# CHAPTER - III

# RESULTS

PAGE

CHAPTER - III : RESULTS

**********

# CHAPTER - III

## RESULTS

The obtained data were scored, grouped and analysed both in terms of parametric and non-parametric statistics to see whether they supported the underlying assumptions and hypotheses. In the analysis of the data, while putting it to statistical analysis, care was taken that the meaning of the data was not lost in the process of its numerical transformation, classification and organization.

### 3.1. Home Adjustment:

#### 3.1.a. Effect of sex difference on home adjustment:

Given in table 5 are means and standard deviations of home adjustment scores for the adolescent boys and girls.

Table - 5:

Means and Standard Deviations of Home Adjustment Scores for for Adolescent Boys and Girls.

| Sex | N | Means | Standard Deviations |
|---|---|---|---|
| Boys | 669 | 4.65 | 2.83 |
| Girls | 631 | 3.49 | 2.66 |

Table 5 shows that in terms of mean problem scores, the adolescent girls have less problems (M = 3.49) in their home adjustment than the adolescent boys (M = 4.65).

Table - 6:

Relationship between Sex Difference and Home Adjustment.

| Sex | | Home Adjustment | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Excellent | Good | Average | Unsatisfactory | Very unsatisfactory | |
| Boys | (f) | 080 | 180 | 307 | 056 | 046 | 669 |
| | (%) | 11.96 | 26.90 | 45.89 | 08.37 | 06.88 | |
| Girls | (f) | 164 | 226 | 117 | 083 | 041 | 631 |
| | (%) | 25.99 | 35.82 | 18.54 | 13.15 | 06.50 | |
| Total | (f) | 244 | 406 | 424 | 139 | 087 | 1300 |
| | (%) | 18.77 | 31.23 | 32.62 | 10.69 | 06.69 | |
| | $\chi^2 = 123.79$; df = 4; $P < .001$ | | | | | | |

Table 6 indicates that, in home adjustment area, highest percentage (45.89) of boys are found under "average" category whereas highest percentage (35.82) of girls are found under "good" category. Girls seem to be higher in proportion under the positive categories i.e., "excellent" and "good". Boys seem to be higher in proportion under "average" category. Girls are higher in proportion (13.15) than boys (08.37) under "unsatisfactory" category. Under extreme negative category

i.e., "very unsatisfactory", both boys (6.88) and girls (6.50) are almost equal in proportion. Percentage distributions of boys and girls under different categories of home adjustment are graphically shown in Figure 4 (P.162).

3.1.b. Effect of locus of control on home adjustment:

Table 7 gives the means and standard deviations of home adjustment scores for the 'internal' and 'external' adolescents.

Table - 7:

Means and Standard Deviations of Home Adjustment Scores for the 'Internal' and the 'External' Group.

| I-E Locus of Control (Score range : 00 to 17) | Sex | N | Means | Standard Deviations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Internal (00 to 09) | Boys | 377 | 4.25 | 2.70 |
| | Girls | 315 | 3.04 | 2.42 |
| External (10 & above) | Boys | 292 | 5.17 | 2.90 |
| | Girls | 316 | 3.94 | 2.81 |

Table 7 shows that in terms of mean problem scores, both boys (M = 4.25) and girls (M = 3.04) with internal orientation (ILC) are better adjusted than boys (M = 5.17) and girls (M = 3.94) with external orientation (ELC).

Table - 8:

Relationship Between I-E Locus of Control and Home Adjustment.

| I-E Locus of Control (Score Range: 00 to 17) | | Home Adjustment | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Excellent | Good | Average | Unsatisfactory | Very unsatisfactory | |
| Internal (00 to 09) | (f) | 158 | 228 | 217 | 059 | 030 | 692 |
| | (%) | 22.83 | 32.94 | 31.36 | 08.53 | 04.34 | |
| External (10 & above) | (f) | 086 | 178 | 207 | 080 | 057 | 608 |
| | (%) | 14.14 | 29.28 | 34.05 | 13.16 | 09.37 | |
| Total | (f) | 244 | 406 | 424 | 139 | 087 | 1300 |
| | (%) | 18.77 | 31.23 | 32.62 | 10.69 | 06.69 | |
| | | $\chi^2 = 33.91$; df = 4; $P < .001$ | | | | | |

Table 8 reveals that highest percentage (32.94) of 'internals' is under "good" category whereas highest percentage (34.05) of 'externals' is under "average" category. Under positive categories i.e., "excellent" and "good", 'internals' (ILC) seem to be higher in proportion than 'externals' (ELC). Starting from "average" category and down toward "unsatisfactory" and "very unsatisfactory" categories 'externals' seem to be higher in proportion than 'internals'. Percentage distributions of ILC and ELC groups under different categories of home adjustment are graphically shown in Figure 5 (P.165).

3.1.c. Effect of purpose-in-life on home adjustment:

Below (Table 9) are given the means and standard deviations of home adjustment scores for the four PIL groups.

Table - 9:

Means and Standard Deviations of Home Adjustment Scores for the Four PIL groups.

| Purpose-in-Life (PIL) in terms of Quartiles (Score Range: 40 to 140) | Sex | N | Total | Mean | Standard Deviations |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| HPIL | Boys | 176 | 318 | 3.44 | 2.34 |
| (117 & above) | Girls | 142 | | 2.50 | 2.07 |
| MHPIL | Boys | 180 | 321 | 4.17 | 2.60 |
| (107 - 116) | Girls | 141 | | 2.85 | 2.05 |
| MLPIL | Boys | 158 | 329 | 4.93 | 2.65 |
| (95 to 106) | Girls | 171 | | 3.60 | 2.65 |
| LPIL | Boys | 155 | 332 | 6.32 | 2.91 |
| (40 to 94) | Girls | 177 | | 4.69 | 3.02 |

Table 9 indicates that the higher the PIL scores, the lesser is the adjustment problem. In terms of mean problem scores, high PIL group seems to have least adjustment problems whereas low PIL group seems to have considerably high rate of adjustment problems.

