CHAPTER IV
There is no unanimity of opinion about the definition of religion. If an attempt is made to list out the definitions of religion given by various scholars, it would take a paper in itself. Hence, with no pretensions to exhaustiveness, some of the more popular definitions are given below. This is essential if the dimensions of religiosity are to be delineated.

Tylor (1913) offered the simplest definition of religion as "the belief in spiritual beings". Bellah (1965) defined religion as a set of symbolic forms and acts which relate men to the ultimate conditions of his existence. Religion according to Durkheim (1947) is "a system of beliefs and practices pertaining to the sacred". According to Clark (1969) religion is the inner experience of the individual when he senses a Beyond. For Sabatier (1957) "religion is a commerce, a conscious and built relation into
which the soul in distress enters with the mysterious power on which it feels it and its destiny depend”. Thouless (1956) says that religion is a felt practical relationship with what is believed to be a Super-human Being or Beings. Leuba (1912) feels that "religion should be looked upon as a functional part of life, as that mode of behaviour in the struggle for life in which use is made of powers characterised as psychic, super-human and usually personal”. Coaklin (1929) emphasises the God concept when he says that religion is the behaviour which is associated with a belief attitude towards some concept of a God or Gods.

King (1916) stresses the value dimension of religion. The religious consciousness according to him may be called, "a valuating attitude towards some thing real or imagined". For Cuber (1935) religion is a "culturally entrenched pattern of behaviour made up of (1) sacred beliefs; (2) emotional feelings accompanying these feelings; and
(3) overt conduct presumably implementing the beliefs and feelings. Arnold (1873) conceives of religion as morality touched with emotion.

The above definitions would lead us to regard religiosity as consisting of the following dimensions:

1. Religious beliefs
2. Religious behaviour, practices and rituals
3. Concept of God
4. Religious values and
5. Prayer

1. Religious Beliefs

All religious systems have in common the embodiment of sacred beliefs. In every society, however simple its technology, investigators have encountered individuals who are able and willing to discuss the contents and meaning of their religious principles. Religious beliefs not only constitute the cognitive aspect of religion but are an expression of social values as well. Statements
of belief express and sustain a people's world view, their style of life and their order of existence. Religion provides explanations and assigns values to otherwise inexplicable phenomena. Without an ordered system of beliefs, religious behaviour would be irrational and unmotivated. Hence religious beliefs are taken to constitute an essential dimension of religiosity.

2. Religious Behaviour, Practices and Rituals

The early scholars like Tylor, Max Muller, Frazer have acknowledged the centrality of religious beliefs or ideology. It is only recently that the importance of religious behaviour, practices and ritual is recognised. Marett's (1909) famous aphorism, "primitive religion is danced out not thought out" though exaggerating the role of religious practices, emphasises their importance as an integral part of any religion. Some scholars like Robertson Smith (1956), Harrison (1912) regard ritual as the core of religion. Even early psychologists including Freud and Neik agreed that
myth is a description of ritual. Boas gave priority to ritual when he noted that it is often accompanied by a variety of explanatory myths and concluded that the different versions must have arisen from the desire to account for ritual acts.

Rituals are instrumental in nature and the performance of rituals is predicated on the belief that it is efficacious in achieving a certain end. They are also designed to express belief. As more elaborated and complicated system of cultic practices develops the expanding need for experts leads to the formation of a body of functionaries who take over and monopolise certain activities in the cult.

3. Prayer

Prayer appears to be a nearly universal feature of religion. It is true that Confucius discouraged prayer, and that Buddha and his early disciples repudiated the notion of seeking guidance through verbal communication with the supernatural,
but as Buddhism developed, prayer became again quite important. Some forms of prayer are highly formalized and some are accompanied by the belief that they must be letter-perfect in order to be acceptable to gods. In prayer men reveal their attitudes to the supernatural and thus also the culturally learned ways of dealing with higher powers. Petition, adoration, atonement and gratitude are the major categories into which prayer can be divided. Prayers also reflect the culturally conceived nature of the supernatural. Prayers can also be individual and communal. Individual prayers are however less accessible to observation. In a number of cultures, frequency of prayer is deemed important. Worship is believed to check religious egoism, asserts Underhill (1937). Highly individual acts of worship do not play a part until a later stage in the development of religions (Wach, 1944).
4. Concept of God

Most of the religions of the world believe in one supreme, all-powerful, all-knowing creator God, although this God may have his various manifestations or aspects. There are, however, religions in the world which either do not believe in God at all (Early Buddhism and Jainism) or do not believe in a personal God, that is, God having a personality (as in the advaitic or absolutistic aspect of Hinduism). Latterday Buddhists have tended to deify Buddha.

