there is not much difference in the extent to which Muslims and Christians are acceptable to Hindu students.

Summary

Within the framework of Detachment value orientation, Hindu students are highly compatible with their ingroup in social interactional contexts. With both Muslims and Christians, Hindu students are generally incompatible. See Figure 12, between pages 201 - 202. There is not much difference in the degree of acceptability of Muslims and Christians to Hindu students.

Ingroup and Outgroup Compatibility of Hindu Students: General Trend

For the purpose of finding out the general trend of the ingroup and outgroup Compatibility of Hindu students, the Compatibility scores on all the three value orientations were combined.
Fig. 12 The Hindu Students' Compatibility towards the Ingroup (HH), towards Muslims (HM), and towards Christians (HC) in Detachment.
Ingroup Compatibility of Hindu Students

The ingroup Compatibility scores of Hindu students (column 1 of Table 24) reveal that Hindu students are significantly compatible with the ingroup in all the relationships: 'Close kin' ($Z=3.35^{**}$), 'Intimate friend' ($Z=13.54^{**}$), 'Room-mate' ($Z=3.11^{**}$), 'Co-employee' ($Z=4.05^{**}$), and 'Neighbour' ($Z=1.90^{*}$).

Outgroup Compatibility: Hindu Students Towards Muslims

The Hindu students' Compatibility scores towards Muslims (column 2 of Table 24) reveal that Hindu students are significantly incompatible with Muslims in 'Close kin' ($Z=3.31^{**}$), 'Intimate friend' ($Z=2.30^{*}$), and 'Room-mate' ($Z=2.94^{**}$), and considerably incompatible in 'Co-employee'. In 'Neighbour' the score is negligible.

Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Muslims to Hindu Students

The scores in column 4 of Table 24 pertaining to the differences between the Hindu students' Compatibility scores towards the ingroup and those towards Muslims show that to Hindu students their ingroup is significantly more acceptable than Muslims in all the relationships.
TABLE 24

The Hindu Students' Combined Ingroup and Outgroup Compatibility Scores and Their Differences in Different Social Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Relationships</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>Outgroups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close kin</td>
<td>+1.718</td>
<td>-.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate friend</td>
<td>+2.451</td>
<td>-.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room-mate</td>
<td>+1.471</td>
<td>-.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-employer</td>
<td>+0.703</td>
<td>-.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>+0.383</td>
<td>+.027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
- IH: The Hindu Students' Ingroup Compatibility
- IH: The Hindu Students' Compatibility towards Muslims
- IC: The Hindu Students' Compatibility towards Christians
* : Significant at .05 level
**: Significant at .01 level
except in 'Neighbour': 'Close kin' ($Z_d=0.39^{**}$), 'Intimate friend' ($Z_d=11.91^{**}$), 'Room-mate' ($Z_d=0.35^{**}$), and 'Co-employee' ($Z_d=2.95^{**}$). In 'Neighbour' also the ingroup to Hindu students is considerably more acceptable.

It may also be noted from the data presented in columns 1 and 2 of Table 24 that the significantly higher acceptability of Hindus to Hindu students is brought about by both the Hindu students' very high ingroup Compatibility and their incompatibility towards Muslims.

Outgroup Compatibility: Hindu Students Towards Christians

It may be observed from the Hindu students' Compatibility scores towards Christians (column 3 of Table 24) that Hindu students find themselves considerably incompatible with Christians in 'Close kin' and 'Room-mate' and considerably compatible in 'Co-employee'. The results in the other relationships are not worth considering. None of the scores is statistically significant.
Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Christians to Hindu Students

The differences between the Hindu students' Compatibility scores towards the ingroup and those towards Christians (column 5 of Table 24) suggest that to Hindu students Hindus are significantly more acceptable than Christians in 'Close kin' ($Z_d=7.41^{**}$), 'Intimate friend' ($Z_d=9.40^{**}$), 'Room-mate' ($Z_d=7.27^{**}$), and 'Co-employee' ($Z_d=2.20^*$). In 'Neighbour' the higher ingroup acceptability though considerable is not significant.

High ingroup compatibility of Hindu students together with some degree of incompatibility towards Christians has caused the significantly higher acceptability of Hindus to Hindu students.

Relative Acceptability of Muslims and Christians to Hindu Students

The differences between the Hindu students' Compatibility scores towards Muslims and those towards Christians (column 6 of Table 24) reveal that Christians are significantly more acceptable than Muslims to Hindu students in 'Intimate friend' ($Z_d=2.11^*$) and considerably more acceptable in all other relationships except in
Hindu students find themselves highly compatible with their ingroup. A high degree of incompatibility is expressed towards Muslims in such relationships as 'Close kin', 'Intimate friend', and 'Room-mate'—all involving intimate interaction. On the other hand, with Christians, Hindu students are considerably compatible in 'Co-employee' and in 'Co-employee' and in no relationship significantly incompatible. To Hindu students their ingroup is much more acceptable than either Muslims or Christians; but the trend to find Christians generally more acceptable than Muslims is apparent though significant only in 'Intimate friend'. See Figure 13, between pages 206 - 207.
Fig. 13: The Hindu Students' General Compatibility (HH), towards the Ingroup (HM), and towards Christians (HC).
Receptivity Value Orientation

Ingroup Compatibility
of Muslim Students

The Compatibility scores of Muslim students towards Muslims in Receptivity orientation, presented in column 1 of Table 25, reveal that Muslim students find themselves compatible with the ingroup, significantly in 'Close kin' ($Z=2.82^{**}$) and 'Intimate friend' ($Z=2.83^{**}$), and considerably in 'Room-mate'. While there is a negligible degree of ingroup compatibility in 'Co-employee', there is a small degree of incompatibility in 'Neighbour'.

Outgroup Compatibility (Receptivity): Muslim Students Towards Hindus

With Hindus, as is evident from the 'Muslim students' Compatibility scores towards Hindus (column 2 of Table 25), Muslim students are significantly compatible in 'Close kin' ($Z=2.35^{*}$) and 'Intimate friend' ($Z=2.31^{*}$) and compatible to a considerable degree in 'Room-mate' and 'Co-employee'. There is a negligible degree of compatibility towards Hindus in 'Neighbour' also.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Relationships</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>Outgroups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close kin</td>
<td>+.604*</td>
<td>+.491*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate friend</td>
<td>+.723*</td>
<td>+.542*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room-mate</td>
<td>+.423</td>
<td>+.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-employee</td>
<td>+.051</td>
<td>+.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>+.051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
- IM: The Muslim Students' Ingroup Compatibility
- MH: The Muslim Students' Compatibility towards Islamic
- NC: The Muslim Students' Compatibility towards Christians
- *: Significant at .05 level
- **: Significant at .01 level
Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Hindus to Muslim Students (Receptivity)

Column 4 of Table 25 pertaining to the differences between the Muslim students' Compatibility scores towards Hindus and those towards Hindus suggests some trends. To Muslim students, their ingroup appears to be a little more acceptable than Hindus in 'Close kin', 'Intimate friend' and 'Room-mate', while Hindus appear to be a little more acceptable than the ingroup in 'Co-employee' and 'Neighbour'. However, these are only trends statistically not significant.

Outgroup Compatibility (Receptivity): Muslim Students Towards Christians

It is evident from the Muslim students' Compatibility scores towards Christians (column 3 of Table 25) that Muslim students find themselves compatible with Christians in all the relationships, significant in 'Intimate friend' (Z=3.27***) and to a considerable degree in all the other relationships except in 'Close kin'. In 'Close kin' there is a small degree of compatibility.

Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Christians to Muslim Students (Receptivity)

The trends, as may be observed from the differences between the Muslim students' Compatibility scores
towards Muslims and those towards Christians (column 3 of Table 25), are that to Muslim students their ingroup appears to be considerably more acceptable than Christians in 'Close kin', while Christians appear to be a little more acceptable than their ingroup in 'Co-employee' and 'Neighbour'. These trends, however, are not statistically significant.

Relative Acceptability of Hindus and Christians to Muslim Students (Receptivity)

The differences between the Muslim students' Compatibility scores towards Hindus and those towards Christians (column 6 of Table 25) suggest that to Muslim students Hindus appear to be considerably more acceptable than Christians in 'Close kin', while Christians appear to be considerably more acceptable than Hindus in 'Neighbour'. In other relationships Christians appear to be a little more acceptable than Hindus. However these are trends statistically not significant.