Table - 11

ANOVA of Home Adjustment Scores for Sex, Locus of Control and Purpose-in-Life Groups

| Source | df | SS | MS | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sex (A) | 1 | 582.7242 | 582.7242 | 88.545 * |
| I-E Locus of Control (B) | 1 | 110.8063 | 110.8063 | 16.837 * |
| Purpose-in-Life (C) | 3 | 1022.4081 | 340.8027 | 51.785 * |
| A x B | 1 | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.000 |
| A x C | 3 | 19.4683 | 6.4894 | 0.986 |
| B x C | 3 | 40.2276 | 13.4092 | 2.038 |
| A x B x C | 3 | 8.3431 | 2.7810 | 0.423 |
| Error | 1284 | 8450.1069 | 6.5811 | |
| Total | 1299 | 10234.0846 | | |

* $p < .01$

The Table 11 shows a highly significant main effect of sex, LC and PIL which indicates that home adjustment is a function of sex ($F = 88.545$; $df = 1,1284$; $p < .01$), locus of control ($F = 16.837$; $df = 1,1284$; $p < .01$), and purpose-in-life ($F = 5 = .785$; $df = 3,1284$; $p < .01$).

As regards interaction of sex and locus of control ($F = 0.000$; $df = 1,1284$; $p > .05$); sex and purpose-in-life ($F = 0.986$; $df = 3,1284$; $p > .05$); locus of control and purpose-in-life ($F = 2.032$; $df = 3,1284$; $p > .05$); sex, locus of control, and purpose-in-life ($F = 0.423$; $df = 3,1284$; $p > .05$), all the F values were found to be non-significant. Results in Table 11 indicate rejection of the null hypotheses (nos: 1, 2, 3) and retention of the null hypotheses (nos: 4, 5, 6 and 7).

## 3.2. Health Adjustment:

### 3.2.a. Effect of sex on health adjustment:

Presented in Table 12 are means and standard deviations of health adjustment scores for adolescent boys and girls.

Table - 12:

Means and Standard Deviations of Health Adjustment Scores for Adolescent Boys and Girls.

| Sex | N | Means | Standard Deviations |
|---|---|---|---|
| Boys | 669 | 4.31 | 2.64 |
| Girls | 631 | 4.19 | 2.84 |

Table 12 indicates that in terms of mean problem scores, both adolescent boys (M = 4.31) and girls (M = 4.19) seem to experience more or less equal degree of adjustment problems related to their health.

Table - 13:

Relationship between Sex and Health Adjustment.

| Sex | | Health Adjustment | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Excellent | Good | Average | Unsatisfactory | Very unsatisfactory | |
| Boys | (f) | 095 | 192 | 170 | 164 | 048 | 669 |
| | (%) | 14.20 | 28.70 | 25.41 | 24.51 | 07.17 | |
| Girls | (f) | 031 | 168 | 300 | 108 | 024 | 631 |
| | (%) | 04.91 | 26.62 | 47.54 | 17.12 | 03.80 | |
| Total | (f) | 126 | 360 | 470 | 272 | 072 | 1300 |
| | (%) | 09.69 | 27.69 | 36.15 | 20.92 | 05.54 | |
| $\chi^2 = 88.56$; df = 4; $p < .001$ | | | | | | | |

Table 13 reveals that adolescent boys are higher in proportion (28.70) under "good" category and adolescent girls are higher (47.54) under "average" category of health adjustment. It also shows that boys are higher in proportion both under 'positive' and 'negative' categories than girls except under the "average" category where girls are almost double in percentage than boys. Percentage distributions of the boys and the girls under different categories of health adjustment are graphically shown in Figure 7 (P.171 ).

3.2.b. Effect of locus of control on health adjustment:

Table 14 gives the means and standard deviations of health adjustment scores for the 'internal' and the 'external' group.

Table - 14:

Means and Standard Deviations of Health Adjustment Scores for the 'Internal' and the 'External' Group.

| I-E Locus of Control (Score Range: 00 to 17) | Sex | N | Mean | Standard Deviations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Internal | Boys | 377 | 4.20 | 2.80 |
| (00 to 09) | Girls | 315 | 3.98 | 2.68 |
| Externals | Boys | 292 | 4.46 | 2.41 |
| (10 & above) | Girls | 316 | 4.42 | 2.98 |

Table 14 shows that the 'internals', in terms of mean problem scores, are slightly better adjusted to their health than the 'external' adolescents. Within the 'internal' group, girls seem to be better adjusted to their health than the boys, and within the 'external' group boys and girls do not show much difference in mean problem scores.

Table - 15:

Relationship between Locus of Control and Health Adjustment.

| I-E Locus of Control (Score Range: 00 to 17) | | Excellent | Good | Average | Unsatisfactory | Very unsatisfactory | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Internal (00 to 09) | (f) | 081 | 208 | 228 | 132 | 043 | 692 |
| | (%) | 11.70 | 30.06 | 32.95 | 19.08 | 06.21 | |
| External (10 & above) | (f) | 045 | 152 | 242 | 140 | 029 | 608 |
| | (%) | 07.40 | 25.00 | 39.80 | 23.03 | 04.77 | |
| Total | (f) | 126 | 360 | 470 | 272 | 072 | 1300 |
| | (%) | 09.69 | 27.69 | 36.16 | 20.92 | 05.54 | |

$\chi^2 = 17.01$; df = 4; $p < .01$

The table (15) shows that highest percentage of both 'internal'(32.95) and 'external' (39.80) groups seem to fall under "average" category. The table further shows that under positive categories of health adjustment like "excellent" and "good", 'internals' (ILC) are higher in percentages and under negative category like "unsatisfactory", 'externals' (ELC) are

higher in percentage. Under the extreme negative category, 'internals' seem to be higher in proportion. Percentage distributions of the ILC and the ELC groups under different categories of health adjustment are shown in Figure 8 (P.173).

3.2.c. Effect of purpose-in-life on health adjustment.

Below (Table 16) are given the means and standard deviations of health adjustment scores for different PIL groups.

Table - 16:

Means and Standard Deviations of Health Adjustment Scores for the Four PIL Groups.

| Purpose-in-Life (PIL) in terms of Quartiles (Score Range: 40 to 140) | Sex | N | Means | Standard Deviations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| HPIL | Boys | 176 | 3.28 | 2.17 |
| (117 & above) | Girls | 142 | 3.68 | 3.11 |
| MHPIL | Boys | 180 | 4.01 | 2.67 |
| (107 - 116) | Girls | 141 | 3.67 | 2.61 |
| MLPIL | Boys | 158 | 4.60 | 2.52 |
| ( 95 - 106) | Girls | 171 | 4.29 | 2.67 |
| LPIL | Boys | 155 | 5.57 | 2.66 |
| ( 40 - 94) | Girls | 177 | 4.25 | 2.77 |

The result (Table 16) shows that, the higher the PIL score, the lesser is the adjustment problem. Except the HPIL group, within

each PIL group girls seem to be better adjusted to their health than boys. In the HPIL group, adolescent boys seem to experience less adjustment problems related to their health than the adolescent girls.

