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Abstract

Religiosity can be defined as ‘the quality or extent of one’s religious experience.’ Or ‘the exaggerated or affected religious zeal’ according to the (APA 2022) dictionary.

Aggression can be defined as the ‘behavior aimed at harming others physically or psychologically. It can be distinguished from anger in that anger is oriented overcoming the target but not necessarily through harm or destruction.’ according to (APA 2022) dictionary.

The aim of the present study is to investigate whether there is any relationship between Religiosity and Aggression among young adults and find out whether there is any difference between male and female young adults of India (aged 18-25)
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**Methodology:** A sample of 126 young adults (53 males and 53 Females aged 18-25 years) was drawn by random sampling. Statistical Analysis of mean, standard deviation along with Pearson’s Correlation was conducted between the variables, and a t-test was done to find out the difference.

**Results:** Negative and Positive correlations were found between Religiosity and Aggression

1. *Religious Conflict and Verbal Aggression (rs=.181;p>0.05)*
2. *Religious Conflict and Anger (rs=.210;p>0.05)*
3. *Religious Tranquillity and Physical Aggression (rs=-.271; p>0.01)*
4. *Religious Tranquillity and Verbal Aggression (rs=-.232; p>0.01)*
5. *Religious Tranquillity and Anger (rs=-.243; p>0.01)*
6. *Religious Tranquillity and Hostility (rs=-.232; p>0.01)*
7. *Religious Solace and Physical Aggression (rs=-.283; p>0.01)*
8. *Religious Solace and Verbal Aggression (rs=-.273; p>0.01)*
9. *Religious Solace and Hostility (rs=-.286; p>0.01)*
10. *Religious Solace and Anger (rs=-.207;p>0.05)*
11. *Change of Religious Attitude and Hostility (rs=.181;p>0.05)*

**Conclusion:** There is a relationship between Religiosity and Aggression but not much difference among male and female participants has been found might be due to the homogeneity of the sample.

Introduction

It is quite evident that religious teachings state about peaceful coexistence. Yet there have been various incidents which can be seen recently, in India, which raised the question of whether there is any relationship between religiosity and aggression. Interestingly, these incidents might support the hypothesis but earlier studies also indicate that there is a negative correlation between the two variables. (Shanea J. Watkins, 2003).

Religiosity can be defined as ‘the quality or extent of one’s religious experience.’ Or ‘the exaggerated or affected religious zeal’ according to the (APA 2022) dictionary.

Aggression can be defined as the ‘behavior aimed at harming others physically or psychologically. It can be distinguished from anger in that anger is oriented toward overcoming the target but not necessarily through harm or destruction.’ according to (APA 2022) dictionary.

In India from 2005-09 an average of 130 individuals died and 2200 injured due to religious conflicts. In 2012 and 2013 93 and 107 deaths, respectively, were reported in the nation. In 2018 report on United Nations Human Rights stated concerns regarding attacks on some particular religious groups and some backward castes or sects. Apart from these, there are several reports of religious aggressive conflicts in India.

‘Religiosity has components with differential impact on aggressive and law-breaking behaviors’ (Elias Ghossoub et.al 2021). Interestingly another literature, from a four-year longitudinal study on male college students stated that ‘peer norms and promiscuity mediate the relationship between religiosity and both outcome measures, while the relationship between religiosity and technology-based coercive behavior’ (Timothy Hagen et.al. 2018).

Religiosity was a strong predictor of rape myth acceptance and sexism. Education was related to rape myth acceptance than sexism, with religiosity as a lesser strengthened variable. (Francesca Prina et.al. 2020). Findings state that individuals with more education and less religiosity who belong to a developed nation are less violent. ‘The effects of religiosity are related to country-level context but vary depending on how religiosity is measured’ (Aaron Gullickson et.al. 2021).

Students with low religiosity who had an experience of being bullied were more likely to abuse substances than those students who rated themselves high in religiosity. ‘Religiosity may be a potential moderator of the association between being bullied and substance use.’ (Rima A. Afifi et.al. 2020).