Summary

Muslim students are very highly compatible with their ingroup in 'Close kin' and 'Intimate friend'.
With Hindus also they are significantly compatible in the above relationships. With Christians they are significantly compatible only in 'Intimate friend'. It is worth noting that Muslim students are not incompatible with the outgroups in any relationship. See Figure 11, between pages 211 - 212.

Though the differential acceptability of the ingroup in relation to the outgroups suggests that Muslim students are likely to find their ingroup a little more acceptable than Hindus in 'Close kin', 'Intimate friend', and 'Room-mate', it is not significant; again, the ingroup is considerably more acceptable than Christians in 'Close kin' but it is not significant. Similarly the higher acceptability of Hindus and Christians, relative to the acceptability of the ingroup, in 'Co-employee' and 'Neighbour' is also not significant. Hindus appear to be considerably more acceptable than Christians in 'Close kin', while Christians appear to be considerably more acceptable than Hindus in 'Neighbour'.

Fig. 14 The Muslim Students' Compatibility towards the Ingroup (MM), towards Hindus (MH), and towards Christians (MC) in Receptivity.
Dominance Value Orientation

Ingroup Compatibility
of Muslim Students

The ingroup compatibility scores of Muslim students, given in column 1 of Table 26, show that, within the framework of Dominance value orientation, they are compatible with the ingroup in all the relationships, significantly in 'Close kin' ($Z=3.17^{**}$), 'Intimate friend' ($Z=2.37^{*}$), and 'Neighbour' ($Z=2.11$), and to a considerable degree in 'Co-employee' and 'Room-mate'.

Outgroup Compatibility (Dominance): Muslim Students Towards Hindus

It may be observed from the Muslim students' compatibility scores towards Hindus (column 2 of Table 26) that Muslim students find themselves significantly compatible with Hindus in all the relationships except in 'Neighbour': 'Close kin' ($Z=2.47^{*}$), 'Intimate friend' ($Z=4.77^{**}$), 'Room-mate' ($Z=2.37^{*}$), and 'Co-employee' ($Z=2.33^{*}$). In 'Neighbour' they have a small degree of compatibility towards Hindus.
TABLE 26
The Muslim Students' Ingroup and Outgroup Compatibility
Mean Scores and Their Differences on Dominance in Different Social Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Relationships</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>Outgroups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close kin</td>
<td>+.815*</td>
<td>+.576*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate friend</td>
<td>+.576*</td>
<td>+.945*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room-mate</td>
<td>+.355</td>
<td>+.576*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-employee</td>
<td>+.389</td>
<td>+.510*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>+.457*</td>
<td>+.130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
IM: The Muslim Students' Ingroup Compatibility
MH: The Muslim Students' Compatibility towards Hindu
MC: The Muslim Students' Compatibility towards Christians
* : Significant at .05 level
** : Significant at .01 level
Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Hindus to Muslim Students (Dominance)

What is evident from the differences between the Muslim students' Compatibility scores towards the ingroup and those towards Hindus (column 1 of Table 26) is only the trend that Muslim students are likely to find their ingroup a little more acceptable than Hindus in 'Close kin' and 'Neighbour', while they are likely to find Hindus a little more acceptable than their ingroup in 'Intimate friend', 'Room-mate' and 'Co-employee'.

Outgroup Compatibility (Dominance): Muslim Students Towards Christians

It may be observed from the 'Muslim students' Compatibility scores towards Christians (column 3 of Table 26) that Muslim students are compatible with Christians in all the relationships: Significantly compatible with them in 'Co-employee' ($Z=2.77^{**}$) and 'Room-mate' ($Z=1.97^*$), considerably compatible with them in 'Intimate friend', and relatively to a lesser extent in 'Neighbour' and 'Close kin'.
Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Christians to Muslim Students (Dominance)

Only trends are suggested by the differences between the Muslim students' Compatibility scores towards the ingroup and those towards Christians (column 5 of Table 28). To Muslim students their ingroup is to a considerable degree more acceptable than Christians in 'Close kin' and is a little more acceptable than Christians in 'Neighbour' and 'Intimate friend', while Christians appear to be a little more acceptable than their ingroup in 'Co-employee' and 'Room-mate'.

Relative Acceptability of Hindus and Christians to Muslim Students (Dominance)

A trend worth noting from the differences between the Muslim students' Compatibility scores towards Hindus and those towards Christians (column 6 of Table 28) is that to Muslim students Hindus are considerably more acceptable than Christians in 'Intimate friend' and 'Close kin'.

Summary

Within the framework of Dominance orientation Muslim students find themselves significantly compatible
with their ingroup in 'Close kin', 'Intimate friend', and 'Neighbour'; with Hindus, significantly compatible in all the relationships except in 'Neighbour'; with Christians, significantly compatible only in 'Co-employee' and 'Room-mate'. It may be noted that Muslim students have only compatibility towards the outgroups and no incompatibility. Further, they appear to be more compatible with Hindus than with Christians in 'Intimate friend' and 'Close kin'. Another notable trend is that they find themselves considerably more compatible with their ingroup than with Christians in 'Close kin'. See Figure 15, between pages 216 - 217.

Detachment Value Orientation

Ingroup Compatibility
of Muslim Students

It is evident from the ingroup Compatibility scores of Muslim students in Detachment orientation, presented in column 1 of Table 27, that they are significantly compatible with the ingroup in all the relationships except in 'Neighbour': 'Close kin' ($Z=2.02^*$), 'Intimate friend' ($Z=4.23^{**}$), 'Room-mate' ($Z=2.03^{**}$), and 'Co-employee' ($Z=2.03^*$). In 'Neighbour' also their ingroup compatibility is high though statistically not significant.
The Muslim Students' Compatibility towards the Ingroup (MM), towards Hindus (MH), and towards Christians (MC) in Dominance.
TABLE 27

The Muslim Students' Ingroup and Outgroup Compatibility
Mean Scores and Their Differences on Detachment
in Different Social Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Relationships</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>Outgroups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close kin</td>
<td>+.482*</td>
<td>+.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate friend</td>
<td>+.965*</td>
<td>+.762*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room-mate</td>
<td>+.644**</td>
<td>+.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-employee</td>
<td>+.423*</td>
<td>+.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>+.423</td>
<td>+.355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
MI : The Muslim Students' Ingroup Compatibility
MII: The Muslim Students' Compatibility towards Hindus
MC: The Muslim Students' Compatibility towards Christians
* : Significant at .05 level
** : Significant at .01 level
Outgroup Compatibility (Detachment): Muslim Students Towards Hindus

The Muslim students' Compatibility scores towards Hindus (column 2 of Table 27) reveal that Muslim students are compatible with Hindus in all the relationships though highly and significantly compatible only in 'Intimate friend' ($Z=3.36^{**}$). The degree of compatibility in 'Close kin' is low.

Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Hindus to Muslim Students (Detachment)

The trend of results evident from the differences between the Muslim students' Compatibility scores towards the ingroup and those towards Hindus (column 2 of Table 27) is that to Muslim students their ingroup is considerably more acceptable than Hindus in 'Close kin' and a little more acceptable than Hindus in 'Intimate friend' and 'Room-mate'.

Outgroup Compatibility (Detachment): Muslim Students Towards Christians

The Muslim students' Compatibility scores towards Christians (column 3 of Table 27) reveal the trend that though Muslim students are generally compatible with Christians, a considerable degree of compatibility is
shown towards them only in 'Room-mate'. A low degree of compatibility is shown in 'Co-employee' and 'Intimate friend'.

Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Christians to Muslim Students (Detachment)

The differences between the Muslim students' Compatibility scores towards the ingroup and those towards Christians (column 5 of Table 87) reveal that to Muslim students their ingroup is more acceptable than Christians in all the relationships and significantly more acceptable in 'Intimate friend' \( (\bar{Z}_d=2.94^*). \)

Relative Acceptability of Hindus and Christians to Muslim Students (Detachment)

Result evident from the differences between the Muslim students' Compatibility scores towards Hindus and those towards Christians (column 6 of Table 87) is that to Muslim students, except in 'Close kin', Hindus are more acceptable than Christians: significantly more acceptable in 'Intimate friend' \( (\bar{Z}=1.98^*), \) to a considerable degree more acceptable in 'Co-employee', and to a small degree more acceptable in 'Neighbour and Room-mate'. In 'Close kin', both the groups are more or less equally acceptable to Muslim students.
Summary

Within the framework of Detachment value orientation, Muslim students are highly compatible with the ingroup in all the relationships. With Hindus and Christians also, they are compatible in all the relationships. Since they have only compatibility towards the ingroup and the outgroup, the differential acceptability of different group refers only to variations within the range of compatibility.

While Muslim students find their ingroup a little more acceptable than Hindus only in 'Close kin', 'Intimate friend', and 'Room-mate', they find their ingroup more acceptable than Christians in all the relationships and significantly more acceptable in 'Intimate friend'. Further, Hindus are generally more acceptable than Christians and significantly more acceptable in 'Intimate friend'. See Figure 16, between pages 220 - 221.

Ingroup and Outgroup Compatibility of Muslim Students: General Trend

Ingroup Compatibility of Muslim Students

It may be observed from the Muslim students' ingroup Compatibility scores presented in column 1 a
Fig. 16 The Muslim Students' Compatibility towards the Ingroup (MM), towards Hindus (MH), and towards Christians (MC) in Detachment.
Table 28 that Muslim students have significant degrees of ingroup compatibility in all the relationships:
'Close kin' ($Z=4.54^{**}$), 'Intimate friend' ($Z=5.94^{**}$),
'Room-mate' ($Z=3.34^{**}$), 'Co-employee' ($Z=2.26^{*}$), and
'Neighbour' ($Z=2.06^{*}$).

Outgroup Compatibility: Muslim Students Towards Hindus

From the Muslim students' Compatibility scores towards Hindus (column 2 of Table 27), it is evident that Muslim students find themselves highly compatible with Hindus in all the relationships and, except in 'Neighbour', significantly: 'Close kin' ($Z=3.07^{**}$),
'Intimate friend' ($Z=5.86^{**}$), 'Room-mate' ($Z=3.30^{**}$), and 'Co-employee' ($Z=3.34^{**}$).

Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Hindus to Muslim Students

A trend worth noting from the differences between the Muslim students' Compatibility scores towards the ingroup and those towards Hindus (column 4 of Table 22) is that to Muslim students their ingroup appears to be considerably more acceptable than Hindus in 'Close kin', while Hindus appear to be a little more acceptable than the ingroup in 'Co-employee'.

Table 28 that Muslim students have significant degrees of ingroup compatibility in all the relationships:
'Close kin' ($Z=4.54^{**}$), 'Intimate friend' ($Z=5.94^{**}$),
'Room-mate' ($Z=3.34^{**}$), 'Co-employee' ($Z=2.26^{*}$), and
'Neighbour' ($Z=2.06^{*}$).

Outgroup Compatibility: Muslim Students Towards Hindus

From the Muslim students' Compatibility scores towards Hindus (column 2 of Table 27), it is evident that Muslim students find themselves highly compatible with Hindus in all the relationships and, except in 'Neighbour', significantly: 'Close kin' ($Z=3.07^{**}$),
'Intimate friend' ($Z=5.86^{**}$), 'Room-mate' ($Z=3.30^{**}$), and 'Co-employee' ($Z=3.34^{**}$).

Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Hindus to Muslim Students

A trend worth noting from the differences between the Muslim students' Compatibility scores towards the ingroup and those towards Hindus (column 4 of Table 22) is that to Muslim students their ingroup appears to be considerably more acceptable than Hindus in 'Close kin', while Hindus appear to be a little more acceptable than the ingroup in 'Co-employee'.

Table 28 that Muslim students have significant degrees of ingroup compatibility in all the relationships:
'Close kin' ($Z=4.54^{**}$), 'Intimate friend' ($Z=5.94^{**}$),
'Room-mate' ($Z=3.34^{**}$), 'Co-employee' ($Z=2.26^{*}$), and
'Neighbour' ($Z=2.06^{*}$).

Outgroup Compatibility: Muslim Students Towards Hindus

From the Muslim students' Compatibility scores towards Hindus (column 2 of Table 27), it is evident that Muslim students find themselves highly compatible with Hindus in all the relationships and, except in 'Neighbour', significantly: 'Close kin' ($Z=3.07^{**}$),
'Intimate friend' ($Z=5.86^{**}$), 'Room-mate' ($Z=3.30^{**}$), and 'Co-employee' ($Z=3.34^{**}$).

Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Hindus to Muslim Students

A trend worth noting from the differences between the Muslim students' Compatibility scores towards the ingroup and those towards Hindus (column 4 of Table 22) is that to Muslim students their ingroup appears to be considerably more acceptable than Hindus in 'Close kin', while Hindus appear to be a little more acceptable than the ingroup in 'Co-employee'.
# TABLE 28

The Muslim Students' Combined Ingroup and Outgroup Compatibility Scores and Their Differences in Different Social Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Relationships</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>Outgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Kin</td>
<td>+1.985*</td>
<td>+1.215*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate friend</td>
<td>+2.270**</td>
<td>+2.249*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room-mate</td>
<td>+1.422*</td>
<td>+1.558*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-employee</td>
<td>+0.363*</td>
<td>+1.325*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>+0.780*</td>
<td>+0.592*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
- MI: The Muslim Students' Ingroup Compatibility
- IM: The Muslim Students' Compatibility towards Hindus
- IC: The Muslim Students' Compatibility towards Christians
- *: Significant at .05 level
- **: Significant at .01 level
Outgroup Compatibility: Muslim Students Towards Christians

As is evident from the Muslim students' Compatibility scores towards Christians (column 3 of Table 28), Muslim students are compatible with Christians in all the relationships and, except in 'Close kin', significantly: 'Intimate friend' ($Z = 1.71^{**}$), 'Room-mate' ($Z = 2.03^{**}$), 'Co-employee' ($Z = 2.30^{**}$), and 'Neighbour' ($Z = 2.09^{*}$).

Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Christians to Muslim Students

The differences between the Muslim students' ingroup Compatibility scores and those towards Christians (column 5 of Table 28) indicate that to Muslim students their ingroup is more acceptable than Christians, significantly in 'Close kin' ($Z = 2.58^{**}$), to a considerable degree in 'Intimate friend', and to a small degree in 'Room-mate'. Christians appear to be a little more acceptable than the ingroup to Muslim students in 'Co-employee'.

Relative Acceptability of Hindus and Christians to Muslim Students

The differences between the Muslim students' Compatibility scores towards Hindus and those towards
Christians (column C of Table 28) suggest that Muslim students are likely to find Hindus more acceptable than Christians to a considerable degree in 'Close kin' and 'Intimate friend', and a little more acceptable than Christians in 'Room-mate'. However, this is only a trend statistically not significant.

Summary

Muslim students find themselves highly compatible with their ingroup as well as with Hindus. With Christians also they are highly compatible except in 'Close kin'. The differential acceptability of groups to Muslim students varies within the range of compatibility only. They are likely to find themselves considerably more compatible with their ingroup than with Hindus in 'Close kin', while they appear to be a little more compatible with Hindus than with their ingroup in 'Co-employee'. On the other hand, they find themselves far more compatible with their ingroup than with Christians in 'Close kin' and 'Intimate friend'. Further, it appears that Muslim students are more compatible with Hindus than with Christians to a considerable degree in 'Close kin' and 'Intimate friend'. See Figure 17, between pages 224 - 225.
Fig. 17 The Muslim Students' General Compatibility towards the Ingroup (MM), towards Hindus (MH), and towards Christians (MC).
Receptivity Value Orientation

Ingroup Compatibility of Christian Students

The Christian students' ingroup Compatibility scores given in column 1 of Table 29 indicate that, within the framework of Receptivity orientation, Christian students find themselves compatible with the ingroup in all the relationships and, except in 'Close kin', significantly compatible 'Intimate friend' ($Z=4.43^{**}$), 'Room-mate' ($Z=2.63^{**}$), 'Co-employee' ($Z=2.45^{*}$), and 'Neighbour' ($Z=2.60^{**}$).