Besides this general point of unity, religions of the world attribute to God some of the metaphysical qualities like infinity, omnipotency, all-knowingness and all-pervasiveness as well as some of the ethical qualities like mercy, benevolence, justice, etc. Furthermore, God is usually regarded as the creator, sustainer and destroyer of the world.

The presocratic philosopher Xenophanes (c.570 BC - c.470 BC) wrote that everywhere man has created
Gods in his own image. "Yea, and if oxen and horses and lions had hands, and could paint with their hands and provide works of art as men do, horses would paint the forms of God like horses, and oxen like oxen and make their bodies in the image of their several kinds". Personification of supernatural beings means that man conceptualizes them in his own physical, social and psychological image. Given the existing varieties of human personality and appearance, it is not surprising that the concepts of the supernatural show a great deal of cultural variation. Hence, it is very difficult to image the religiosity of a person without taking into consideration his attitude towards God.

5. Religious Values

Every religion provides general guidelines for action in the form of values. Man's conduct is evaluated in terms of these values and standards. By establishing general principles and moral beliefs, religion is believed to help in providing the
consensus which is necessary for the order and stability in the society.

All religions in one sense can be regarded as ethical systems. At the same time, all religions specify certain sanctions for the enforcement of the values they approve. Certain approved behaviour patterns are believed to be supernaturally rewarded, and serious deviancy is supernaturally punished. However, the degree to which religion functions to uphold social norms and ethical values is markedly different in different cultures. Some religious systems impinge on nearly every important form of social interaction and behaviour, others leave punishment of deviant behaviour largely to secular institutions.

Religiosity thus encompasses the dimensions mentioned above viz., religious beliefs, religious behaviour, practices and rituals, concept of god, prayer and religious values.
II. The 16 PF Questionnaire

The 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire Form C was adopted for the purpose of the present study. According to Cattell (1950), "Personality is that which permits a prediction of what a person will do in a given situation. His theory is based on the principle of the totality of behaviour of the individual. He utilises the personality sphere concept (Cattell, 1946, 1957, 1964) - a design to ensure initial item coverage for all the behaviour that commonly enters rating. His theory focuses on "source traits". Cattell defines a source trait as a spring of human behaviour. According to him, a trait is a mental structure which is a relatively fixed characteristic of the individual, expressing itself from time to time in behaviour.

The 16 PF Questionnaire is an objectively acceptable test devised by basic research in psychology to give the most complete coverage of personality possible in a short time. The coverage of personality is insured by the 16 functionally
independent and psychologically meaningful dimensions isolated by over 20 years of factor analytical research on normal and clinical groups. Having a certain position on one scale does not prevent a person from having any position whatsoever on any of the other scales. Thus, each of the sixteen scales brings an entirely new piece of information about the person—a condition not found in many multi-dimensional scales.

The 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire is a very comprehensive measure of the personality dimensions. The scales yield an organized and integrated body of practical and theoretical knowledge. The 16 Factors in this test cover what are commonly needed dimensions in psychological research. The test also measures about six second-stratum traits, thus giving the broadest necessary insight into individual personality. The test also possesses a good predictive capacity in relation to everyday life criteria in applied psychology.

The test is particularly valuable because there
has been evidence of basically similar personality source trait structure across cultures. In the words of Cattell (1970), "the 16 PF is designed as an all purpose instrument bringing to applied psychology the concepts central to general personality theory".

The scales describe the personality dimensions in bipolar form with the high scores corresponding to the description at the right and the low scores to that at the left. The following is the description of the 16 Personality Factors.