Self-report questionnaires of intrinsic religiosity were negatively correlated with aggressive verbal and aggressive attitudes among athletes. (Eric A Storch et.al. 2002)

Most of the investigations or studies are based on are on crime, sexual aggression, the role of education, etc., and merits demerits of individuals with high and low scores on religiosity, who are mostly older adults. There have been fewer studies on younger adults compared to older adults as the sample. Apart from that, India being a land of various cultures and religions, there are very less studies conducted on religiosity and aggression.

Noting these aspects, the aim of the present study is to:

* To assess the relationship between Religiosity and Aggression of Younger Adults of India.
* To compare the difference between male and female participants on the basis of religiosity and aggression.

Background and Literature Review

**Background (Brief History):** In 2007, it was stated by United States Department of State International Religious Freedom Report, The Constitution provides for freedom of practice of religion, and the National Government respected the practice of this right. Yet, some local bodies of government restricted this freedom.

In 2008 Human Rights Watch report stated “India claims an abiding commitment to human rights, but its record is marred by continuing violations by security forces in counterinsurgency operations and by government failure to rigorously implement laws and policies to protect marginalised communities. A vibrant media and civil society continue to press for improvements, but without tangible signs of success in 2007.”

In 2007 Amnesty International Reported concerns regarding justice and rehabilitation of the victims of Gujarat violence in 2002.

**Religiosity:**

Religiosity can be defined as ‘the quality or extent of one’s religious experience.’ Or ‘the exaggerated or affected religious zeal’ according to (APA 2022) dictionary. It refersto an individual’s tendency to abide by one’s own religious teachings, rituals or activities, principles or beliefs.

**Aggression:**

Aggression can be defined as the ‘behaviour aimed at harming othersphysically or psychologically. It can be distinguished from anger in that anger is oriented overcoming the target but not necessarily through harm or destruction.

1. Hostile aggression: When destructive behaviour is purposively performed with the primary goal of intentional injury or destruction.
2. Instrumental aggression: It involves an action carried out principally to achieve another goal, such as acquiring a desired resource.
3. Affective aggression: It involves an emotional response that tends to be targeted toward the perceived source of the distress but maybe displaced onto other people or objects if the disturbing agent cannot be attacked.
4. Displaced aggression: The direction of hostility away from the source of frustration or anger and either toward self or different entity.
5. Direct aggression: Aggressive behaviour directed toward the source of frustration or anger.’ according to (APA 2022) dictionary.

**Literature review:** Several studies have been conducted in order to understand the relationship between various types of aggression with different domains of religiosity. Some of the result findings are being stated in Chapter 1: Introduction. Here are some more research findings which might throw some light on the research objective.

Religious conflict takes the support of political instability only when there is deprivations or psychological loss of resource. Also, more than the economic resource loss it is the psychological one that plays a major role. (Daphna Canetti, Stevan E. Hobfall, Ami Pedahzur, Eran Zaidise, 2011)

Self-enhancement of religion as religious overclaiming supported and displayed willingness to engage in aggressive behaviour (religious). Interestingly, knowledge about religious teachings had negative relationship with aggression. (Daniel N Jones, Adon L. Neria, Farhad A. Helm, 2020)

It was revealed with the help of mediation tests, alcohol abuse mediated religious violent outcomes. (Gonclaves JPdB, Madruga CS, Luchetti G, Dias Latorre MdR, Laranjeira R et.al. 2020).

Findings reveal that “existential belief explained the effect of religiosity on negative emotional states and intended aggression.” (Sung Joon Jang, Byron R. Johnson, Joshua Hays, Michael Hallett, Grand Duwe, 2018).

**Significance of the present Study:** From the literatures it is evident that there is a mixed relationship between Religiosity and Aggression where different mediating variables or domains come into play. There are at times findings states about the negative relationship between the two variables and sometimes there is a highly positive relationship between the two, which further encourages the researchers to study these variables in a more detailed manner. Moreover, there have been very less studies those are conducted on young adults of India, which is the aim of the present study.