Table - 17:

Relationship between Purpose-in-Life and Health Adjustment.

| Purpose-in-Life (PIL) in terms of Quartiles (Score Range: 40 to 140) | | Health Adjustment | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Excellent | Good | Average | Unsatisfactory | Very unsatisfactory | |
| PIL (117 & above) | (f) | 047 | 115 | 109 | 040 | 007 | 318 |
| | (%) | 14.78 | 36.16 | 34.28 | 12.58 | 02.20 | |
| MHPIL (107 - 116) | (f) | 040 | 103 | 109 | 058 | 011 | 321 |
| | (%) | 12.46 | 32.08 | 33.96 | 18.07 | 03.43 | |
| MLPIL ( 95 - 106) | (f) | 027 | 079 | 134 | 072 | 017 | 329 |
| | (%) | 08.21 | 24.01 | 40.73 | 21.88 | 05.17 | |
| LPIL ( 40 - 94) | (f) | 012 | 063 | 118 | 102 | 037 | 332 |
| | (%) | 03.61 | 18.98 | 35.54 | 30.72 | 11.15 | |
| Total | (f) | 126 | 360 | 470 | 272 | 072 | 1300 |
| | (%) | 09.69 | 27.69 | 36.15 | 20.92 | 05.54 | |

$\chi^2 = 105.16$; df = 12; $p < .001$

Result (Table 17) shows that highest percentages of LPIL (35.54), MLPIL (40.73) and MHPIL (33.96) groups seem to fall under "average" category whereas HPIL group seems to be highest

(36.16) under "good" category. Under positive categories i.e., "excellent" and "good", higher PIL groups seem to be higher in percentage and under negative categories i.e., "unsatisfactory" and "very unsatisfactory", lower PIL groups seem to be higher in percentage. Percentage distributions of different PIL groups under different categories of health adjustment are graphically shown in Figure 9 (P.175).

3.2.d. Effects of sex, locus of control, and purpose-in-life on health adjustment:

Table 18 gives the main and interaction effects of sex, locus of control (LC), and purpose-in-life (PIL) on health adjustment.

Table - 18:

ANOVA of Health Adjustment Scores for Sex, Locus of Control and Purposein-Life Groups.

| Source | df | SS | MS | F | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sex (A) | 1 | 17.9553 | 17.9553 | 2.543 | |
| I-E Locus of Control (B) | 1 | 4.1288 | 4.1288 | 0.585 | |
| Purpose-in-Life (C) | 3 | 560.7782 | 186.9261 | 26.478 | * |
| A x B | 1 | 3.0471 | 3.0471 | 0.432 | |
| A x C | 3 | 45.3247 | 15.1082 | 2.140 | |
| B x C | 3 | 28.8404 | 9.6135 | 1.362 | |
| A x B x C | 3 | 33.4073 | 11.1358 | 1.577 | |
| Error | 1284 | 9064.5984 | 7.0597 | | |
| Total | 1299 | 9758.0802 | | | |

* $p < .01$

2 x 2 x 4 analysis of variance (Table 18) shows a non-significant main effect of sex ($F = 2.543$; $df = 1284$; $p > .05$) and locus of control ($F = 0.585$; $df = 1,1284$; $p > .05$), and a significant main effect of PIL (26.478; $df = 3,1284$; $p < .01$) on health adjustment.

The results also show non-significant interaction effects of sex x LC ($F = 0.432$; $df = 1,1284$; $p > .05$); sex x PIL ($F = 2.140$; $df = 3,1284$; $p > .05$); LC x PIL ($F = 1.362$; $df = 3,1284$; $p > .05$); sex x LC x PIL ($F = 1.577$; $df = 3,1284$; $p > .05$) on health adjustment. The data analysis rejects the null hypothesis (no: 3) and retains the null hypotheses (nos: 1,2,4,5,6 and 7).

## 3.3. Social Adjustment:

### 3.3.a. Effect of sex on social adjustment:

Means, standard deviations of the social adjustment scores for adolescent boys and girls are presented in Table 19.

The Table 20 shows that adolescent boys are socially better adjusted than adolescent girls since highest percentage (38.71) of boys are found under "good" category and highest percentage (37.72) of girls are found under "average" category. Under positive categories like "excellent" and "good", boys seem to be higher in proportion whereas under "average" and "unsatisfactory" category, girls seem to be higher in proportion. And under extreme negative category boys are higher than girls in proportion. Percentage distributions of the boys and the girls under different categories of social adjustment are presented graphically in Figure 10( P.179).

3.3.b. Effect of locus of control on social adjustment:

Below (Table 21) are given the means and standard deviations of social adjustment scores for the 'internal' and the 'external' groups.

Table - 21:

Means and Standard Deviations of Social Adjustment Scores for the 'Internal' and the 'External' Group.

| I-E Locus of Control (Score Range: 00 to 17) | Sex | N | Mean | Standard Deviations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Internals | Boys | 377 | 6.19 | 3.17 |
| (00 to 09) | Girls | 315 | 6.40 | 2.81 |
| Externals | Boys | 292 | 7.86 | 3.33 |
| (10 & above) | Girls | 316 | 8.09 | 2.91 |

Table 21 indicates that in terms of mean adjustment scores, 'internals' seem to be socially better adjusted than 'externals'. Within the 'internal' and the 'external' group, girls seem to experience more problems in their adjustment to society than the boys.

Table - 22:

Relationship between Locus of Control and Social Adjustment

| I-E Locus of Control (Score Range: 00 to 17) | | Social Adjustment | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Excellent | Good | Average | Unsatisfactory | Very unsatisfactory | |
| Internal (00 to 09) | (f) | 008 | 268 | 222 | 095 | 019 | 692 |
| | (%) | 12.72 | 38.73 | 32.08 | 13.73 | 02.74 | |
| External (10 & above) | (f) | 029 | 172 | 219 | 141 | 047 | 608 |
| | (%) | 04.77 | 28.29 | 36.02 | 23.19 | 07.73 | |
| Total | (f) | 117 | 440 | 441 | 236 | 066 | 1300 |
| | (%) | 09.00 | 33.85 | 33.92 | 18.15 | 05.08 | |
| $\chi^2 = 66.40$; df = 4; $p < .001$ | | | | | | | |

In the area of social adjustment (Table 22), highest percentage (38.73) of 'internals' (ILC) are found to be under "good" category whereas more (36.02) 'externals' (ELC) are found under "average" category. Percentages of internals are higher under the positive categories like "excellent" and "good", whereas externals are higher in proportions under the negative categories like "unsatisfactory" and "very unsatisfactory". Percentage distributions of the ILC and the ELC groups under different categories of social adjustment are graphically shown in Figure 11 (P.181).