1. *Sincere - Affective (Factor A)*:

Cattell earlier used the terms Schizothymia and Cyclothymia for this trait. But he later abandoned the use of these classical terms, because its constant discussion in connection with the pathology of psychoses and schizophrenia had distorted its use as a normal psychological dimension. The Sincere individual tends to be cautious in emotional expression, uncompromising
and critical in outlook and awkwardly aloof in manner.

The opposite pole affectothymia refers to the tendency to fullsome expression in affect. The affectothymic individuals are easy-going, show interest in people and exhibit a predominance of affect. Cattell found an appreciable hereditary influence in determining a person's level on sizo-thymia-affectothymia. The affectothymic individual shows a marked preference for occupations dealing with people, enjoys social recognition and usually goes along with expediency. The sizo-thymic person likes things or words, working alone and rejection of compromise.

2. 

As the scale is unspeeded it is necessarily a "power" measure. It indicates a moderate tendency for the more intelligent person to have somewhat more morale, persistency and strength of interest. However, as Cattell (1970) himself points out "The principal
object in measuring it in the 16 PF is not to add personality information as such but to complete the supply of data on the range of source traits important in most predictions for general ability is obviously an important dimension in individual differences."

3. **Emotional - Mature (Factor C)**

This factor is one of dynamic integration and maturity as opposed to uncontrolled, disorganised general emotionality. The emotionally unstable person is easily annoyed by things and people, is dissatisfied with world situation, his family, the restrictions of life and his own health and he feels unable to cope with life. He shows generalised neurotic responses in the form of phobias, psychosomatic disturbance, sleep disturbances and hysterical and obsesssional behaviour.

The emotionally mature individuals on the other hand, are far more frequently leaders. They are calm and unruffled and remain stable and constant in interest.
4. **Submissive - Dominant (Factor E)**:

Persons scoring low on this scale tend to be submissive, mild, obedient, easily led, docile and accommodating. They are easily upset by authority.

Dominant individuals, on the other hand, are assertive, independent-minded, stern and solemn. They tend to demand admiration. Allport reports that dominance tends to be positively correlated to some extent with social status and is somewhat higher in established leaders than followers. It is appreciably influenced by heredity and is one of the personality factors distinguishing the sexes.

5. **Desurgency - Surgency (Factor F)**:

Cattell reports that this is one of the most important components of extraversion. Desurgency, he warns should not be confused with depression. Desurgency is 'soberness' and caution rather than depression. The desurgent individual tends to be sober, taciturn, serious, silent, introspective,
reflective, incommunicative, slow and cautious.

On the other hand, surgency is characterized by talkativeness, cheerfulness, frankness, expressiveness, quickness and alertness.

However, Cattell found that desurgency is associated in mild degree with practically all mental (and probably most physical) illness, e.g., neurosis, schizophrenia, and alcoholism, though possibly as a secondary effect of the illness situation.

6. Casual – Conscientious (Factor G):

This factor brings a strong involvement in moral concerns of right and wrong. Whatever coheres in the psychoanalytic concept of superego strength seems to be embodied in this demonstrated source trait. It certainly seems to best depict the deeply rooted concern for moral standards, for persistence of effort and, in general, that tendency to drive the Ego and to restrain the id.

Persons scoring low on this scale tend to be fickle, frivolous, self-indulgent, slack, indolent,
undependable and generally disregard rules.

Persons scoring high tend to be conscientious, persistent, moralistic, staid, persevering, determined, responsible, emotionally disciplined, consistently ordered, dominated by a sense of duty, and are concerned about moral standards and rules.

In questionnaire responses, the person having high superego strength views himself as correct in, and a guardian of, manner and morals, persevering, plodding, able to concentrate, interested in animating people, cautious in statements, and preferring efficient people to other companions.

This factor seems to be particularly susceptible for faking. Further, expression of moral values takes fairly different forms with different religions, societies and ages.

7. Timid - Adventurous (Factor II):

The person who scores low on this trait tends to be intensely shy, tormented by unreasonable sense of inferiority, slow and impeded in expressing himself,
disliking occupations with personal contacts, preferring one or two close friends to large groups, and not able to keep in contact with all that is going on around him.