Methodology

**Aims and Objectives:**

1. To Study the relationship, if any, between Religiosity and Aggression on a sample of young adults.
2. To assess the difference, if any, between both male and female participants, on the basis of the relationship, if any, between the two variables.

**Hypothesis:**

1. Alternative Hypothesis: There is a relationship between religiosity and aggression among young adults.
2. Alternative Hypothesis: There is a difference among the male and female young adults in religiosity and aggression.

**Disclaimer: The study was not done considering any particular sect, community or religion. The participants were asked to not to reveal their original identity, and were asked to provide only the initials of their names. Also, there was no Column of religion in the sociodemographic details were taken where they could reveal anything about the participant’s religion.**

**Sample and Study Design:**

It was a correlational study that considering 126 young adults (53 Female and 53 Male) who were selected by snowball sampling technique. The google form link was circulated in most of the social media platforms like Facebook, WhatsApp, email, and other social media platforms and contacted over phone call, to participate in the said dissertation study- the only exclusion criteria was the participants should be young adults aged between 18-25 years. Among these invitees 147 subjects participated out of which 126 (others were not meeting the inclusion criteria) data were calculated. Questionnaires were sent through email or through social media for those who stay far away and participants who stay nearby were approached directly to fill the form. Consent Form was duly signed by the participants before conducting the study rather considering the participant’s response as data.

No such screening tools were used as the sample was chosen with randomisation. Also, there was not so many exclusion criteria for selecting sample, screening was done after collecting the data. The participants were asked to fill in the sociodemographic details.

It is a Correlational Study Design, wherein the correlation between the variables were analysed and investigated. Each domain, of religiosity as well as aggression, was considered for calculation. Since the sample was a bit homogenous and belonged to almost the similar sociocultural milieu there was not much difference that has been observed among male and female participants on the basis of these two variable scores. It has been observed that Some of the subscales or domains has negative correlation between other subscales or domains of aggression.

**Procedure:**

1. Looking at the current violent religious conflictual incidents, this was the study that has been considered as the utmost importance.
2. After choosing the variables like Religiosity and Aggression, alternative hypothesis was drawn.
3. Suitable scales along with their reliability and validity scores were used to fulfil the objective of the study.
4. A google form was made containing the questionnaires and surveyed as well as circulated in almost all the social media platforms. Some of the participants were invited over phone and some were approached directly.
5. Proper Sociodemographic details were taken after taking the consent to participate in the study.
6. Proper instructions were given and they were requested to fill the form, after taking an oath to maintain the confidentiality of the responses, and using the responses only for the purpose of research.
7. Proper calculation was done, scores were interpreted and conclusion drawn without knowing the religious affiliation of the participants, or without knowing the community they belong to.

**Measuring Tools Used:**

1. **The Attitude toward Religion and Philosophy of Life Scale (Funk, 1955, 1958):**

This scale consists of seven different scales to understand the relationship between different shades of an individual’s religious attitude among college students. Following are the scales those are being used as domains:

1. Religious Conflict: This is referred as “simultaneous tendencies to react in opposing and incompatible ways to the same religious attitude object.” (Funk, 1958)
2. Religious Orthodoxy: It is defined as “the tendency to accept the teachings of religious authorities, and conform to religious practices.” (Funk 1958). Meyers(1952) originally developed this scale.
3. Philosophy of Life: This can be conceptualised as “an integrated system of meaning and purposes which relates the individual’s goals to the goals of humanity and the wider structure of the universe.” (Funk 1958).
4. Hostility towards the Religious Institution: This can be defined as “aggression or withdrawal towards religious attitude object.” (Funk 1958).
5. Religious Tranquillity: It is stated as to “characterize the attitude of those who see religion, not as compensation, but an aid to happiness and favourable sociopsychological adjustment” (Funk 1958).
6. Religious Solace: This is an assessment of “use of religion as a means of compensating for the unhappiness and disappointment of life.” (Funk 1958).
7. Change of Religious Attitudes: It can be defined as the assessment of “stability or instability of religious beliefs since college entrance.” (Funk 1958).