3.3.c. Effect of purpose-in-life on social adjustment:

Presented below (Table 23) are the means and standard deviations of social adjustment scores for different PIL groups.

Table - 23:

Means and Standard Deviations of Social Adjustment Scores for the Four PIL Groups.

| Purpose-in-Life (PIL) in terms of Quartiles (Score Range: (40 to 140) | Sex | N | Means | Standard Deviations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| HPIL | Boys | 176 | 5.30 | 2.72 |
| (117 & above) | Girls | 142 | 6.20 | 2.51 |
| MHPIL | Boys | 180 | 6.31 | 2.85 |
| (107 - 116) | Girls | 141 | 6.39 | 2.64 |
| MLPIL | Boys | 158 | 7.10 | 3.03 |
| ( 95 - 106) | Girls | 171 | 7.54 | 2.70 |
| LPIL | Boys | 155 | 9.27 | 3.49 |
| ( 40 - 94) | Girls | 177 | 9.20 | 2.81 |

Results (Table 23) show that higher PIL groups are socially better adjusted than the lower PIL groups. The table further shows that within each PIL group, adolescent boys experienced less problems in their social adjustment than adolescent girls.

Table - 24:

Relationship between Purpose-in-Life and Social Adjustment.

| Purpose-in-Life (PIL) in terms of Quartiles (Score Range: 40 - 140) | | Social Adjustment | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Excellent | Good | Average | Unsatisfactory | Very unsatisfactory | |
| HPIL | (f) | 052 | 148 | 092 | 025 | 001 | 318 |
| (117 & above) | (%) | 16.35 | 46.54 | 28.93 | 07.86 | 00.31 | |
| MHPIL | (f) | 037 | 129 | 115 | 036 | 004 | 321 |
| (107 - 116) | (%) | 11.53 | 40.19 | 35.82 | 11.21 | 01.25 | |
| MLPIL | (f) | 020 | 113 | 119 | 064 | 013 | 329 |
| ( 95 - 106) | (%) | 06.08 | 34.35 | 36.17 | 19.45 | 03.95 | |
| LPIL | (f) | 008 | 050 | 115 | 111 | 048 | 332 |
| ( 40 - 94) | (%) | 02.41 | 15.06 | 34.64 | 33.43 | 14.46 | |
| Total | (f) | 117 | 440 | 441 | 236 | 066 | 1300 |
| | (%) | 09.00 | 33.85 | 33.92 | 18.15 | 05.08 | |

$\chi^2 = 249.44$; df = 12; $p < .001$

Results (Table 24) reveal that HPIL (46.54) and MHPIL (40.19) groups are better adjusted than the MLPIL and LPIL groups since highest percentages of higher PIL groups fall under "good" category, whereas highest percentages of MLPIL (36.17) and LPIL (34.64) groups seem to fall under "average" category. Under the positive categories, higher PIL groups

seem to be higher in percentage, and under negative categories, lower PIL groups seem to be higher in percentage. Percentage distributions of different PIL groups under different categories of social adjustment are graphically shown in Figure 12 (P.184).

3.3.d. Effects of sex, locus of control, and purpose-in-life on social adjustment:

Table 25 gives the main and interaction effects of sex, locus of control (LC) and purpose-in-life (PIL) on social adjustment.

Table - 25:

ANOVA of Social Adjustment Scores for the Sex, Locus of Control and Purpose-in-Life Groups.

| Source | df | SS | MS | F | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sex (A) | 1 | 24.5238 | 24.5238 | 3.085 | |
| Locus of Control (B) | 1 | 361.9282 | 361.9282 | 45.536 | * |
| Purpose-in-Life (C) | 3 | 1908.4479 | 636.1493 | 80.037 | * |
| A x B | 1 | 11.5328 | 11.5328 | 1.451 | |
| A x C | 3 | 44.5498 | 14.8499 | 1.868 | |
| B x C | 3 | 46.2523 | 15.4174 | 1.940 | |
| A x B x C | 3 | 6.8710 | 2.2903 | 0.288 | |
| Error | 1284 | 10207.0296 | 7.9494 | | |
| Total | 1299 | 12611.1354 | | | |

* $p < .01$

The data (Table 25) give a non-significant main effect of sex ($F = 3.085$; $df = 1,1284$; $p > .05$). The results further give a significant main effect of locus of control ($F = 45.536$; $df = 1,1284$; $p < .01$), and purpose-in-life ($F = 80.037$; $df = 3.1284$; $p < .01$) on social adjustment.

The results also indicate non-significant interactions of sex x LC ($F = 1.451$; $df = 1,1284$; $P > .05$), sex x PIL ($F = 1.868$; $df = 3,1284$; $P > .05$), LC x PIL ($F = 1.940$; $df = 3,1284$; $P > .05$), and sex x LC x PIL ($F = 0.288$; $df = 3,1284$; $P > .05$) on social adjustment of Bangladesh adolescents. The results advocate the rejection of null hypotheses (nos: 2, 3) and retention of null hypotheses (nos: 1,4, 5,6 and 7).

## 3.4. Emotional Adjustment:

### 3.4.a. Effect of sex on emotional adjustment:

Means, standard deviations of emotional adjustment scores for the adolescent boys and girls are presented in Table 26.

Table - 26:

Means and Standard Deviations of Emotional Adjustment Scores for Adolescent Boys and Girls.

| Sex | N | Means | Standard Deviations |
|---|---|---|---|
| Boys | 669 | 13.39 | 5.95 |
| Girls | 631 | 13.92 | 5.16 |

Table 26 shows that the boys (M = 13.39) and the girls (M = 13.92) do not differ in their adjustment to emotionality. They experience more or less equal degree of emotional problems.

Table - 27:

Relationship between Sex and Emotional Adjustment.

| Sex | | Emotional Adjustment | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Excellent | Good | Average | Unsatisfactory | Very unsatisfactory | |
| Boys | (f) | 002 | 117 | 316 | 162 | 072 | 669 |
| | (%) | 00.30 | 17.49 | 47.23 | 24.22 | 10.76 | |
| Girls | (f) | 000 | 070 | 260 | 258 | 043 | 631 |
| | (%) | 00.00 | 11.09 | 41.20 | 40.89 | 06.81 | |
| Total | (f) | 002 | 187 | 576 | 420 | 115 | 1300 |
| | (%) | 00.15 | 14.38 | 44.31 | 32.31 | 08.85 | |

$\chi^2 = 47.44$; df = 4; $p < .001$

Results (Table 27) indicate that highest percentages of both boys (47.23) and girls (41.20) seem to fall under "average" category. Under the "unsatisfactory" category girls seem to be higher in proportion and under "good" category boys seem to be higher in proportion. Neither of the groups show extreme positive emotional adjustment. Percentage distributions of the boys and the girls under different categories of emotional adjustment are graphically shown in Figure 13 (P.189).