The person who scores high on this trait tends to be adventurous, socially bold, responsive, likes meeting people, active, takes overt interest in opposite sex, genial, friendly, impulsive, care-free, spontaneous, and abundant in emotional response. He is able to face wear and tear in dealing with people and gruelling emotional situations without fatigue. However, he can be careless in detail, ignore danger signals, and consume much time talking.

This trait seems to be one of the most highly inherited personality traits. The high scorers are more frequently involved in organising clubs or teams. In group situations, they feel free to participate, and make more socio-emotional (friendly) than task oriented remarks (Cattell and Gline, 1953).
3. Tough - Sensitive (Factor I)

This pattern was first popularized by William James as part of his "Tender-vs-Tough" continuum of temperament.

The low scorers on this scale tend to be tough-minded, realistic, self-reliant, independent, responsible, unaffected by fancies, act on practical, logical evidence, keeps to the point, and not to dwell on physical disabilities.

The high scorers, on the other hand, tend to be tender-minded, imaginative, introspective, artistic, fastidious and excitable. They are sometimes demanding, impatient, dependent, impractical, and indulgent. They seek help and sympathy and attention. They show a fastidious dislike of "crude" people and rough occupations; a romantic liking for travel and new experiences, a love of dramatics; and a certain impracticality in general affairs.

This factor is largely environmental and cultural
in origin (Cattell, Elywett, and Baloff, 1955).

9. Trustful - Suspecting (Factor I):

The person who scores low on this factor tends to be free of jealous tendencies, adaptable, cheerful, composed, concerned about other people, conciliatory, lax over connecting people, tolerant, understanding, permissive, ready to forget difficulties and unsuspecting of hostility.

The person who scores high on this factor tends to be suspecting, jealous, mistrusting and doubtful. He is usually dogmatic, suspicious of interference and dwells upon frustrations. He is often irritable and involved in his own ego. He is unconcerned about other people and a poor team member.

Much of the behaviour in this factor may be identified with the persistent adoption of a particular defence mechanism - projection.

In questionnaire responses they report that they come from a parental home which they admired
and which had lively intellectual interests. They are contemptuous of the average, are scrupulously correct in behaviour, are annoyed by people putting on superior airs. They usually test a high number of annoyances and are uninfluenced by the views of prominent people.

10. Conventional - Eccentric (Factor M):

The low scorers on this scale tend to be anxious to do the right thing, practical and conformist. They have 'down to earth' concerns and are alert to practical needs. They are earnest, worried but steady. They keep their head in emergencies. They are usually unimaginative.

The persons who score high on this scale tend to be unconventional, unconcerned bohemian, ego-centric, sensitive and imaginative. They are usually absent-minded, fanciful, do not have dependable practical judgement and are imaginatively enthralled by inner creations. They have an intense subjectivity and inner mental life.
11. Simple - Sophisticated (Factor N):

The person, who scores low on this factor tends to be forthright, unpretentious, genuine but socially clumsy, gets emotionally involved, gregarious, spontaneous, natural, has simple tastes, lacks self insight and is usually unskilled in analysing motives, is content with what comes and has blind trust in human nature.

The person who scores high on this factor tends to be polished, shrewd and worldly. He is hard headed and analytical. He has intellectual and unsentimental approach to situations. He is smart and "cuts corners". He is insightful regarding self and others. He is emotionally detached and disciplined. He is socially aware and has exact calculating mind. This factor certainly represents the "diplomat" of Machiavelli as opposed to natural man of Rousseau.

The low scorers on the positive side have naive emotional genuineness, complete directness and spontaneous outspokenness. Several common types
of delinquents have been reported to have shown quite high scores on this factor.

12. **Confident - Insecure (Factor G)**:

The person who scores low on this factor tends to be calm, placid with unshakable nerve. He has a mature unanxious confidence in himself and his capacity to deal with things. He is resilient and secure.

The persons who score high on this factor tend to be apprehensive, self-reproaching, insecure, worrying, anxious and suspicious. They have a child like tendency to anxiety in difficulties. He exhibits phobic symptoms and is very sensitive to people's approval and disapproval and feels inadequate. As the questionnaire items show, the high scorer feels that he is unstable, reports over fatigue from exciting situations, is unable to sleep through worrying, is easily downhearted and remorseful, and is inclined to pitty. He shows symptoms of phobias and anxieties. This factor is thus broader than guilt.
in its most specific sense. This factor is one of the largest components in anxiety.

