CHAPTER - III

R E S U L T S

PART ONE:

3.1 The Effect of the Type of Limb-Injury and Amputation (Leg or Arm) on Crisis Experience.

3.2 The Effect of the Disability-Causing Situation (Accident and Illness or War) on Crisis Experience.

3.3A The Effect of the Dominant World-Hypotheses on Crisis Experience.

3.3B The Effect of the Differential Patterns of the World Hypotheses on Crisis Experience.

3.4 The Effect of the Differential Patterns of Value-Types on Crisis Experience.

PART TWO:

3.5 The Effect of the Type of Limb-Injury and Amputation (Leg or Arm) on the Problems of Adjustment.

3.6 The Effect of the Disability-Causing Situation (Accident and Illness or War) on the Problems of Adjustment.

3.7 The Effect of the Differential Patterns of the World Hypotheses on the Problems of Adjustment.

3.8 The Effect of the Differential Patterns of Value-Types on the Problems of Adjustment.

CHAPTER - III

R E S U L T S

PART ONE:

The obtained data were scored, grouped and analysed to see whether they supported the underlying theoretical assumptions and hypotheses. Complete care was taken while using the statistical procedures for analysing the data. In the analysis of the data care was also taken that the psychological meaning of the data was not lost in the process of numerical transformation and its classification.

3.1 The Effect of the Type of Limb-Injury and Amputation (leg or arm) on Crisis Experience.

To study the effect of the type of limb-injury and amputation (leg or arm) on crisis experience frequencies and percentages were calculated for both leg amputed and arm amputed groups. These frequencies and percentages are shown in Table 1.

Phase I : Shock

The results (Table 1) indicated that as compared to the LA group the AA group showed relatively greater tendency toward disturbances in self-experience (9.28) reality perception (4.95) and cognitive structure (3.59). The results also revealed that the LA and AA groups did not differ much

Table 1:

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of the Leg Amputed and Arm Amputed in Terms of the Phases and Dimensions of Crisis Experience.

Type of Injury		1. SHOCK PHASE						2. DEFENSIVE PHASE						3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT PHASE					4. ADJUSTMENT AND CHANGE PHASE							Total
		1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.6	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.6	
Leg Amp. N = 70 %= 63.63	F	123	63	108	40	36	58	99	37	91	48	34	58	130	66	117	52	48	85	97	59	73	25	30	66	1643
	P	7.48	3.83	6.57	2.44	2.19	3.54	6.06	2.25	5.54	2.92	2.07	3.54	7.91	4.01	7.12	3.16	2.92	5.17	5.90	3.60	4.44	1.52	1.83	4.02	100
Arm Amp. N=40 %=36.36	F	75	40	43	29	18	39	43	15	33	12	19	29	66	27	44	21	18	50	52	37	33	31	14	20	808
	P	9.28	4.95	5.32	3.59	2.23	4.83	5.32	1.86	4.08	1.48	2.35	3.59	8.17	3.34	5.45	2.60	2.22	6.19	6.44	4.58	4.08	3.84	1.73	2.47	100
Total N=110 %=100	F	198	103	151	69	54	97	142	52	124	60	53	87	196	93	161	73	66	135	149	96	106	56	44	86	2451
	P	8.07	4.20	6.16	2.81	2.20	3.96	5.79	2.12	5.06	2.45	2.16	3.55	8	3.79	6.57	2.98	2.69	5.51	6.08	3.92	4.32	2.28	1.79	3.51	100