Outgroup Compatibility (Receptivity): Christian Students Towards Hindus

From the Christian students' Compatibility scores towards Hindus (column 2 of Table 29), it is evident that Christian students find themselves compatible with Hindus in all the relationships, significantly in 'Intimate friend' ($Z=3.03^{**}$), 'Room-mate' ($Z=3.40^{**}$), 'Co-employee' ($Z=3.09^{**}$), and 'Neighbour' ($Z=2.30^{**}$), and to a considerable degree in 'Close kin'.
### TABLE 29

The Christian Students' Ingroup and Outgroup Compatibility Mean Scores and Their Differences on Receptivity in Different Social Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Relationships</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>Outgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close kin</td>
<td>+.296</td>
<td>+.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate friend</td>
<td>+.758**</td>
<td>+.440**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room-mate</td>
<td>+.340*</td>
<td>+.351*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-employee</td>
<td>+.340*</td>
<td>+.340*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>+.351*</td>
<td>+.340*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- CC: The Christian Students' Ingroup Compatibility
- CH: The Christian Students' Compatibility towards Hindus
- CM: The Christian Students' Compatibility towards Muslims
- *: Significant at .05 level
- **: Significant at .01 level
Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Hindus to Christian Students (Receptivity)

The differences between the Christian students' Compatibility scores towards the ingroup and those towards Hindus (column 4 of Table 29) suggest that both Christians and Hindus are equally acceptable to Christian students in all the relationships except in 'Intimate friend' in which they are likely to find their ingroup a little more acceptable than Hindus.

Outgroup Compatibility (Receptivity): Christian Students Towards Muslims

From the Christian students' Compatibility scores towards Muslims (column 3 of Table 29) it may be observed that Christian students are compatible with Muslims in all the relationships; significantly in 'Intimate friend' (Z=2.43*), 'Neighbour' (Z=2.54*), to a considerable degree in 'Room-mate' and 'Close kin', and to a small degree in 'Co-employee'.

Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Muslims to Christian Students (Receptivity)

What is evident from the differences between the Christian students' Compatibility scores towards the
ingroup and those towards Muslims (column 5 of Table 23) is only the trend that to Christian students their ingroup is more acceptable than Muslims in all the relationships. The higher acceptability of the ingroup to Christian students is particularly noticeable in 'Intimate friend'.

Relative Acceptability of Hindus and Muslims to Christian Students (Receptivity)

A general trend evident from the differences between the Christian students' Compatibility scores towards Hindus and those towards Muslims (column 6 of Table 23) is that to Christian students Hindus are more acceptable than Muslims; however, this trend is noticeable clearly only in 'Co-employee' and 'Room-mate'.

Summary

Within the framework of Receptivity value orientation, Christian students find themselves highly compatible with their ingroup as well as with Hindus in all the relationships except in 'Close kin'. In 'Close kin' too they have quite a high degree of compatibility towards both the ingroup and Hindus, though it is statistically not significant. With Muslims, on the other hand, though Christian students
are generally compatible, they are significantly compatible with their only in 'Intimate friend' and 'Neighbour'. The differential acceptability of groups to Christian students varies within the range of compatibility only. Notable is the trend that, they find their ingroup generally more acceptable than Muslims, they seem to find their ingroup a little more acceptable than Hindus only in 'Intimate friend'. Hindus appear to be generally more acceptable than Muslims and clearly so in 'Co-employee' and 'Room-mate'. See Figure 18, between pages 229 - 230.

Dominance Value Orientation

Ingroup Compatibility of Christian Students

It may be observed from the Christian students' ingroup Compatibility scores in Dominance orientation (column 1 of Table 30) that Christian students are incompatible with the ingroup in all the relationships except in 'Neighbour' in which they are compatible with the ingroup to a small degree. The degree of incompatibility varies: they are significantly incompatible with the ingroup in 'Room-mate' ($\bar{Z}=3.43^{**}$), to a considerable degree incompatible in 'Co-employee'.
Fig. 18 The Christian Students' Compatibility towards the Ingroup (CC), towards Hindus (CH), and towards Muslims (CM) in Receptivity.
TABLE 30

The Christian Students' Ingroup and Outgroup Compatibility: Mean Scores and Their Differences on Dominance in Different Social Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Relationships</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>Outgroups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close kin</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td>+.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate friend</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room-mate</td>
<td>-.428</td>
<td>+.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-employee</td>
<td>-.363</td>
<td>+.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>+.009</td>
<td>+.241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
CC : The Christian Students' Ingroup Compatibility
CH : The Christian Students' Compatibility towards Hindus
CI : The Christian Students' Compatibility towards Muslims
* : Significant at .05 level
** : Significant at .01 level
and 'Close kin', and to a small degree incompatible in 'Intimate friend'.

Outgroup Compatibility (Dominance): Christian Students Towards Hindus

It is evident from the Christian students' Compatibility scores towards Hindus (column 2 of Table 30) that Christian students are significantly compatible with Hindus in 'Co-employee' (\(Z = 2.75**\)), to a considerably high degree in 'Close kin', 'Room-mate' and 'Neighbour'. In 'Intimate friend', neither compatibility nor incompatibility is expressed towards Hindus.

Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Hindus to Christian Students (Dominance)

It is evident from the differences between the Christian students' Compatibility scores towards the ingroup and those towards Hindus (column 4 of Table 30) that to Christian students Hindus are more acceptable than their ingroup in all the relationships; significantly more acceptable than their ingroup in 'Close kin' (\(Z_d = 1.98^*\)), 'Room-mate' (\(Z_d = 3.75^{**}\)), and 'Co-employee' (\(Z_d = 3.17^{**}\)), to a considerable degree.
more acceptable in 'Neighbour' and to a small degree more acceptable in 'Intimate friend'.

Outgroup Compatibility (Dominance): Christian Students Towards Muslims

Generally incompatible with Muslims, as indicated by the Christian students' Compatibility scores towards Muslims (column 3 of Table 30), Christian students find themselves significantly incompatible with Muslims in 'Room-mate' ($T=2.96^{* *}$) and 'Co-employee' ($T=2.43^{*}$), and to a considerable degree in other relationships.

Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Muslims to Christian Students (Dominance)

A trend is noticed from the differences between the Christian students' Compatibility scores towards the ingroup and those towards Muslims (column 6 of Table 30) that to Christian students their ingroup appears to be more acceptable than Muslims in all the relationships except in 'Room-mate'. The higher acceptability of the ingroup, however, is clearly noticeable only in 'Neighbour' and 'Intimate friend'.
Relative Acceptability of Hindus and Muslims to Christian Students (Dominance)

It is revealed from the differences between the Christian students' Compatibility scores towards Hindus and those towards Muslims (column 6 of Table 30) that to Christian students Hindus are much more acceptable than Muslims in all the relationships and, except in 'Intimate friend' significantly more acceptable: 'Close kin' ($Z_d = 2.06^*$), 'Room-mate' ($Z_d = 3.46^{**}$), 'Co-employee' ($Z_d = 3.06^{**}$), and 'Neighbour' ($Z_d = 2.34^*$).

Summary

Generally incompatible with their ingroup and Muslims within the framework of Dominance orientation, Christian students find themselves significantly incompatible with their ingroup in 'Room-mate', and with Muslims in 'Room-mate' and 'Co-employee'. On the other hand, they find themselves generally compatible to a considerable degree with Hindus and significantly compatible in 'Co-employee'. While Christian students find Hindus generally more acceptable than their ingroup and significantly more acceptable in 'Close kin', 'Room-mate', and 'Co-employee', they find their ingroup a little more acceptable than Muslims in all the relationships except in 'Room-mate'. Further, Hindus
are significantly more acceptable than Muslims in all the relationships except in 'Intimate friend'. See Figure 19, between pages 234 - 235.

Detachment Value Orientation

Ingroup Compatibility
of Christian Students

There is evident only a trend from the Christian students' Compatibility scores towards the ingroup (column 1 of Table 31); Christian students find themselves compatible with the ingroup to a considerable degree in all the relationships except in 'Co-employee'. In 'Co-employee' there is a considerable degree of incompatibility towards the ingroup.