3.4.b. Effect of locus of control on emotional adjustment:

Below (Table 28) are given the means and standard deviationsof emotional adjustment scores for the 'internal' and 'external' group.

Table - 28:

Means and Standard Deviations of Emotional Adjustment Scores for the 'Internal' and the 'External' Groups.

| I-E Locus of Control (Score Range: 00 to 17) | Sex | N | Means | Standard Deviations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Internal (00 to 09) | Boys | 377 | 12.24 | 5.77 |
| | Girls | 315 | 12.76 | 5.01 |
| External (10 and above) | Boys | 292 | 14.88 | 5.84 |
| | Girls | 316 | 15.09 | 5.03 |

Table 28 shows that the 'internals' seem to be emotionally better adjusted than the 'externals'. In terms of mean problem scores, internals experience less problems related to their emotion than 'externals'. Within each locus of control group, both boys and girls seem to experience more or less equal degree of emotional problems.

Table - 29:

Relationship between Locus of Control and Emotional Adjustment.

| I-E Locus of Control (Score Range: 00 to 17) | | Emotional Adjustment | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Excellent | Good | Average | Unsatisfactory | Very unsatisfactory | |
| Internal (00 to 09) | (f) | 001 | 135 | 323 | 194 | 039 | 692 |
| | (%) | 00.14 | 19.51 | 46.68 | 28.03 | 05.64 | |
| External (10 & above) | (f) | 001 | 052 | 253 | 226 | 076 | 608 |
| | (%) | 00.16 | 08.55 | 41.61 | 37.17 | 12.50 | |
| Total | (f) | 002 | 187 | 576 | 420 | 115 | 1300 |
| | (%) | 00.15 | 14.38 | 44.31 | 32.31 | 08.85 | |
| $\chi^2 = 54.50$; df = 4; $p < .001$ | | | | | | | |

Table 29 shows that both the groups showed a tendency toward "average" adjustment ('Internals': 46.68; 'Externals': 41.61 respectively) with 28.03 falling under "unsatisfactory" and 05.64 under "very unsatisfactory" category among the 'internals', and 37.17 under "unsatisfactory" and 12.50 under "very unsatisfactory" category among the 'externals'. Under

both the negative categories, 'externals' are found to be higher in proportion than 'internals'. Percentage distributions of the ILC and the ELC groups under different categories of emotional adjustment are shown graphically in Figure 14 (P.191).

3.4.c. Effect of purpose-in-life on emotional adjustment:

Below (Table 30) are presented the means and standard deviations of emotional adjustment scores for different PIL groups.

Table - 30:

Means, Standard Deviations of Emotional Adjustment Scores for the Four PIL Groups.

| Purpose-in-Life (PIL) in terms of Quartiles (Score Range: 40 - 140) | Sex | N | Means | Standard Deviations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| HPIL | Boys | 176 | 10.28 | 5.40 |
| (117 & above) | Girls | 142 | 11.45 | 4.85 |
| MHPIL | Boys | 180 | 12.72 | 5.21 |
| (107 - 116) | Girls | 141 | 12.69 | 4.42 |
| MLPIL | Boys | 158 | 13.98 | 5.51 |
| ( 95 - 106) | Girls | 171 | 14.25 | 4.59 |
| LPIL | Boys | 155 | 17.11 | 5.59 |
| ( 40 - 94) | Girls | 177 | 16.59 | 5.16 |

Table 30 reveals that emotional problems decrease with increase in PIL scores. It indicates that HPIL group seem to experience least emotional problems than the MHPIL group followed by MLPIL and LPIL groups.

Table - 31:

Relationship between Purpose-in-Life and Emotional Adjustment.

| Purpose-in-Life (PIL) in terms of Quartiles (Score Range: 40 - 140) | | Emotional Adjustment | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Excellent | Good | Average | Unsatisfactory | Very unsatisfactory | |
| HPIL | (f) | 001 | 095 | 153 | 058 | 011 | 318 |
| (117 & above) | (%) | 00.32 | 29.87 | 48.11 | 18.24 | 03.46 | |
| MHPIL | (f) | 001 | 050 | 165 | 092 | 013 | 321 |
| (107 - 116) | (%) | 00.31 | 15.58 | 51.40 | 28.66 | 04.05 | |
| MLPIL | (f) | 000 | 031 | 146 | 126 | 026 | 329 |
| ( 95 - 106) | (%) | 00.00 | 09.42 | 44.38 | 38.30 | 07.90 | |
| LPIL | (f) | 000 | 011 | 112 | 144 | 065 | 332 |
| ( 40 - 94) | (%) | 00.00 | 03.31 | 33.74 | 43.37 | 19.58 | |
| Total | (f) | 002 | 187 | 576 | 420 | 115 | 1300 |
| | (%) | 00.15 | 14.38 | 44.31 | 32.31 | 08.85 | |

$\chi^2 = 200.91$; df = 12; $p < .001$

Table 31 indicates that highest percentages of HPIL, MHPIL, MLPIL, groups seem to fall under "average" category whereas LPIL group is found to be highest in percentage under

"unsatisfactory" category. Higher PIL groups seem to be higher in percentage under "good" category and lower PIL groups seem to be higher in percentage under "unsatisfactory" category. The table further shows that neither the PIL groups shows extreme positive ("excellent") emotional adjustment. Percentage distributionsof different PIL groups under different categories of emotional adjustment are shown graphically in Figure 15 (P.193).

3.4.d. Effect of sex, locus of control and purpose-in-life on emotional adjustment:

The main and interaction effects of sex, locus of control (LC), and purpose-in-life (PIL) on emotional adjustment of adolescents are presented in Table 32.