1.1 Self experience at the shock phase.

1.2 Reality perception at the shock phase.

1.3 Emotional experience at the shock phase.

1.4 Cognitive structures at the shock phase.

1.5 Physical disability at the shock phase.

1.6 Attitude towards help and sympathy at the shock phase

2.1 Self experience at the defensive retreat phase.

2.2 Reality perception at the defensive retreat phase.

2.3 Emotional experience at the defensive retreat phase.

2.4 Cognitive structure at the defensive retreat phase.

2.5 Physical disability at the defensive retreat phase.

2.6 Attitude towards help and sympathy at the defensive retreat phase.

3.1 Self experience at the Acknowledgement phase.

3.2 Reality perception at the Acknowledgement phase

3.3 Emotional experience at the Acknowledgement phase.

3.4 Cognitive structure at the Acknowledgement phase.

3.5 Physical disability at the Acknowledgement phase.

3.6 Attitude towards help and sympathy at the Acknowledgement phase.

4.1 Self experience at the Adjustment and change phase.

4.2 Reality perception at the Adjustment and change phase.

4.3 Emotional experience at the Adjustment and change phase.

4.4 Cognitive structure at the Adjustment and change phase.

4.5 Physical disability at the Adjustment and change phase.

4.6 Attitude towards help and sympathy at the Adjustment and change phase.

For details refer to the Coding Manual in Appendix - C.

in their attitude toward physical disability (2.19, 2.23). The AA group were found to have relatively more disturbed attitude toward help and sympathy (4.83) as compared to the LA group (3.54) during the shock phase.

Phase II : Defensive Retreat (Denial)

Table 1 showed that the LA group had greater tendency toward disturbances in self-experience (6.03), reality perception (2.25), emotional experience (5.54) and cognitive structure (2.92) as compared to the AA group. The AA group was found to have relatively more defensive attitude (2.35) toward their physical disability as compared to the LA group. It was also observed that both the LA and AA groups did not differ much in their attitude toward help and sympathy at this phase.

Phase III : Acknowledgement (Renewed stress)

The results revealed (Table 1) that AA group showed relatively greater tendency toward disturbances in self-experience (8.17) as compared to the LA group. The LA group as compared to the AA group revealed greater tendency toward disturbances in reality perception (4.01) emotional experiemce (7.12) and cognitive structure (3.16). It was also observed that both LA and AA groups expressed equal acceptance of their physical disability but AA group showed more positive attitude toward help and sympathy (6.19) as compared to the LA group.

Phase IV : Adjustment and change

The results pointed out (Table 1) that the AA group had greater tendency towards establishing positive self-structure (6.44) and they were also found to have relatively better reality perception (4.58) as well as cognitive structure (3.84) as compared to the LA group. The LA group showed relatively more emotional adjustment (4.44), acceptance of physical disability (1.83) and also expressed positive attitude towards help and sympathy (4.02) as compared to the AA group.

Table 2 :

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of the Disabled-Civilians and the War-Disabled in Terms of the Phases and Dimensions of Crisis Experience.

		1. SHOCK PHASE								2. DEFENSIVE PHASE				3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT PHASE						4. ADJUSTMENT AND CHANGE PHASE						
		1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.6	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.6	Total
Disabled-Civilians N = 70 %= 63.63	F	143	65	97	49	35	60	82	32	92	36	44	60	97	51	99	46	48	84	104	55	69	42	31	52	1576
	P	9.07	4.13	6.15	3.11	2.22	3.81	5.21	2.03	5.84	2.28	2.79	3.81	6.15	3.23	6.28	2.92	3.04	5.33	6.60	3.68	4.38	2.66	1.97	3.30	100
War-Disabled N = 40 %= 36.36	F	54	39	54	19	19	28	61	20	32	24	9	29	102	43	62	25	19	50	50	38	36	14	14	34	875
	P	6.17	4.46	6.17	2.17	2.17	3.20	6.97	2.28	3.66	2.74	1.03	3.82	11.66	4.92	7.09	2.86	2.17	5.71	5.71	3.34	4.12	1.60	1.60	3.89	100
Total N = 110 %= 100	F	197	104	151	68	54	88	143	52	124	60	53	89	199	94	161	71	67	134	154	96	105	56	45	86	2451
	P	8.04	4.24	6.16	2.77	2.20	3.59	5.83	2.12	5.06	2.45	2.16	3.63	8.12	3.83	6.57	2.90	2.73	5.47	6.28	3.92	4.28	2.28	1.83	3.51	99.97

3.2 The Effect of the Disability-Causing Situation (Accident, illness or War) on Crisis Experience.

Given in Table 2 are the frequencies and percentage of responses for disabled-civilians and war disabled people analysed in terms of phases and dimensions of crisis experience.