Reliability: Following are the test-retest reliability coefficients of the scale- Religious Conflict (.84), Religious Orthodoxy (.95), Philosophy of life (.81), Hostility toward the Church (.88), Religious Tranquillity (.84), Religious Solace (.87), and Change of Religious Attitude (.90).

Validity: The findings from Content and Construct Validity for Religious Conflict Scale has highly significant correlation of (.43).

1. **Aggression Questionnaire (Buss and Perry 1992):**

It was developed by Buss and Perry in the year of 1992 to measure four different aspects rather domains of aggression, those are as follows:

1. Physical Aggression (α = .85)
2. Verbal Aggression (α = .72)
3. Anger (α = .83)
4. Hostility (α = .77)

The Alpha level of total Aggression Scale is .89

Reliability: According to the test – retest reliability, the correlational scores were, Physical aggression, r =.72; Verbal aggression = .76; Anger = .72; Hostility = .72; and the total aggression score, r = .80 (Buss and Perry 1992).

According to the Split Half Reliability Coefficients, the scores are as followed: Physical aggression, r = .80; Verbal aggression, r = .70; Anger, r = .79; Hostility, r = .82 and total aggression score, r = .91

Validity: According to the Criterion Validity the correlation coefficient is .49 between Aggression Questionnaire and MDAS. The validity score of the subscales of the questionnaire are, physical aggression = .40, hostility = .40, anger = .31 and verbal aggression = .27

**Statistical Analysis:**

All statistical analysis was carried out using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive analysis such as mean and the standard deviation was calculated and computed. Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient (to find out the degree of relationship among the two variables, Religiosity and Aggression, if any) and t-test (to find out the difference in gender on the basis of two variables Religiosity and Aggression, if any) was assessed at 0.05 level to determine the significance.

Results

**TABLE 1:** Sociodemographic Details

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **DOMAIN** | MEAN (in years) | STANDARD DEVIATION |
| AGE (in years) | 21.21 | 1.709 |
| YEARSOF EDUCATION (in years) | 14.58 | 1.597 |

*The above table shows the mean and SD for each of the sociodemographic variables. The average age has been computed to be 21 years(approximately).*

*The mean average education level of the present sample has been found to be 15 years(approximately), so it can be said that it is a more or less educated pool of participants where the average level of education is that of graduation.*

**TABLE 2:** It shows descriptive statistics of Religiosity and Aggression (n=126)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **DOMAIN** | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION |
| Religious Conflict | 9.67 | 4.151 |
| Religious Orthodoxy | 4.27 | 1.750 |
| Philosophy of Life | 3.47 | 1.468 |
| Religious Tranquillity | 3.05 | 1.554 |
| Religious Solace | 4.09 | 2.266 |
| Hostility To Religious Institution | 4.60 | 1.972 |
| Religious Attitude Change | 6.83 | 5.414 |
| TOTAL RELIGIOSITY | 35.97 | 9.297 |
| Physical Aggression | 22.75 | 6.247 |
| Verbal Aggression | 14.51 | 4.427 |
| Anger | 18.49 | 5.571 |
| Hostility | 22.53 | 6.416 |
| TOTAL AGGRESSION | 78.29 | 19.279 |

*The above table shows that the mean score of for Total Religiosity is 35.97. The mean score of Total Aggression is 78.29. The study has been conducted on the general population with a randomly selected sample (n=126).*

**TABLE 3:** It shows the correlation matrix between the subscales and domains between Religiosity and Aggression (n=126).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DOMAIN** | PHYSICAL AGGRESSION | VERBAL AGGRESSION | HOSTILITY | ANGER |
| RELIGIOUS CONFLICT |  | .181\* |  | .210\* |
| RELIGIOUS TRANQUILLITY | -.271\*\* | -.232\*\* | -.243\*\* | -.278\*\* |
| RELIGIOUS SOLACE | -.283\*\* | -.273\*\* | -.207\* | -.286\*\* |
| CHANGE OF RELIGIOUS ATTITUDE |  |  | .181\* |  |

\*Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (two-tailed)

\*\*Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (two-tailed)

**Findings:**

* *No Significant correlation was found between the following domains or subscales between:*