Table 32

ANOVA of Emotional Adjustment Scores for Sex, Locus of Control and Purpose-in-Life Groups.

| Source | df | SS | MS | F | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sex (A) | 1 | 3.5999 | 3.5999 | 0.140 | |
| Locus of Control (B) | 1 | 975.8964 | 975.8964 | 38.087 | * |
| Purpose-in-Life (C) | 3 | 5193.4515 | 1731.1505 | 67.563 | * |
| A x B | 1 | 5.7196 | 5.7196 | 0.223 | |
| A x C | 3 | 121.7135 | 40.5712 | 1.583 | |
| B x C | 3 | 190.4092 | 63.4697 | 2.477 | |
| A x B x C | 3 | 5.5114 | 1.8371 | 0.072 | |
| Error | 1284 | 32699.8247 | 23.6229 | | |
| Total | 1299 | 39396.1262 | | | |

* $p < .01$

The data analysis (Table 32) shows a non-significant main effect of sex ($F = 0.140$; $df = 1,1284$; $P > .05$). Main effects of locus of control ($F = 38.087$; $df = 1,1284$; $P < .01$) and purpose-in-life ($F = 67.563$; $df = 3,1284$; $P < .01$) on emotional adjustment of the adolescents were found to be significant.

Interaction effects of sex x LC ($F = 0.223$; $df = 1,1284$; $P > .05$). sex x PIL ($F = 1.583$; $df = 3,1284$; $P > .05$), LC x PIL ($F = 2.477$; $df = 3,1284$; $P > .05$), and sex x LC x PIL ($F = 0.072$; $df = 3,1284$; $P > .05$) on emotional adjustment were found to be non-significant. The results (Table 32) advocate rejection of null hypotheses (nos: 2, 3) and retention of null hypotheses (nos: 1,4,5,6 and 7).

## 3.5 Educational Adjustment:

### 3.5.a. Effect of sex on educational adjustment:

Table 33 gives the means and standard deviations of educational adjustment scores for the adolescent boys and girls.

Table - 33:

Means and Standard Deviations of Educational Adjustment Scores for Adolescent Boys and Girls.

| Sex | N | Means | Standard Deviations |
|---|---|---|---|
| Boys | 669 | 7.36 | 3.48 |
| Girls | 631 | 6.00 | 3.28 |

Table 33 shows that, in terms of mean problem scores, adolescent girls (M = 6.00) seem to be better adjusted to their education than adolescent boys (M = 7.36).

Table - 34:

Relationship between Sex and Educational Adjustment.

| Sex | | Educational Adjustment | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Excellent | Good | Average | Unsatisfactory | Very unsatisfactory | |
| Boys | (f) | 011 | 151 | 335 | 153 | 019 | 669 |
| | (%) | 01.64 | 22.57 | 50.07 | 22.87 | 02.84 | |
| Girls | (f) | 026 | 213 | 263 | 104 | 025 | 631 |
| | (%) | 04.12 | 33.76 | 41.68 | 16.48 | 03.96 | |
| Total | (f) | 037 | 364 | 598 | 257 | 044 | 1300 |
| | (%) | 02.85 | 28.00 | 46.00 | 19.77 | 03.38 | |
| | $\chi^2$ = 34.38; df = 4; $p < .001$ | | | | | | |

Findings (Table 34) indicate that highest percentages of both boys (50.07) and girls (41.88) are under "average" category. Under "excellent" and "good" category of educational adjustment, girls seem to be higher in proportion. Under "unsatisfactory" category, boys seem to be higher in proportion. Percentage distributions of the boys and the girls under different categories of educational adjustment are graphically shown in Figure 16 (P.197).

3.5.b. Effect of locus of control on educational adjustment:

Given in table 35 are the means and standard deviations of educational adjustment scores for the 'internal'(ILC) and the 'external'(ELC) group.

Table - 35:

Means and Standard Deviations of Educational Adjustment Scores for the 'Internal' and the 'External' Groups.

| I-E Locus of Control (Score Range: 00 to 17) | Sex | N | Mean | Standard Deviations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Internal | Boys | 377 | 6.75 | 3.41 |
| (00 to 09) | Girls | 315 | 6.27 | 2.99 |
| External | Boys | 292 | 8.13 | 3.42 |
| (10 and above) | Girls | 316 | 6.73 | 3.38 |

Table 35 shows that the 'internals' seem to be educationally better adjusted than the 'externals'. Within both 'internal' and 'external' groups, girls seem to be better adjusted than boys in terms of mean problem scores.

Table - 36:

Relationship between Locus of Control and Educational Adjustment.

| I-E Locus of Control (Score Range: 00 to 17) | | Educational Adjustment | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Excellent | Good | Average | Unsatisfactory | Very unsatisfactory | |
| Internal (00 to 09) | (f) | 024 | 214 | 303 | 109 | 015 | 692 |
| | (%) | 03.47 | 34.83 | 43.79 | 15.75 | 02.17 | |
| External (10 & above) | (f) | 013 | 123 | 295 | 148 | 029 | 608 |
| | (%) | 02.14 | 20.23 | 48.52 | 24.34 | 04.77 | |
| Total | (f) | 037 | 364 | 598 | 257 | 044 | 1300 |
| | (%) | 02.87 | 28.00 | 46.00 | 19.77 | 03.38 | |
| $\chi^2 = 46.76$; df = 4; $p < .001$ | | | | | | | |

Table 36 indicates that highest percentages of both 'internals' (43.79) and 'externals' (48.52) are found under "average" category. As regards other categories, 'internals' (ILC) are found to be higher in proportion under positive categories and 'externals' (ELC) higher under negative categories. Percentage distributions of the ILC and the ELC groups under different categories are graphically shown in Figure 17 (P.199).

3.5.c. Effect of purpose-in-life on educational adjustment:

Means, standard deviations of educational adjustment scores for different PIL groups are shown in Table 37.

Table - 37:

Means, Standard Deviations of Educational Adjustment Scores for the Four PIL Groups.

| Purpose-in-Life (PIL) in terms of Quartiles (Score Range: 40 - 140) | Sex | N | Means | Standard Deviations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| HPIL | Boys | 176 | 5.41 | 2.61 |
| (117 & above) | Girls | 142 | 4.69 | 2.61 |
| MHPIL | Boys | 180 | 6.67 | 3.18 |
| (107 - 116) | Girls | 141 | 5.07 | 2.56 |
| MLPIL | Boys | 158 | 7.77 | 3.27 |
| ( 95 - 106) | Girls | 171 | 6.02 | 3.09 |
| LPIL | Boys | 155 | 9.95 | 3.19 |
| ( 40 to 94) | Girls | 177 | 7.77 | 3.62 |

Table 37 shows that as PIL scores increase, mean problem scores decrease. Higher the PIL score, lesser is the problem. The result (Table 37) further shows that

within each PIL group; adolescent girls seem to be better educationally adjusted than adolescent boys.