Phase I : Shock

As is shown in Table 2 the DC group showed greater tendency toward disturbances in self-experience (9.07) and cognitive structure (3.11) as compared to the WD group. It was found that both the DC and WD groups did not differ much in regard to their experiences of reality perception (4.13, 4.46) disturbances in emotional experience (6.15,6.17) and attitude toward physical disability (2.22,2.17) but the DC group showed relatively more disturbed attitude toward help and sympathy (3.81) as compared to the WD group during the shock phase.

Phase II : Defensive Retreat (Denial)

The results (Table 2) also indicate that the WD group showed greater tendency toward disturbances in self-experience (6.97) and reality perception (2.28) as compared to the DC group. However the DC group showed greater degree of emotional disturbances (5.84) while both the DC and WD

groups did not differ in their cognitive experience (2.28, 2.74). The DC group showed more defensive attitude toward physical disability (2.79). The results also showed that both the groups DC and WD did not differ much in their attitude toward help and sympathy (3.81,3.32) during this phase.

Phase III : Acknowledgement (Renewed stress)

The results (Table 2) showed that the WD group showed relatively greater tendency toward disturbances in self-experience (11.66) as compared to the DC group. The WD group also revealed relatively more acceptance of reality (4.92) but still showed more disturbed emotional experience (7.08) as compared to the DC group. The DC group showed relatively better organized cognitive structure (2.92) and acceptance of their physical disability (3.04) as compared to the WD group. The results also found that WD group had relatively more positive attitude toward help and sympathy (5.71) as compared to the DC group during this phase.

Phase IV : Adjustment and change

As is seen from Table 2 the DC group showed greater tendency toward positive self-experience (6.60) and revealed relatively more emotional adjustment(4.38) they also were found to have more organized and balanced cognitive structure (2.66)

and more acceptance of their physical disability (1.97) as compared to those of the WD group. The WD group showed relatively better reality perception (4.34) and also more positive attitude toward help and sympathy (3.89) as compared to the CD group, during the adjustment phase.

Table 3 :

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of the Dominant World-Hypotheses Groups in Terms of the Phases and Dimensions of Crisis Experience.

Type of World-Hypotheses		1. SHOCK PHASE						2. DEFENSIVE PHASE						3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT PHASE						4. ADJUSTMENT AND CHANGE PHASE						Total
		1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.6	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.6	
Formists N=24 %=21.82	F	49	22	32	10	9	17	28	8	22	7	11	22	37	26	33	16	12	30	35	19	21	7	9	15	497
	P	9.86	4.43	6.44	2.01	1.81	3.42	5.63	1.61	4.43	1.41	2.21	4.43	7.44	5.23	6.64	3.22	2.41	6.04	7.04	3.82	4.22	1.41	1.81	3.02	100
Mechanicists N=27 %=24.54	F	36	26	44	16	14	25	28	11	31	13	14	20	57	25	34	19	14	36	35	21	26	15	15	15	580
	P	6.21	4.48	7.59	2.76	2.41	4.31	4.83	1.90	5.34	2.24	2.41	3.45	9.83	2.59	5.86	3.27	2.41	6.21	6.03	3.62	4.48	2.59	2.59	2.59	100
Organicists N=22 %=20	F	43	25	32	16	12	19	31	13	25	25	16	18	41	15	39	14	15	27	25	31	25	14	11	21	563
	P	7.64	4.44	5.68	2.84	2.13	3.37	5.51	2.31	6.22	4.44	2.84	3.20	7.28	2.66	6.93	2.49	2.66	4.79	4.44	5.51	4.44	2.49	1.95	3.73	100
Contextualists N=18 %=16.36	F	37	18	29	10	10	10	29	10	20	14	2	6	36	16	27	9	11	26	26	11	21	5	8	21	414
	P	8.94	4.35	7.00	2.41	2.41	2.41	7.00	2.41	4.83	3.38	0.48	1.45	8.70	4.35	6.52	2.17	2.66	6.28	6.28	2.66	5.07	1.21	1.93	5.07	99.97
*Unclassified Group N=19 %=17.27	F	31	13	14	17	9	17	27	10	16	6	11	23	29	19	26	13	13	15	28	14	14	16	5	11	397
	P	7.81	3.27	3.53	4.28	2.27	4.28	6.80	2.52	4.03	1.51	2.77	5.79	7.30	4.78	6.55	3.27	3.27	3.78	7.05	3.53	3.53	4.03	1.26	2.77	100
Total N=110 %=100	F	196	104	151	69	54	88	143	52	124	65	54	89	200	93	159	71	65	134	149	96	107	57	48	83	2451
	P	8.00	4.24	6.16	2.81	2.20	3.59	5.83	2.12	5.06	2.65	2.20	3.63	8.16	3.79	6.49	2.90	2.65	5.47	6.08	3.92	4.36	2.32	1.96	3.39	100