1. *Religious Conflict and* *Physical Aggression and Hostility.*
2. *Religious Orthodoxy* *and Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Hostility and Anger*
3. *Philosophy of Life and Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Hostility and Anger*
4. *Change of Religious Attitude and Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Hostility and Anger*

* *There exists a significant positive and negative correlations between domains of Religiosity and Aggression, those are as follows:*

1. *Religious Conflict and Verbal Aggression (rs=.181;p>0.05)*
2. *Religious Conflict and Anger (rs=.210;p>0.05)*
3. *Religious Tranquillity and Physical Aggression (rs=-.271; p>0.01)*
4. *Religious Tranquillity and Verbal Aggression (rs=-.232; p>0.01)*
5. *Religious Tranquillity and Anger (rs=-.243; p>0.01)*
6. *Religious Tranquillity and Hostility (rs=-.232; p>0.01)*
7. *Religious Solace and Physical Aggression (rs=-.283; p>0.01)*
8. *Religious Solace and Verbal Aggression (rs=-.273; p>0.01)*
9. *Religious Solace and Hostility (rs=-.286; p>0.01)*
10. *Religious Solace and Anger (rs=-.207;p>0.05)*
11. *Change of Religious Attitude and Hostility (rs=.181;p>0.05)*

*Therefore, Firstly, It can be assumed, that the greater the presence of Religious conflict, the greater is the presence of the degree of Verbal Aggression and Anger. Secondly, the greater the absence of Religious Tranquillity, the greater is the presence of the degree Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Hostility and Anger. Thirdly, the greater is the absence of Religious Solace, the greater is the degree of presence of Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Anger and Hostility. Lastly, the greater the presence of Change of Religious Attitude, the greater the degree of Hostility in young adults.*

*This suggests that Religiosity has an influence on the degree of Aggressiveness among individuals.*

***\*There is no significant Gender difference found between Religiosity (Religious Conflict, Religious Orthodoxy, Philosophy Of Life, Hostility Towards Religious Institution, Religious Tranquillity, Religious Solace and Change Of Religious Attitude) and Aggression (Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Anger and Hostility).***

**GRAPH 1:** *Graphical Representation of Total Religiosity scores*

**GRAPH 2:** *Graphical Representation of Total Aggression scores*

**Discussion**

In a country like India, where there are residents from all the religious communities, to assess rather investigate upon one of the most sensitive issues of the nation, Religion and Religiosity, and that too discover the relationship with Aggression, was itself a tough choice. Some of the previous literatures stated about both positive and negative aspects and relationship between Religiosity and Aggression but there were very few studies initiated in India, where there is a high chance of the relationship among the above two variables. This can be considered as one of the basic reasons of choosing these variables for the study, specially looking at the current scenario of various religious conflicts that’s going on all over the nation.

The study sample group of young adults (aged between 18-25 years) was deliberately chosen for the availability of the sample and also it is very crucial factor to understand the degree of religiosity as well as aggression among youth of today. The sample group was homogenous with almost similar degree of literacy and education. They belong to almost similar age group, has access to social media, aware and living in the current scenario, and are also considered as the future of the nation and civilization as well, it was necessary to choose this group as the sample of study.

The specific scales **The Attitude toward Religion and Philosophy of Life Scale (Funk, 1955, 1958)** and **Aggression Questionnaire (Buss and Perry 1992)**, along with their proper reliability and validity scores, these scales with their respective subscales,were used to fulfil the aim of the study. A google form link was created and shared in most of the social media platforms to gather data and then to compute scores and interpret it.

The present study aimed to investigate upon the relationship between Religiosity and Aggression and to compute the difference between female and male participants regarding these two variables. The sample that was chosen for conducting this study included 126 young adults aged between 18-25 years. It has been observed that the sample belongs to more or less similar sociocultural milieu, mostly students. It is seen the average age of the sample is 21 years approximately and most of them has completed graduation, as the computed mean of years of education states to be 15 years approximately, so it can be said that the data was collected from a literate pool of individuals. The standard deviation has been computed to be 1.709 in case of Age (in years) and 1.597 in case of Years of Education (in years) respectively. Finally, the sociodemographic details suggests that the sample was homogenous in nature. The mean and SD of Total score of Religiosity and Total score of Aggression are 35.97 and 9.297, and 78.29 and 19.279 respectively.