Table - 38:

Relationship between Purpose-in-Life and Educational Adjustment.

| Purpose-in-Life (PIL) in terms of Quartiles (Score Range: 40 - 140) | | Educational Adjustment | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Excellent | Good | Average | Unsatisfactory | Very unsatisfactory | |
| HPIL | (f) | 014 | 145 | 133 | 026 | 000 | 318 |
| (117 & above) | (%) | 04.40 | 45.60 | 41.82 | 08.18 | 00.00 | |
| MHPIL | (f) | 012 | 101 | 168 | 034 | 066 | 321 |
| (107 - 116) | (%) | 03.74 | 31.46 | 52.34 | 10.59 | 01.87 | |
| MLPIL | (f) | 005 | 084 | 166 | 061 | 013 | 329 |
| ( 95 - 106) | (%) | 01.52 | 25.53 | 50.46 | 18.54 | 03.95 | |
| LPIL | (f) | 006 | 034 | 131 | 136 | 025 | 332 |
| ( 40 - 94) | (%) | 01.81 | 10.24 | 39.46 | 40.96 | 07.53 | |
| Total | (f) | 037 | 364 | 598 | 257 | 044 | 1300 |
| | (%) | 02.85 | 28.00 | 46.00 | 19.77 | 03.38 | |

$\chi^2 = 220.40$; df = 12; $p < .001$

Table 38 indicates that highest percentage (45.60) of HPIL group is under "good" category whereas highest percentages of MHPIL (52.34) and MLPIL (50.46) are under "average" category

and highest percentage (40.96) of LPIL group is under "unsatisfactory" category of educational adjustment. Under positive categories i.e., "excellent" and "good", higher PIL groups seem to be higher and under negative categories i.e., "unsatisfactory" and "very unsatisfactory", lower PIL groups seem to be higher in proportion. Percentage distributions of different PIL groups under different categories of educational adjustment are graphically shown in Figure 18 (P.201).

3.5.d. Effects of sex, locus of control and purpose-in-life on educational adjustment:

The main and interaction effects of sex, locus of control, and purpose-in-life on educational adjustment of adolescents are presented in Table 39.

Table - 39:

ANOVA of Educational Adjustment Scores for Sex, Locus of Control and Purpose-in-Life Groups.

| Source | df | SS | MS | F | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sex (A) | 1 | 847.9181 | 847.9181 | 92.708 | ** |
| Locus of Control (B) | 1 | 280.9475 | 280.9475 | 30.718 | ** |
| Purpose-in-Life (C) | 3 | 2288.1967 | 762.7322 | 83.394 | ** |
| A x B | 1 | 0.6858 | 0.6858 | 0.075 | |
| A x C | 3 | 90.7017 | 30.2339 | 3.306 | * |
| B x C | 3 | 30.7511 | 10.2504 | 1.121 | |
| A x B x C | 3 | 58.8166 | 19.6055 | 2.144 | |
| Error | 1284 | 11743.5895 | 9.1461 | | |
| Total | 1299 | 15341.6070 | | | |

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

Results (Table 39) reveal significant main effects of sex ($F = 92.708$; $df = 1,1284$; $P < .01$), locus of control ($F = 30.718$; $df = 1,1284$; $P < .01$), and purpose-in-life ($F = 83.394$; $df = 3,1284$; $P < .01$) on educational adjustment of adolescents.

As regards interaction effects, sex x LC ($F = 0.075$; $df = 1,1284$; $P > .05$), LC x PIL ($F = 1,121$; $df = 3,1284$; $P > .05$), Sex x LC x PIL ($F = 2.144$; $df = 3,1284$; $P > .05$) were found to be non-significant. And interaction effect of sex x PIL on educational adjustment was significant ($F = 3.306$; $df = 3,1284$; $P < .05$). Data in Table 39 reject null hypotheses (nos: 1, 2, 3 and 5) and retain null hypotheses (nos: 4,6, and 7).

## 3.6. Total Adjustment:

### 3.6.a. Effect of sex on total adjustment:

Table 40 gives the means and standard deviations of total adjustment scores for the adolescent boys and girls.

Table - 40:

Means and Standard Deviations of Total Adjustment Scores for Adolescent Boys and Girls.

| Sex | N | Means | Standard Deviations |
|---|---|---|---|
| Boys | 669 | 36.63 | 14.56 |
| Girls | 631 | 34.96 | 12.62 |

Results (Table 40) reveal that in terms of mean problem scores, girls (M = 34.96) seem to be better adjusted than boys (M = 36.63).

Table - 41:

Relationship between Sex and Total Adjustment.

| Sex | | Total Adjustment | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Excellent | Good | Average | Unsatisfactory | Very unsatisfactory | |
| Boys | (f) | 018 | 199 | 268 | 144 | 040 | 669 |
| | (%) | 02.69 | 29.75 | 40.06 | 21.52 | 05.98 | |
| Girls | (f) | 013 | 171 | 283 | 137 | 027 | 631 |
| | (%) | 02.06 | 27.10 | 44.85 | 21.71 | 04.28 | |
| Total | (f) | 031 | 370 | 551 | 281 | 067 | 1300 |
| | (%) | 02.38 | 28.46 | 42.38 | 21.62 | 05.15 | |

$\chi^2 = 4.92$; df = 4: $p > .05$

Table 41 shows that highest percentages of both boys (40.06) and girls (44.85) are under "average" category. Boys are found to be higher in proportion under positive i.e., "good" category category. Boys and girls are almost equal in proportion under "excellent" and "unsatisfactory" category, and boys slightly higher under extreme negative i.e., "very unsatisfactory" category. Percentage distributions of the boys and the girls under different categories of total adjustment are graphically shown in Figure 19 (P.205).

3.6.b. Effect of locus of control on total adjustment.

Table 42, gives the means and standard deviations of total adjustment scores for the 'internal' and the 'external' groups.

Table - 42:

Means, Standard Deviations of Total Adjustment Scores for the 'Internal' and the 'External' Groups.

| I-E Locus of Control (Score Range: 00 to 17) | Sex | N | Means | Standard Deviations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Internal | Boys | 377 | 33.63 | 14.26 |
| (00 to 09) | Girls | 315 | 31.77 | 12.01 |
| External | Boys | 292 | 40.47 | 14.00 |
| (10 and above) | Girls | 316 | 38.21 | 13.38 |

Table 42 shows that in their overall adjustment, internally oriented adolescents seem to be better adjusted than their externally oriented counterparts. Within 'internal' and 'external' groups, adolescent girls seem to experience less problems than adolescent boys.