* Unclassified Group : The subjects who had equal scores on two World-Hypothesis were described as unclassified group.

3.3 A. The Effect of the Dominant World-Hypotheses on Crisis Experience.

Presented in Table 3 are the responses (Frequencies and percentages) of the dominant world-hypotheses groups : The Formist, Mechanicist, Organicist, Contextualist and the unclassified groups analysed in terms of the phases and dimensions of the crisis experience.

Phase I : Shock

The results (Table 3) indicates that the Formist group showed relatively more disturbances in self-experience (9.86) as compared to the Mechanicist, Organicist and the Contextualist and the unclassified groups. The Mechanicist and Contextualist groups were found to have relatively more disturbances in emotional experience (7.59,7.00) as compared to the Formists Organicists and the unclassified groups. The unclassified group showed more disturbances in the cognitive structure (4.28) ascompared to the Formists, Mechanicists, Organicists and the Contextualists. Relatively less disturbances in the attitude toward physical disability were found in the Formist group (1.81) as compared to the Mechanicist, Organicist, Contextualist and the unclassified groups. The Mechanicist and the unclassified groups showed more disturbances in the attitude toward help and sympathy (4.31,4.28) as compared to the Formist, Organicist and the Contextualist groups.

Phase II : Defensive Retreat (Denial)

Table 3 indicates that the contextualist and the unclassified groups showed relatively more disturbances in self-experience (7.00,6.80) as compared to the Formist, Mechanicist and the Organicist groups. The Organicist, Contextualist and the unclassified groups were found to be more defensive in their attitude toward reality perception (2.31, 2.41,2.52) as compared to the Formist and the Mechanicist groups. The Organicist and the Mechanicist showed more disturbances in emotional experience (6.22,5.34) as compared to the Formist, Contextualist and the unclassified groups. The Formist and the unclassified groups showed relatively less disturbances in the cognitive structure (1.41,1.51) as compared to the Mechanicist, Organicist and the Contextualist groups. The Contextualist group showed less disturbances in their attitude toward physical disability. as well as help and sympathy (0.48,1.45) as compared to the Formist, Mechanicist, Organicist and unclassified groups.

Phase III : Acknowledgement (Renewed stress)

The results (Table 3) indicated that the Mechanicist and the Contextualist groups showed relatively greater tendency toward disturbances in self-experience (9.83,8.70) as compared to the Formist, Organicist and the unclassified groups.The Formist, Contextualist and the unclassified groups

revealed relatively more acceptance of reality (5.23, 4.35, 4.78) as compared to the Mechanicist and the Organicist groups. The results also showed that all the groups, Formist, Mechanicist, Organicist, Contextualist and the unclassified groups did not differ much in their emotional experiences (6.64, 5.86, 6.92, 6.52, 6.55), cognitive structure (3.22, 3.27, 2.49, 2.17, 3.27) as well as attitude toward their physical disability (2.41, 2.41, 2.66, 2.66, 3.27). The Formist, Mechanicist and the Contextualist had relatively more positive attitude toward help and sympathy (6.04, 6.21, 6.28) as compared to the Organicist and the unclassified groups during this phase.