Outgroup Compatibility (Detachment):
Christian Students Towards Hindus

Generally compatible with Hindus except in 'Close kin', as may be observed from the Christian students' Compatibility scores towards Hindus (column 2 of Table 31), Christian students are significantly compatible with Hindus in 'Intimate friend' ($Z = 2.2$).
Fig. 19 The Christian Students' Compatibility towards the Ingroup (CC), towards Hindus (CH), and towards Muslims (CM) in Dominance.
### TABLE 31

The Christian Students' Ingroup and Outgroup Compatibility Mean Scores and Their Differences on Detachement in Different Social Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Relationships</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>Outgroups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close kin</td>
<td>+.274</td>
<td>-.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate friend</td>
<td>+.175</td>
<td>+.329*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room-mate</td>
<td>+.153</td>
<td>+.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go-employee</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td>+.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>+.142</td>
<td>+.175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- CC: The Christian Students' Ingroup Compatibility
- CH: The Christian Students' Compatibility towards Hindus
- CI: The Christian Students' Compatibility towards Muslims

* : Significant at .05 level
Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Hindus to Christian Students (Detachment)

The differences between the Christian students' Compatibility scores towards Christians and those towards Hindus (column 4 of Table 31) suggest the following trend: To Christian students their ingroup appears to be more acceptable than Hindus to a considerable degree in 'Close kin', while Hindus appear to be more acceptable than their ingroup in 'Co-employee' and 'Intimate friend'—a trend statistically not significant.

Outgroup Compatibility (Detachment): Christian Students Towards Muslims

The Christian students' Compatibility scores towards Muslims (column 3 of Table 31) suggest that Christian students are compatible with Muslims to a considerable degree in 'Close kin' and to a small degree compatible in all other relationships except in 'Neighbour'. In 'Neighbour' a considerable degree of incompatibility is expressed towards Muslims.

Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Muslims to Christian Students (Detachment)

The differences between the Christian students' Compatibility scores towards the ingroup and there
towards the Muslims (column 5 of Table 31) indicate that, though to Christian students their ingroup is more acceptable than Muslims in all the relationships except in 'Co-employee', the higher acceptability of their ingroup is clear only in 'Neighbour'. In 'Co-employee' Muslims appear to be more acceptable than the ingroup to a considerable degree.

Relative Acceptability of Hindus and Muslims to Christian Students (Detachment)

What is worth noting from the differences between the Christian students' Compatibility scores towards Hindus and those towards Muslims (column 5 of Table 31) is the trend that to Christian students Muslims appear to be considerably more acceptable than Hindus in 'Close kin', while Hindus appear to be considerably more acceptable than Muslims in 'Neighbour' and 'Intimate friend'.

Summary

The results of the ingroup and outgroup Compatibility of Christian students within the framework of Detachment value orientation are suggestive in most cases of only trends statistically not significant. Christian students have compatibility in most of the relationships towards
the ingroup, towards Hindus, and to a lesser degree towards Muslims. There is a considerable degree of incompatibility towards the ingroup in 'Co-employee' and towards Muslims in 'Neighbour'. To Christian students, their ingroup appears to be considerably more acceptable than Hindus in 'Close kin', while Hindus appear to be considerably more acceptable than the ingroup in 'Co-employee' and 'Intimate friend'. Again, their ingroup appears to be considerably more acceptable than Muslims in 'Neighbour' and a little more acceptable than Muslims in 'Intimate friend', while Muslims appear to be more acceptable than the ingroup in 'Co-employee'. Hindus appear to be considerably more acceptable than Muslims in 'Neighbour' and 'Intimate friend', while Muslims appear to be considerably more acceptable than Hindus in 'Close kin'. See Figure 20, between pages 238 - 239.

Ingroup and Outgroup Compatibility of Christian Students: General Trend

Ingroup Compatibility of Christian Students

The ingroup Compatibility scores of Christian students, presented in column 1 of Table 32, reveal
Fig. 20 The Christian Students' Compatibility towards the Ingroup (CC), towards Hindus (CH), and towards Muslims (CM) in Detachment.
### TABLE 32

The Christian Students' Combined Ingroup and Outgroup Compatibility Scores and Their Differences in Different Social Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Relationships</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>Outgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close kin</td>
<td>+.395</td>
<td>+.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate friend</td>
<td>+.900**</td>
<td>+.768**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room-mate</td>
<td>+.065</td>
<td>+.745**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-employee</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>+.707**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>+.599**</td>
<td>+.750**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

CC : The Christian Students' Ingroup Compatibility
CH : The Christian Students' Compatibility towards Hindus
CM : The Christian Students' Compatibility towards Muslims
* : Significant at .05 level
** : Significant at .01 level
that they find themselves compatible with the ingroup in all the relationships except in 'Co-employee'.

Significantly compatible in 'Intimate friend' (Z=3.26**) and 'Neighbour' (Z=2.59**), to a considerable degree compatible in 'Close kin', and to a small extent in 'Room-mate'. There is a small degree of incompatibility in 'Co-employee'.

Outgroup Compatibility: Christian Students Towards Hindus

It may be observed from the Christian students' Compatibility scores towards Hindus (column 2 of Table 39) that Christian students find themselves highly compatible with Hindus in all the relationships and, except in 'Close kin', significantly compatible: 'Intimate friend' (Z=3.02**), 'Room-mate' (Z=3.28**), 'Co-employees' (Z=3.70**), and 'Neighbour' (Z=3.36**).

Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Hindus to Christian Students

It is evident from the differences between the Christian Students' Compatibility scores towards the ingroup and those towards Hindus (column 4 of Table 39) that to Christian students Hindus appear to be more acceptable than their ingroup in all the relationships.
except in 'Intimate friend': significantly more acceptable in 'Co-employee' ($Z_d=2.76^{**}$) and 'Room-mate' ($Z_d=2.10^*$), and to a small degree in 'Neighbour'. The difference is negligible in 'Close kin'. In 'Intimate friend', the ingroup appears to be more acceptable than Hindus to a small degree.

Outgroup Compatibility: Christian Students Towards Muslims

The Christian students' Compatibility scores (column 3 of Table 32) suggest the trend: Christian students are compatible to a considerable degree with Muslims in 'Close kin' and 'Intimate friend' and incompatible to a small degree in other relationships.

Relative Acceptability of the Ingroup and Muslims to Christian Students

It is evident from the differences between the Christian students' Compatibility scores towards the ingroup and those towards Muslims (column 3 of Table 32) that to Christian students their ingroup is more acceptable than Muslims in all the relationships: significantly more acceptable in 'Neighbour' ($Z_d=2.22^*$), and also to a considerably high degree in 'Intimate friend' though it does not reach the level of statistical
significance. The higher acceptability of the ingroup is clear in 'Room-mate' and 'Close kin' also.

Relative Acceptability of Hindus and Muslims to Christian Students

Hindus appear to be more acceptable than Muslims to Christian students in all the relationships, as the differences between the Christian students' Compatibility scores towards Hindus and those towards Muslims (column 6 of Table 38) reveal: Hindus are significantly more acceptable than Muslims in 'Room-mate' ($Z_d=2.96^{**}$), 'Co-employee' ($Z_d=3.07^{**}$), and 'Neighbour' ($Z_d=2.61$); and to a considerably high degree in 'Intimate friend'. The higher acceptability of Hindus is also clear in 'Close kin'.

Summary

Compatible with the ingroup in most of the relationships, Christian students find themselves significantly compatible only in 'Intimate friend' and 'Neighbour'. With Hindus they are compatible in all the relationships and, except in 'Close kin', significantly. On the other hand, they are somewhat compatible with Muslims in 'Close kin' and 'Intimate friend' and to a
small degree incompatible in other relationships.

To Christian students Hindus are more acceptable than their ingroup in all the relationships except in 'Intimate friend', and significantly more acceptable in 'Co-employee' and 'Room-mate'. On the other hand, Christian students find their ingroup more acceptable than Muslims in all the relationships and highly more acceptable in 'Neighbour' and 'Intimate friend'. Hindus are more acceptable than Muslims in all the relationships and except in 'Close kin', highly more acceptable.