Table - 43:

Relationship between Locus of Control and Total Adjustment.

| I-E Locus of Control (Score Range: (00 to 17) | | Total Adjustment | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Exce- | Good | Ave- rage | Unsatis- factory | Very unsatis- factory | |
| Internal (00 to 09) | (f) | 027 | 244 | 287 | 112 | 022 | 692 |
| | (%) | 03.90 | 35.26 | 41.47 | 16.18 | 02.18 | |
| External (10 and above) | (f) | 004 | 126 | 264 | 169 | 045 | 608 |
| | (%) | 00.66 | 20.72 | 43.42 | 27.80 | 07.40 | |
| Total | (f) | 031 | 370 | 551 | 281 | 067 | 1300 |
| | (%) | 02.38 | 28.46 | 42.38 | 21.62 | 05.15 | |
| $\chi^2 = 69.98$; df = 4; $p < .001$ | | | | | | | |

Table 45 shows that most of the adolescents from both the groups fall under "average" category (Internals = 41.47; Externals = 43.42). Results also show that under the positive categories, i.e."excellent" and "good", 'internals'(ILC) are higher and under negative categories, i.e., "unsatisfactory" and "very unsatis-factory", 'externals' (ELC) are higher in proportion. Percentage distributions of the ILC and ELC groups under different categories

of total adjustment are shown graphically in Figure 20 (P.207).

3.6.c. Effect of purpose-in-life on total adjustment:

Table 44 shows the means and standard deviations of total adjustment scores for different PIL groups.

Table - 44:

Means, Standard Deviations of Total Adjustment Scores for the Four PIL Groups.

| Purpose-in-Life (PIL) in terms of Quartiles (Score Range: 40 - 140) | Sex | N | Mean | Standard Deviations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| HPIL | Boys | 176 | 27.70 | 11.62 |
| (117 & above) | Girls | 142 | 28.39 | 10.64 |
| MHPIL | Boys | 180 | 33.87 | 12.59 |
| (107 - 116) | Girls | 141 | 30.47 | 10.16 |
| MLPIL | Boys | 158 | 38.38 | 12.47 |
| ( 95 - 106) | Girls | 171 | 35.71 | 11.10 |
| LPIL | Boys | 155 | 48.14 | 13.54 |
| ( 40 to 94) | Girls | 177 | 43.21 | 12.49 |

Table 44 indicates that in terms of mean problem scores, HPIL group seems to be better adjusted than the MHPIL, MLPIL and LPIL groups. Within each PIL group, as the results (Table 44) shows, girls seem to experience less adjustment problems than boys.

Table - 45:

Relationship between Purpose-in-Life and Total Adjustment.

| Purpose-in-Life in terms of Quartiles (Score Range: 40 - 140) | | Total Adjustment | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Excellent | Good | Average | Unsatisfactory | Very unsatisfactory | |
| HPIL (117 & above) | (f) | 021 | 153 | 115 | 024 | 005 | 318 |
| | (%) | 06.60 | 48.11 | 36.16 | 07.55 | 01.57 | |
| MHPIL (107 - 116) | (f) | 005 | 112 | 159 | 040 | 005 | 321 |
| | (%) | 01.56 | 34.89 | 49.53 | 12.46 | 01.56 | |
| MLPIL ( 95 - 106) | (f) | 004 | 077 | 162 | 075 | 011 | 329 |
| | (%) | 01.22 | 23.40 | 49.24 | 22.80 | 03.34 | |
| LPIL ( 40 - 94) | (f) | 001 | 028 | 115 | 142 | 046 | 332 |
| | (%) | 00.30 | 08.43 | 34.64 | 42.77 | 13.86 | |
| Total | (f) | 031 | 370 | 551 | 281 | 067 | 1300 |
| | (%) | 02.39 | 28.46 | 42.38 | 21.62 | 05.15 | |

$\chi^2 = 322.65$; df = 12; $p < .001$

Results (Table 45) reveal that HPIL is better adjusted than the other PIL groups. High PIL group seems to be highest in percentage (48.11) under "good" category whereas highest percentage of MHPIL (49.53) and MLPIL (49.24) are found under "average" category and highest percentage of LPIL group (42.77) is found under "unsatisfactory" category. The results further

show that under positive categories, higher PIL groups seem to be higher in percentage and under negative categories, lower PIL groups seem to be higher in percentage. Percentage distributions of different PIL groups under different categories of total adjustment are graphically shown in Figure 21 ( P.209).

3.6.d. Effects of sex, locus of control, and purpose-in-life on total adjustment:

Main and interaction effects of sex, locus of control and purpose-in-life on total adjustment are presented in Table 46.

Table - 46:

ANOVA of Total Adjustment Scores for Sex, Locus of Control and Purpose-in-Life Groups.

| Source | df | SS | MS | F | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sex (A) | 1 | 2673.6758 | 2673.6758 | 19.310 | ** |
| Locus of Control (B) | 1 | 6270.2232 | 6270.2232 | 45.286 | ** |
| Purpose-in-Life (C) | 3 | 48174.9016 | 16058.3005 | 115.979 | ** |
| A x B | 1 | 8.6851 | 8.6851 | 0.063 | |
| A x C | 3 | 1349.9399 | 449.9800 | 3.250 | * |
| B x C | 3 | 658.5702 | 219.5234 | 1.585 | |
| A x B x C | 3 | 66.7430 | 22.2477 | 0.161 | |
| Error | 1284 | 177781.0770 | 138.4588 | | |
| Total | 1299 | 236983.8158 | | | |

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

Results (Table 46) revealed significant main effects of sex ($F = 19.310$; $df = 1,1284$; $P < .01$), locus of control ($F = 45.286$; $df = 1,1284$; $P < .01$), purpose-in-life ($F = 115.979$; $df = 3,1284$; $P < .01$).

Regarding interaction effects, sex x LC ($F = 0.063$; $df = 1,1284$; $P > .05$), LC x PIL ($F = 1.585$; $df = 3,1284$; $P > .05$), sex x LC x PIL ($F = 0.161$; $df = 3,1284$; $P > .05$) were found to be non-significant. Interaction effect of sex x PIL ($F = 3.250$; $df = 3,1284$; $P < .05$) on total adjustment of adolescents was found to be significant. The findings reject null hypotheses (nos: 1, 2, 3 and 5) and retain null hypotheses (nos: 4, 6 and 7).