Phase IV : Adjustment and change

As is seen from (Table 3) the Formist, Mechanicist, Contextualist and the unclassified groups showed greater tendency toward positive self-experience (7.04, 6.03, 6.28, 7.05) as compared to the organicist group. The organicist group showed relatively more reality perception (5.51) as compared to the Formist, Mechanicist, Contextualist and the unclassified groups. All the groups i.e. Formist, Mechanicist, Organicist, Contextualist and the unclassified did not differ much in their emotional experiemce (4.22, 4.48, 4.44, 5.07) cognitive structure (1.41, 2.59, 2.49, 1.21) as well as attitude toward physical disability (1.81, 2.59, 1.95, 1.93, 1.26). The contextualist group showed more positive attitude

toward help and sympathy (5.07) as compared to the Formist, Mechanicist, Organicist, and the unclassified groups during this phase.

Table 4:

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of the Dominant Formists in Terms of the Phases and Dimensions of the Crisis Experience.

		1. SHOCK PHASE						2. DEFENSIVE PHASE						3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT PHASE						4. ADJUSTMENT AND CHANGE PHASE						
		1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.6	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.6	Total
FO N = 9 %= 37.5	F	14	10	6	8	1	5	13	1	8	3	5	8	11	14	14	6	1	16	12	6	10	4	6	4	186
	P	7.53	5.38	3.23	4.30	0.53	2.69	6.99	0.53	4.30	1.61	2.69	4.30	5.91	7.53	7.53	3.23	0.53	8.60	6.45	3.23	5.38	2.15	3.23	2.15	100
FM N = 9 %= 37.5	F	25	8	14	2	2	5	10	2	9	2	4	8	12	6	9	6	7	10	16	8	4	2	3	9	183
	P	13.66	4.37	7.65	1.09	1.09	2.73	5.46	1.09	4.92	1.09	2.18	4.37	6.56	3.28	4.92	3.28	3.82	5.46	8.74	4.37	2.18	1.09	1.64	4.92	100
FC N = 6 %= 25.00	F	10	4	12	0	6	7	5	5	5	2	2	6	14	6	10	4	4	4	7	5	7	1	0	2	128
	P	7.81	3.12	9.37	0	4.69	5.47	3.91	3.91	3.91	1.56	1.56	4.69	10.94	4.69	7.81	3.12	3.12	3.12	5.47	3.91	5.47	0.78	0	1.56	100
Total N = 24 %= 100.	F	49	22	32	10	9	17	28	8	22	7	11	22	37	26	33	16	12	30	35	19	21	7	9	15	497
	P	9.86	4.43	6.44	2.01	1.81	3.42	5.63	1.61	4.43	1.41	2.21	4.43	7.44	5.23	6.64	3.22	2.41	6.04	7.04	3.82	4.22	1.41	1.81	3.02	100

3.3B The Effect of Differential Patterns of World Hypotheses on Crisis Experience. The Formist Group.

Presented in Table 3 are the responses (Frequencies and Percentages) of the dominant Formist group analysed in terms of the phases and dimensions of the crisis experience.

Phase I : Shock

Table 4 indicate that the FM group showed relatively more disturbances in self-experience (13.66) as compared to the FD and FC groups. The FD group showed relatively more disturbed reality perception (5.38) and cognitive structure (4.30) as compared to the FM and FC groups. The FC group showed relatively more disturbances in emotional experience (9.37) as compared to the FD and FM groups. Relatively more disturbances in the attitude toward physical disability (4.69) as well as the attitude towards help and sympathy (5.47) were found in the FC group as compared to the FM and FD groups during this phase.

Phase II : Defensive Retreat (Denial)

The results (Table 4) also showed that the FD and FM groups had greater tendency towards disturbances in self-experience (6.99 , 5.46) as compared to the FC group. The FC group was found to be more defensive in their attitude toward reality perception (3.91). The FM people showed relatively more

disturbed emotional experience (4.92) as compared to the FO and FC groups. All the three groups i.e. FO , FM and FC did not differ much in their attitude toward physical disability (2.69 , 2.18 , 1.56) as well as help and sympathy (4.30 , 4.37 , 4.69) during this phase.