***Relationship between Religiosity and Aggression***

1. ***Relationship between Religious Conflict and Verbal Aggression:***Religious Conflict can be conceptualised as “simultaneous tendencies to react in opposing and incompatible ways to the same religious attitude object.” (Funk, 1958). Verbal Aggression can be defined as “extremely critical, threatening, or insulting words delivered in oral or written form and intended to demean, belittle, or frighten the recipient” (APA Dictionary 2022). The mean and SD of Religious Conflict and Verbal Aggression was computed to be 9.67 and 4.151, 14.51 and 4.427 respectively. The Spearman Rank Correlation coefficient was computed to be .181\* at 0.05 level of significance. The results suggests that there is a significant positive correlation between the above two variables which means that if an individual scores high in Religious Conflict i.e. an individual who has high tendency to oppose own or other religious object might have high tendency of Verbal Aggression. The positive correlation might be due to the false news or different propagandas which might lead to lesser understanding of religious perspectives or philosophy.
2. ***Relationship between Religious Conflict and Anger:***Religious Conflict can be conceptualised as “simultaneous tendencies to react in opposing and incompatible ways to the same religious attitude object.” (Funk, 1958). Anger can be defined as an “emotion characterized by antagonism toward someone or something you feel has deliberately done you wrong.” (APA Dictionary 2022). The mean and SD of Religious Conflict and Verbal Aggression was computed to be 9.67 and 4.151, 18.49 and 5.571 respectively. The Spearman Rank Correlation coefficient was computed to be .210\* at 0.05 level of significance. The results suggests that there is a significant positive correlation between the above two variables which means that if an individual scores high in Religious Conflict i.e. an individual who has high tendency to oppose own or other religious object might have high degree of expressing Anger. The positive correlation might be due to the false news or different propagandas which might lead to lesser understanding of religious perspectives or philosophy which might evoke Anger which is a negative emotion when one perceives a situation, object or a person has wronged the individual. This emotion might be aroused due to the different understanding towards a situation. In cases of Religious events, due to rumours, false news, propagandas or personal gain, some misunderstanding or misinterpretation might take place which later leads to Anger.
3. ***Relationship between Religious Tranquillity and Physical Aggression:*** It is stated as to “characterize the attitude of those who see religion, not as compensation, but an aid to happiness and favourable sociopsychological adjustment” (Funk 1958). Physical Aggression can be defined as “aggression involves harming others physically” (APA Dictionary 2022). The mean and SD of Religious Tranquillity and Physical Aggression was computed to be 3.05 and 1.554, 22.75 and 6.247 respectively. The Spearman Rank Correlation coefficient was computed to be

-.271\*\* at 0.01 level of significance. The results suggests that there is a significant negative correlation between the above two variables which means that if an individual has high degree of religious tranquillity i.e. an individual who sees religion as an aid to happiness and sociopsychological adjustment might have less tendency to harm others physically in an aggressive way. The above result might be due to the advent of new liberal ideas of religiosity among young adults. These new ideas has developed maybe due to the education or literacy of the individuals.