See Figure 21, between pages 243 - 244.
Fig. 21. The Christian Students' General Compatibility towards the Ingroup (CC), towards Hindus (CH), and towards Muslims (CM).
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(ii) Intercultural Compatibility

In this section the conclusions pertaining to the outgroup Compatibility of the three religio-cultural groups are brought together with a view to focus on how a given group is likely to react towards members of the outgroups and how the members of the outgroups are likely to react towards the given group in interactional contexts within the framework of value orientations. Only the conclusions of combined Compatibility are considered.

Hindus and Muslims
Towards Each Other

Generally incompatible with Muslims, Hindu students find themselves significantly incompatible with them in 'Close kin', 'Intimate friend', and 'Room-mate'; whereas Muslim students find themselves highly compatible with Hindus in all the relationships. See Figure 2", between pages 244'- 245.

To Muslim students, Hindus are as much acceptable as their own group in all the relationships except in 'Close kin', while to Hindu students their ingroup is significantly more acceptable than Muslims in all the relationships except in 'Neighbour'.

Fig. 22 Intercultural Compatibility: Hindu Students towards Muslims and Muslim Students towards Hindus.
Hindus and Christians
Towards Each Other

While Hindu students have some measure of both compatibility and incompatibility towards Christians in social interactional contexts, Christian students find themselves highly compatible with Hindus in all the relationships. See Figure 23, between pages 245 - 246.

Hindu students find their ingroup significantly more acceptable than Christians in all the relationships except in 'Neighbour'; whereas Christian students find Hindus more acceptable than their ingroup in all the relationships except in 'Intimate friend' and significantly more acceptable in 'Room-mate' and 'Co-employee'.

Muslims and Christians
Towards Each Other

Muslim students find themselves generally significantly compatible with Christians in interactional contexts, while Christian students have some measure of both compatibility and incompatibility towards Muslims. See Figure 24, between pages 245 - 246.

To Muslim students their ingroup appears to be more acceptable than Christians in 'Close kin' and
Intercultural Compatibility: Hindu Students towards Christians and Christian Students towards Hindus.
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Fig. 23 Intercultural Compatibility: Hindu Students towards Christians and Christian Students towards Hindus.
Fig. 24 Intercultural Compatibility: Muslim Students towards Christians and Christian Students towards Muslims.
'Intimate friend', while to Christian students their ingroup appears to be more acceptable than Muslim in 'Intimate friend' and 'Neighbour'.
Generalization and Discussion of Compatibility Data

The ingroup and outgroup Compatibility data of the three religio-cultural groups summarized earlier suggest the following pattern of intergroup acceptability:

To Hindu students, their ingroup is more acceptable than either Christian or Muslim in social interactional contexts; but between the outgroups, Christians are generally more acceptable than Muslims (see pp. 201-206).

To Muslim students, on the other hand, Hindus are generally as much acceptable as their own group, but Christians considerably less in 'Close Kin' and 'Intimate friend'—both involving intimate interaction (see pp. 220-224). To Christian students, Hindus are to some extent more acceptable than their ingroup in some relationships; but Muslims a little less than their ingroup (see pp. 238-243). Therefore, to generalize, Hindu students, while maintaining a large degree of difference between the ingroup and outgroup acceptability, have placed nearer themselves Christians relative to Muslims; whereas Christian and Muslim students, while placing the outgroups near their ingroups, have each placed Hindus nearer themselves.
To understand the intergroup acceptability that has emerged in the present study, it appears necessary to recall briefly the nature of Compatibility and interpret the results within the framework of the Compatibility Model. Briefly, Compatibility is conceived of as a product of 'desirability' expressive of positive or negative appraisal of a value orientation and the 'attributability' of the same value orientation to a given group. The appraisal of value orientations by Hindu students, then, does not 'go with' their attribution of value orientations to Muslims and Christians as much as it does in case of attribution to their ingroup. On the other hand, Muslim and Christian students exhibit a degree of alignment between the appraisal of value orientations and the attribution of value orientations to Hindus, which is at least as much as it is in case of their respective ingroups; between them, however, these two groups have each shown a slightly higher degree of alignment in case of their ingroup relative to the other.

Now, within the framework of the Compatibility Model, the different degrees of alignment between the conceived values and attributability ratings that a given group exhibits towards different groups are...
consequences of differential attributability of value orientations to different groups. Differential attributability to different groups results in their differential acceptability. Therefore, the question arises: What are the factors or sources underlying differential attributability?

The sources of differential attributability must be both the objective applicability of the value orientations to different groups and the factors which influence the ratings of attributability in the context of ingroup and outgroup perception. Moreover, any suggestion that the differential attributability is primarily determined by the objective applicability of the value orientations may be discredited in view of the attributability ratings for the same value orientations to a given group varying to different degrees depending on the respondent group. Moreover, there is a major discrepancy observed between the ingroup perception of Muslim students and the perception of Muslims by the other religious-cultural groups (see pp. 182-183).

Among the factors that are likely to modify or influence the attributability of a given value orientation in the context of intergroup perception,
important, perhaps, is the nature of intergroup dynamics obtaining between the attributing and the attributed groups. Therefore, the intergroup dynamics governing the intergroup interaction of Hindu, Muslim, and Christian students might provide a clue to the understanding of the attributability ratings.

Hindus and Muslims have a history of conflict governing their intergroup interaction (Ghurye, 1979; Murphy, 1953). But between Hindus and Christians or between Christians and Muslims, no conflict is recorded. Further, a stereotype study (Nataraj, 1965a) reveals that Muslim and Christian students have by and large, favourable picture of Hindus; Hindu and Muslim students have a favourable picture of Christians; Hindu and Christian students have an unfavourable picture of Muslims. In a social distance study (Nataraj, 1965b), Hindus are placed nearer themselves by both Muslim and Christian students. Hindu students have the Christians placed nearer themselves. Muslims are placed at a considerable social distance by both Hindu and Christian students. The implications of this intergroup dynamics operating between the religio-cultural groups in relation to attributability ratings may be briefly examined.
From the standpoint of Hindu students, then, their interaction with Muslims is characterized by a history of conflict, negative stereotypes, and pronounced social distance. In view of this, the attributability ratings of Hindu students to Muslims are likely to have been modified in the direction of producing incompatibility towards Muslims. In contrast to this, in view of Muslim students having little social distance and a very few negative stereotypes towards Hindus, their attributability ratings to Hindus might not have been modified in the direction of generating incompatibility towards them. On the other hand, there is a likelihood of the attributability ratings of Muslim students to Hindus being modified in the direction of producing compatibility. The intergroup dynamics operating in the context of interaction between Hindus and Christians is suggestive of a greater likelihood of these two groups modifying the attributability ratings towards each other in the direction of producing compatibility.

Another factor which is likely to have influenced the ratings of Muslims and Christians in the direction of producing greater compatibility towards Hindus is that both these are minority groups in the Indian
context. Being in the minority, both these groups may want to place themselves nearer the majority—i.e., Hindus—rather than another minority group.

It was stated earlier that among the three religio-cultural groups Hindu students alone find their ingroup significantly more acceptable than the outgroups in most of the social interactional contexts studied here. It may be suggested that Hindus constitute the majority cultural group in the Indian context and, therefore, there may be no tendency operating on their part to place themselves nearer to any of the minority groups. Alternatively, it may be a tendency on the part of the majority group (i.e., Hindus here) to keep the minority groups at a distance.

It may be recalled that intergroup dynamics is cited here as a likely source indicating the major directions along which the modification of the attributability ratings is likely to have taken place. What is suggested in the above discussion is that the intergroup dynamics is at least partially determinative of intercultural value Compatibility.
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(ii) Intracultural Variables in Relation to Value Compatibility
Chapter XI

INTRACULTURAL VARIABLES

In this chapter is examined the relation of intracultural variations in environment to (i) the ratings on "Ways to Live" and to (ii) the in-group and out-group value compatibility.