13. **Conservative - Experimenting (Factor O₁)**:

The person who scores low on this factor tends to be conservative, respectful of established ideas, tolerant of traditional difficulties. He is overly cautious and moderate. He is opposed to any change, inclined to go along with tradition.

The high scorers on this factor tend to be experimenting, liberal, analytical, free thinking, interested in fundamental issues are less inclined to moralize and more inclined to experiment in life generally.

Examination of the actual content of the questionnaire items of this factor shows that they express more interest in science than religion, more interest in analytical thought, in breaking the crust of custom and tradition and in leading and persuading people.
14. Dependency - Self-Sufficiency (Factor $C_2$):

The person who scores low on this factor is dependent and a sound follower. He goes with the group, depends on social approval more and is conventional and fashionable.

The high scorer tends to be self-sufficient, resourceful, prefer his own decisions. He is resolute and accustomed to making his own decisions. In group dynamics, the high scorer is significantly more dissatisfied with group integration, makes remarks which are more frequently independent solutions than questions and tends to be rejected. This is one of the major factors in introversion.

15. Uncontrolled - Self-controlled (Factor $C_3$):

The person who scores low on this factor tends to be uncontrolled, lax, follows his own urges, careless of social rules. The high scorer tends to be controlled, socially precise, exhibits socially approved character responses, conscientious. He has exacting will power, self-control, persistence.
foresight and has regard for etiquette and social reputation.

16. Stable - Tense (Factor Q<sub>4</sub>):

Low scores on this factor indicate that the person tends to be relaxed, tranquil, torpid, un-
frustrated and composed.

High scorers tend to be tense, frustrated, driven, overwrought and fretful. They rarely
achieve leadership.

Cattell interprets a high score on this factor
as an indication of 'id' energy cited in excess of
the ego strength capacity to discharge it and which
is therefore misdirected, converted into psychoso-
matic disturbances, anxiety etc., and is generally
disruptive of steady application and emotional
balance.

III. Locus of Control

The concept of personal control occupies a
central place in the theories of many personality
psychologists. The critical element, of course, is one's perceptions of personal control rather than the reality of the control situation.

Internal-External Control (I-E) has been a widely investigated personality dimension. The first outlines of the I-E construct were developed out of clinical work with a patient. The theoretical context of I-E is Rotter's social learning theory in which it is construed as a problem solving generalised expectancy.

Rotter's I-E scale is a 22 item, forced-choice device. The score of an individual on this scale is the total number of external choices. The items deal with the subjects' belief about the nature of the world. That is, they are concerned with the subjects' expectations about how reinforcement is controlled. Thus, the test is a measure of a generalised expectancy.

Internal-external control is an important individual differences variable which has developed from social learning theory (Rotter, Chance and
Phares, 1972). This scale seems to distinguish between people who seem to march through life reacting to nearly every situation as if they were handicapped by fate and those who strive to grab those same situations by the tail and twist them to their own purposes.

The low scorers on this scale are the internals, those who feel that the outcomes of their efforts are related to their own efforts or attributes; and the high scorers are the externals, those who feel that the outcomes of their efforts are controlled by forces and events, external to themselves.

Rotter (1966) outlined the concept systematically as follows:

"When a reinforcement is perceived by the subject as following some action of his own but not being entirely contingent upon his action, then, in our culture, it is typically perceived as a result of luck, chance, fate, or under the control of
powerful others, or as unpredictable because of the great complexity of the forces surrounding him. When the event is interpreted in this way by an individual, we have labelled this a belief in "external control". If the person perceives that the event is contingent upon his own behaviour or his own relatively permanent characteristics, we have termed this a belief in "internal control".

IV. Personal Data Sheet

The information with regard to certain socio-economic, family and demographic variables was obtained from a carefully worded personal data sheet. Father's income, father's education, father's occupation, mother's income, mother's education and mother's occupation were the socio-economic variables studied. The family variables included size of the family and order of birth. The demographic variables taken into consideration were sex and locality.