1. ***Relationship between Religious Tranquillity and Veral Aggression:***It is stated as to “characterize the attitude of those who see religion, not as compensation, but an aid to happiness and favourable sociopsychological adjustment” (Funk 1958). Verbal Aggression can be defined as “extremely critical, threatening, or insulting words delivered in oral or written form and intended to demean, belittle, or frighten the recipient” (APA Dictionary 2022). The mean and SD of Religious Tranquillity and Verbal Aggression was computed to be 3.05 and 1.554, 14.51 and 4.427 respectively. The Spearman Rank Correlation was computed to be -.232\*\* at 0.01 level of significance. The results suggests that there is a significant negative correlation between the above two variables which means that if an individual has high degree of Religious Tranquillity i.e. an individual who sees religion as an aid to happiness and sociopsychological adjustment might have less tendency to harm others verbally in an aggressive way. The above result might be due to the advent of new liberal ideas of religiosity among young adults. These new ideas has developed maybe due to the education or literacy of the individuals.
2. ***Relationship between Religious Tranquillity and Hostility:***It is stated as to “characterize the attitude of those who see religion, not as compensation, but an aid to happiness and favourable sociopsychological adjustment” (Funk 1958). Hostility can be defined as “the overt expression of intense animosity or antagonism in action, feeling, or attitude.” (APA Dictionary 2022). The mean and SD of Religious Tranquillity and Hostility was computed to be 3.05 and 1.554, 22.53 and 6.416 respectively. The Spearman Rank Correlation coefficient was computed to be -.243\*\* at 0.01 level of significance. The results suggests that there is a significant negative correlation between the above two variables which means that if an individual has high degree of religious tranquillity, i.e., an individual who sees religion as an aid to happiness and sociopsychological adjustment might have less degree of anger. Seeing religion as a source of happiness might be considered as the development of spiritual insight. This might be the reason of the above results.
3. ***Relationship between Religious Tranquillity and Anger:***It is stated as to “characterize the attitude of those who see religion, not as compensation, but an aid to happiness and favourable sociopsychological adjustment” (Funk 1958). Anger can be defined as an “emotion characterized by antagonism toward someone or something you feel has deliberately done you wrong.” (APA Dictionary 2022).The mean and SD of Religious Tranquillity and Anger was computed to be 3.05 and 1.554, 18.49 and 5.571 respectively. The Spearman Rank Correlation coefficient was computed to be -.278\*\* at 0.01 level of significance. The results suggests that there is a significant negative correlation between the above two variables which means that if an individual has high degree of religious tranquillity, i.e., an individual who sees religion as an aid to happiness and sociopsychological adjustment might have less degree of anger. Seeing religion as a source of happiness might be considered as the development of spiritual insight. This might be the reason of the above results. If one considers religion as a source of happiness, the individual automatically calms down which does not lead to the arousal to the negative emotion of Anger.
4. ***Relationship between Religious Solace and Physical Aggression:***Religious Solace can be defined as “use of religion as a means of compensating for the unhappiness and disappointment of life.” (Funk 1958). Physical Aggression can be defined as “aggression involves harming others physically” (APA Dictionary 2022). The mean and SD of Religious Solace and Physical Aggression was computed to be 4.09 and 2.266, 22.75 and 6.247 respectively. The Spearman Rank Correlation coefficient was computed to be -.283\*\* at 0.01 level of significance. The results suggests that there is a significant negative correlation between the above two variables which means that if an individual has high degree of religious solace i.e. an individual who uses religion as a way compensating disappointments of life might have less tendency to harm others physically in an aggressive way. Seeing religion as a source of happiness might be considered as the development of spiritual insight. This might be the reason of the above results.
5. ***Relationship between Religious Solace and Verbal Aggression:***Religious Solace can be defined as “use of religion as a means of compensating for the unhappiness and disappointment of life.” (Funk 1958). Verbal Aggression can be defined as “extremely critical, threatening, or insulting words delivered in oral or written form and intended to demean, belittle, or frighten the recipient” (APA Dictionary 2022). The mean and SD of Religious Solace and Verbal Aggression was computed to be 4.09 and 2.266, 14.51 and 4.427 respectively. The Spearman Rank Correlation coefficient was computed to be -.273\*\* at 0.01 level of significance. The results suggests that there is a significant negative correlation between the above two variables which means that if an individual has high degree of religious solace, i.e., an individual who uses religion as a way compensating disappointments of life might have less tendency to harm or demean or insult others verbally. The above result might be due to the advent of new liberal ideas of religiosity among young adults. These new ideas have developed maybe due to the education or literacy of the individuals.
6. ***Relationship between Religious Solace and Hostility:***Religious Solace can be defined as “use of religion as a means of compensating for the unhappiness and disappointment of life.” (Funk 1958). Hostility can be defined as “the overt expression of intense animosity or antagonism in action, feeling, or attitude.” (APA Dictionary 2022). The mean and SD of Religious Solace and Hostility was computed to be 4.09 and 2.266, 22.53 and 6.416 respectively. The Pearson’s Correlation coefficient was computed to be -.207\* at 0.05 level of significance. The results suggests that there is a significant negative correlation between the above two variables which means that if an individual has high degree of Religious Solace, i.e., an individual who uses religion as a way compensating disappointments of life might have less tendency to become hostile, i.e., to hold negative attitude towards others. The above result might be due to the liberal and change of negative attitude into a positive one which has developed in the newly educated generation.
7. ***Relationship between Religious Solace and Anger:***Religious Solace can be defined as “use of religion as a means of compensating for the unhappiness and disappointment of life.” (Funk 1958). Anger can be defined as an “emotion characterized by antagonism toward someone or something you feel has deliberately done you wrong.” (APA Dictionary 2022). The Pearson’s Correlation coefficient was computed to be -.286\*\* at 0.01 level of significance. The results suggests that there is a significant negative correlation between the above two variables which means that if an individual has high degree of religious tranquillity, i.e., an individual who sees religion as an aid to happiness and sociopsychological adjustment might have less degree of anger. Seeing religion as a source of happiness might be considered as the development of spiritual insight. This might be the reason of the above results. If one considers religion as a source of happiness, the individual automatically calms down which does not lead to the arousal to the negative emotion of Anger.
8. ***Relationship between Change of Religious Attitude and Hostility:***Change of Religious Attitude can be defined as the assessment of “stability or instability of religious beliefs since college entrance.” (Funk 1958). Hostility can be defined as “the overt expression of intense animosity or antagonism in action, feeling, or attitude.” (APA Dictionary 2022). The mean and SD of Religious Tranquillity and Hostility was computed to be 6.83 and 5.414, 22.53 and 6.416 respectively. The Spearman Rank Correlation coefficient was computed to be .181\* at 0.01 level of significance. The results suggests that there is a significant positive correlation between the above two variables which means that if an individual scores high in Change Of Religious Attitude i.e; either they have positive or negative attitude towards religiosity and its institutions after their entrance in college. In case of either of the two attitudes, they might tend to become hostile as both the attitudes might evoke negative emotions.