Samples

The subjects included in different groupings here were all drawn from the sample of Hindu students (N=831) by using the information provided on the personal data sheet (page 10) of the Questionnaire. Subjects from other religious-cultural groups could not be grouped and studied in view of their small number.
Variables

Groups with the following environmental variations were identified and studied:

1. Educational Level of Parents
   (see item 7 of page 10 in the Questionnaire):
   (a) Subjects with both their parents illiterate (Ss of non-educated family, n=41) and
   (b) subjects with both the parents having college education (Ss of college-educated family, n=45);

2. Early Religious Environment
   (see item 9):
   (a) Subjects who had in childhood predominantly Hindus as their neighbours (Ss of own-religious environment, n=174) and
   (b) subjects who had in childhood predominantly non-Hindus as their neighbours (Ss of mixed-religious environment, n=183);

3. Early Social Environment
   (see item 8):
   (a) Subjects who had their primary and secondary education in villages (rural-educated group, n=36) and
(b) subjects who had their primary and secondary education in towns and cities (urban-educated group, n=54); and

4. Income Status of Parents

(see item 6):

(a) Subjects whose parents' annual income is reported to be $1,000 and below (Ss of low income group, n=74) and

(b) subjects whose parents' annual income is reported to be $5,000 and above (Ss of high income group, n=62).

The tables pertaining to this discussion are given in Appendix D.

(i) Intracultural Variables in Relation to Cultural Ideologies

Ss of Non-educated and College-educated Families

Significant differences between the Ss of college-educated and the Ss of non-educated families are observed on Waves 7, 8, and 10 (Table 1, Appendix D).
Both the groups highly like 'stoic control of the self' (Way 10), but the Ss of college-educated family significantly more ($Z_d=2.66^{**}$). The Ss of college-educated family have an active liking towards the flexibility depicted in Way 7, while the Ss of non-educated family have a small degree of dislike, the difference being significant ($Z_d=2.13^*$). Way 3, 'enjoy the simple easily obtainable pleasures', is somewhat liked by Ss of non-educated family and disliked by Ss of college-educated family, the difference being significant ($Z_d=2.26^{**}$).

It appears that the college-educated parents provide an environment to their children which fosters flexibility. Perhaps, educated parents would not insist on their children adopting any particular line of orientation and thus avoid developing rigidity. It also appears that the college-educated parents emphasize more the control of the self and commitment to more long-range goals. This, perhaps, explains the dislike of Ss of college-educated family towards the enjoyment of simple pleasures.
Ss of Own-religious and Mixed-religious Environments

The only significant difference between those groups is with respect to Way 2 (Table 2, Appendix 3). 'Cultivate Independence and Self-knowledge' (a positive of withdrawn individualism) is liked to a considerable degree by the Ss of own-religious environment and disliked to a small degree by the Ss of mixed-religious environment, the difference being significant ($Z = 5.22^{**}$).

Another notable difference between those groups, although statistically not significant, is in respect of 'admission of diversity' (Way 7) which is shown indifference by the Ss of own-religious environment and some degree of liking by the Ss of mixed-religious environment.

Rural-educated and Urban-educated Groups

Significant differences between these groups are noticed on Ways 7, 3, and 10 (Table 3, Appendix 3). Both the groups highly favour the 'stole control of the self' (Way 10), but the urban-educated significantly more ($Z = 2.60^*$). The rural-educated dislikes to a
considerable degree the 'admiration of diversity' (Way 7) while the urban-educated likes it to a considerable degree, the difference being significant ($Z_d = 2.61^{**}$). 'Enjoyment of the simple easily obtainable pleasures' (Way 8) is liked to a considerable degree by the rural-educated and disliked to a considerable degree by the urban-educated, the difference being significant ($Z_d = 3.54^{**}$).

It may be observed that the pattern of differential rating on the "Ways to Live" by the urban- and rural-educated groups is the same as the pattern of differential rating by the Ss of college- and non-educated families.

Ss of Low Income and High Income Groups

Significant difference between these groups is noticed with respect to Ways 3, 7, and 10 (Table 3, Appendix D). 'Sympathetic concern for others' (Way 3) and 'stoic control of the self' (Way 10) are highly liked by both the groups, but the Ss of high income group like them significantly more ($Z_d = 2.31^{*}$ for Way 3 and $Z_d = 2.23^{*}$ for Way 10). On the other hand, 'admiration of diversity' (Way 7) is disliked to a small degree by
the Ss of low income group and liked to a considerable
degree by the Ss of high income group, the difference
being significant ($Z_a=3.61^{**}$).

Summary and Discussion

It is observed from the results on the ratings
to "Ways to Live" by different sub-groups that Ways 7
and 10 are the two Ways on which there is significant
difference in three out of four groupings. The Ss
of the educated-family, the urban-educated group, and
the Ss of high income group have liked more than their
respective contrasting sub-groups, the 'stoic control
of the self' (Way 10). Again, those groups have shown
a considerable degree of liking to the 'admission of
diversity' (Way 7) as compared to their respective
contrasting groups showing indifference or some degree
of dislike to it. Way 7 also figures as the one to
differentiate, although not significantly, between the
sub-groups on the early religious environment: the Ss
of own-religious environment show indifference, while
the Ss of mixed-religious environment show a considerable
degree of liking.

Further, the 'enjoyment of the simple easily
obtainable pleasures' is liked by the Ss of the
non-educated family and the rural-educated group are disliked by the members of the college-educated family and the urban-educated group. 'Withdrawn individualism' is liked by the Ss of the own-religious environment and disliked by the Ss of the mixed-religious environment. 'Sympathetic concern for others' seems to carry a stronger appeal for the Ss of high income group than for the low income group.

However, as is evident, the ways sensitive to most of the intracultural variables appear to be the Ways 7 and 10. It may be pertinent to note that Way 7 which does not depict a 'way of life' in the strict sense of the term but only emphasizes the 'admission of diversity' is sensitive to intracultural variables. Perhaps, a wider exposure to the complexity of the social and ideological environments open to some may be responsible for developing the appreciation of flexibility implied in Way 7. Also, the appreciation of the 'stoic control of the self' (Way 10) seems to be influenced by the subjects' exposure to wider, complex environments.

To conclude, the appreciation of 'admission of diversity' and 'stoic control of the self' seems to be
influenced by the early religious and social environment, by the educational level of the parents as well as by the income level of the parents.
(ii) Intracultural Variables in Relation to Value Compatibility

As the major concern here is to bring out the differences between the sub-groups in their ingroup and out-group Compatibility, the ingroup and outgroup Compatibility data of each sub-group are referred to here in a general way (without going into their statistical significance), only to serve as a background to understand the differences. Only the combined Compatibility scores are considered.

Ss of Non-educated and College-educated Families

Comparison of Ingroup Compatibility

Columns 1 and 2 of Table 5 (Appendix D) indicate that both the groups are generally highly compatible with the ingroup except that the Ss of non-educated family are to some extent incompatible with the ingroup in 'Neighbour'.

As to the relative acceptability of the ingroup to the two sub-groups, it may be observed (from column 3 of Table 5) that the ingroup is a little more
acceptable to the Ss of non-educated family than to the Ss of College-educated family in all the relationships except in "Neighbour". In "Neighbour", the ingroup appears to be significantly more acceptable to the Ss of college-educated family than to the Ss of non-educated family ($Z_{q}=2.53$).

Comparison of Outgroup Compatibility: Towards Muslims

Both the sub-groups are generally incompatible with Muslims with a few exceptions (columns 4 and 5 of Table 3).

Suggestive of only the trends statistically not significant, the difference scores (column 6 of Table 3) indicate that Muslims are considerably more acceptable in "Close kin" and a little more acceptable in "Intimate friend" to the Ss of College-educated family than to the Ss of non-educated family, while in other relationships Muslims appear to be a little more acceptable to the Ss of non-educated family.

Comparison of Outgroup Compatibility: Towards Christians

Both the subgroups exhibit some measure of both compatibility and incompatibility towards Christians.
(columns 7 and 8 of Table 5).

Christians appear to be more acceptable to the Ss of college-educated family than to the Ss of non-educated family in all the relationships except in 'Co-employee' (column 9 of Table 5). In 'Co-employee', Christians appear to be significantly more acceptable to the Ss of non-educated family ($Z_{a}=2.06^*$.)

Ss of Own-religious and Mixed-religious Environment

Comparison of Ingroup Compatibility

Both the sub-groups are generally highly compatible with the ingroup except in 'Neighbour' in which they have a lower degree of compatibility (columns 1 and 2 of Table 6).

The difference scores (column 3 of Table 6) indicate that the Ss of own-religious environment are more compatible with the ingroup than the Ss of mixed-religious environment do. However, this trend is noticeable somewhat clearly in 'Close kin' and 'Intimate friend'. None of the scores is statistically significant.
Comparison of Outgroup Compatibility Towards Muslims

Except for a small degree of compatibility in 'Neighbour' by the Ss of own-religious environment, both the groups find themselves incompatible with Muslims (columns 4 and 5 of Table 6).

Column 6 of Table 6 indicates that, while the Ss of own-religious group find Muslims a little more acceptable in 'Room-mate' and 'Neighbour' than the Ss of mixed-religious environment do, they find themselves significantly more incompatible with Muslims in 'Close kin' ($Z_d=2.38^*$).

Comparison of Outgroup Compatibility Towards Christians

The trend suggested by columns 7 and 3 of Table 6 is that the Ss of own-religious environment find themselves generally incompatible with Christians to a small degree, while the Ss of mixed-religious environment exhibit both compatibility and incompatibility in some measure towards Christians.

The difference scores (column 9 of Table C) indicate that, except in 'Intimate friend', Christians are more acceptable to the Ss of mixed-religious environment.
which is, however, clearly noticeable in 'Close kin' and 'Co-employee'.

Rural-educated and Urban-educated Groups

Comparison of Ingroup Compatibility

It may be observed from columns 1 and 2 of Table 7 that both the sub-groups find themselves generally compatible with the ingroup. And, except in 'Co-employee' and 'Neighbour' the ingroup compatibility is also generally high.

Column 3 of Table 7 suggests that the rural-educated group finds itself more compatible with the ingroup than the urban-educated group does in all the relationships. This is particularly clear in 'Intimate friend', 'Close kin' and 'Room-mate'.

Comparison of Outgroup Compatibility: Towards Muslims

From columns 4 and 5 of Table 7, it may be observed that while the urban-educated group is generally incompatible with Muslim, the rural-educated group has exhibited both compatibility and incompatibility
towards Muslims. There is a considerable degree of compatibility expressed towards Muslims in 'Neighbour'.

What may be noted from the difference scores (column 6 of Table 7) is that Muslims are a little more acceptable in 'Close kin' and to a considerable degree more acceptable in 'Room-mate' and 'Neighbour' to the rural-educated group than they are to the urban-educated group.

Comparison of Outgroup Compatibility: Towards Christians

Both the groups are generally incompatible with Christians, as is evident from columns 7 and 8 of Table 7.

The difference scores (column 9 of Table 7) indicate that Christians are considerably more acceptable in 'Close kin', 'Room-mate', and 'Neighbour' to the urban-educated group than they are to the rural-educated group.
Ss of High Income and Low Income Groups

Comparison of Ingroup Compatibility

Both the groups are, by and large, highly compatible with the ingroup except in 'Neighbour' in which the Ss of low income group find themselves incompatible with the ingroup to a small degree (columns 1 and 2 of Table 8).

The difference scores (column 3 of Table 8) indicate that, except in 'Neighbour', the Ss of low income group find themselves more compatible with the ingroup, though it is somewhat clear only in 'Intimate friend' and 'Co-employee'. In 'Neighbour', the Ss of high income group find the ingroup considerably more acceptable.

Comparison of Outgroup Compatibility: Towards Muslims

Columns 3 and 4 of Table 8 show that the Ss of high income group are incompatible with Muslims in all the relationships, whereas the Ss of low income group are incompatible with them except in 'Neighbour' and 'Co-employee' in which they have a small degree of compatibility.
The difference scores (column 6 of Table 3) suggest that the Ss of low income group find Muslims more acceptable than the Ss of high income group do—a trend statistically not significant.

Comparison of Outgroup Compatibility Towards Christians

As is evident from columns 7 and 3 of Table 2, each of the two sub-groups exhibits both some degree of compatibility and incompatibility towards Christians.

It may be observed from the differences (column 9 of Table 4) that, as compared with the Ss of high income group, the Ss of low income group find Christians considerably more acceptable in 'Intimate friend' and 'Co-employee' and significantly more acceptable in 'Neighbour' ($Z_d=2.40^+$). In 'Close kin', Christians appear to be a little more acceptable to the Ss of high income group than to the Ss of low income group.

Summary and Discussion

The differences between the sub-groups in their ingroup and outgroup compatibility are not, by and large, statistically significant. Nonetheless, some general trends may be noted: The Ss of the non-educated
family, the Ss of the own-religious environment, the rural-educated group, and the Ss of low income. They find themselves, by and large, more compatible with the ingroup than the members of their respective contrasting sub-groups do. There is a trend to find the outgroups less acceptable by the Ss of own-religious environment than by the Ss of mixed-religious environment. The Christians are likely to be found, by and large, more acceptable by the Ss of college-educated family and the Ss of urban-educated group than by the Ss of non-educated family and the rural-educated group.

However, a general comparison of the ingroup and outgroup Compatibility of the sub-groups studied here with the ingroup and outgroup Compatibility of the parent population (i.e., Hindus, N=311) would reveal a similarity in pattern—the pattern is to have generally high degrees of compatibility towards the ingroup, and to exhibit, by and large, considerable degrees of incompatibility and small degrees of compatibility towards the outgroups (depending on the outgroup and the social relationships under consideration).

The absence of statistically significant differences, by and large, between the sub-groups in their ingroup and
outgroup Compatibility, taken together with the basic similarity in the pattern of ingroup and outgroup Compatibility between the parent population and the sub-groups, suggests that the ingroup and outgroup value Compatibility is primarily determined by the cultural membership of the respondents. Within the framework of the broader Compatibility pattern of the cultural group as a whole, environmental variations cause such minor changes as are listed above. Moreover, the observations regarding the trends of change caused by intracultural variables should remain tentative as they have, by and large, not reached the level of statistical significance in this study.
Chapter XII

GENERAL DISCUSSION
In both the conceived values to cultural ideologies and the conceived values in interactional contexts, Hindu and Muslim students appear to be nearer to each other than either of them to Christian students. Viewed from the standpoint of history, the greater degree of similarity between Hindus and Muslims is perhaps partly due to the cultures of both these groups being eastern and also because these groups have co-existed in India for several centuries. However, the results are suggestive of a possible cultural synthesis between these groups at the level of conceived values.

Christianity, on the other hand, is associated predominantly with the western culture.
indicative of the western influence operating in the ratings of Christian students is their relatively greater emphasis on ways expressing 'master the threatening forces by constant practical work' (item 3), 'admission of diversity' (item 7), and, in general, on 'enjoyment and progress in action'. Further, with respect to conceived values in interactional contexts, while Hindu and Muslim students have expressed generally a positive appraisal towards Detachment value orientation, Christian students show a strong negative appraisal in 'Close kin' and do not exhibit any positive appraisal towards it except in 'Neighbour'. The negative appraisal as well as the absence of positive appraisal of Detachment observed in the Christian students' ratings in the context of some social relationships is perhaps suggestive of western influence.

The intergroup acceptability pattern that has emerged in the present study, however, reveals that Hindus and Christians are, by and large, closer to each other than either of them to Muslims. From the standpoint of Hindu students, a large degree of potential value-conflict exists in the context of their social interaction with Muslims; whereas from the standpoint of Muslim students, there exists almost as much
value-harmony in their social interaction with Hindus as in their interaction with the ingroup. To Christian students, Hindus are even a little more acceptable than their ingroup. These findings of intergroup acceptability, viewed in the context of cultural similarities and differences of conceived values discussed above, point out the non-relevance of cultural similarities and differences of conceived values in determining the value-harmony or value-conflict between groups. As there is a general correspondence between the intergroup acceptability pattern within the framework of value orientations and that obtained through social distance study, one is tempted to hypothesise some association, as was shown earlier, between the history of intergroup relations and the attribution of value orientations to groups.

The results of the study of value Compatibility as related to intracultural variables have brought to focus the role of cultural membership of the respondents in determining the pattern of ingroup and outgroup Compatibility. Perhaps, in perceiving the ingroup and outgroup qualities differentially, the cultural membership of the respondents is a basic consideration operating over and above the intracultural variations in the environment.