However, There is no significant Gender difference found between Religiosity (Religious Conflict, Religious Orthodoxy, Philosophy Of Life, Hostility Towards Religious Institution, Religious Tranquillity, Religious Solace and Change Of Religious Attitude) and Aggression (Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Anger and Hostility).

Therefore, it can be determined rather opined that Religiosity effects Aggression in young adults of India. There is not much significant difference that has been observed due to might be homogeneity of the sample group.

**Conclusion:**

From the above studies, whose aim and objective was to discover whether there is any relationship between Religiosity and Aggression and whether there is any gender difference based on the above two variables. The findings suggest that there is positive as well as negative relationship between the domains of Religiosity and Aggressiveness.

It can be observed that there is a positive relationship between Religious Conflict and Verbal Aggression, Change of Religious Attitude and Hostility.

It can be observed that there is a negative relationship between Religious Tranquillity and Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Hostility and Anger. There is another negative relationship between Religious Solace and Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Hostility and Anger.

It was observed that there is no significant Gender difference found between Religiosity (Religious Conflict, Religious Orthodoxy, Philosophy Of Life, Hostility Towards Religious Institution, Religious Tranquillity, Religious Solace and Change Of Religious Attitude) and Aggression (Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Anger and Hostility).

Future Prospects:

The study indicated and presented several interesting findings such as there is no significant correlation between Religious Orthodoxy and subscales of Aggression. Extensive research can be conducted on this looking at the current scenario of religious conflictual incidents.

According to the Indian context, it is well accepted that males are more hostile than females are but here the data shows a different result. Here, the score of female participants is more than that of the male participants, in Hostility to Religious Institution subscale.

**Limitation:**

The study was conducted with the sample size of 126 participants which is less in number. Extensive research can be conducted with higher sample size to gain more accuracy and authenticity in this aspect of religiosity and aggression.
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