Phase III : Acknowledgement

As is seen from Table 4 the FC group was found to have greater tendency toward disturbances in self-experience(10.94) as compared to the FO and FM groups. The FO group showed greater tendency towards disturbances in reality perception (7.53) as compared to the FM and FC groups. The FO and FC groups indicated relatively more disturbances in emotional experience (7.53 , 7.81) than the FM group. All the three groups i.e. FO , FM and FC were not found to differ significantly in regard to their cognitive experiences (3.23 , 3.28 , 3.12). The FM and FC groups showed more acceptance of their physical disability (3.82 , 3.12) as compared to the FO group. The FO group showed relatively more positive attitude towards help and sympathy (8.60) than the FM and FC groups at this phase.

Phase IV : Adjustment and change

In the adjustment phase it was found that the FM group had greater tendency towards positive self-experience (8.74) and reality perception (4.37) as compared to the FO and FC groups. The FO and FC groups revealed more emotional adjustment

(5.38 , 5.47) as compared to the FM group. The FO and FM groups were found to have more balanced and organized cognitive structure (2.15 , 1.09) as well as more positive attitude towards their physical disability (3.23 , 1.64) as compared to the FC group. The FM group also showed more positive attitude towards help and sympathy (4.92) as compared to the FO and FC group during the adjustment phase.

Table 5 :

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of the Dominant Mechanicists in Terms of the Phases and Dimensions of Crisis Experience.

		1. SHOCK PHASE						2. DEFENSIVE PHASE						3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT PHASE			4. ADJUSTMENT AND CHANGE PHASE								
		1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.6	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.6	Total
MO N = 8 %= 29.63	F	12	12	17	5	4	6	5	3	5	5	4	3	25	4	11	7	8	11	10	3	13	3	0	4	160
	P	7.57	6.67	9.45	2.77	2.22	3.33	2.77	1.67	2.77	2.77	2.22	1.67	13.89	2.22	6.11	3.89	4.45	6.11	5.56	1.67	7.23	1.67	0	2.22	100
MF N = 7 %= 25.92	F	9	7	11	2	4	11	5	4	4	3	5	4	10	5	10	2	1	10	7	3	2	2	5	1	127
	P	7.08	5.51	8.66	1.57	3.15	8.66	3.94	3.15	3.15	2.36	3.94	3.15	7.87	3.94	7.87	1.57	0.79	7.87	5.51	2.36	1.57	1.57	3.94	0.79	99.97
MC N = 12 %= 44.44	F	15	7	16	9	6	8	18	4	22	5	5	13	22	6	13	10	5	15	18	15	11	10	10	10	275
	P	5.49	2.56	5.86	3.30	2.20	2.94	6.61	1.46	8.05	1.83	1.83	4.76	8.05	2.20	4.76	3.66	1.83	5.49	6.61	5.49	4.03	3.66	3.66	3.66	99.99
Total N = 27 %= 99.99	F	36	26	44	16	14	25	28	11	31	13	14	20	57	15	34	19	14	36	35	21	26	15	15	15	580
	P	6.21	4.48	7.59	2.76	2.41	4.31	4.83	1.90	5.34	2.24	2.41	3.45	9.83	2.59	5.86	3.27	2.41	6.21	6.03	3.62	4.48	2.59	2.59	2.59	100

3.4 The Effect of Differential Patterns of World-Hypotheses on Crisis Experience: The Mechanicist Group.

Given in Table 5 are the responses (Frequencies and percentages) of the dominant Mechanicist group analysed in terms of phases and dimensions of crisis experience.

Phase I : Shock

As is indicated in Table 5 the MF group revealed relatively more disturbances in self-experience (7.08) as compared to the MO and MC groups. The MO and MF groups revealed relatively more tendency toward disturbances in reality perception (6.67,5.51) and emotional experiences (9.45,8.66) than the MC group. However, the MC group was found to have comparatively more disturbances (3.30) in cognitive structure than the MO and MF groups. The MF group showed more disturbed attitude towards their physical disability (3.15) as well as attitude towards help and sympathy (8.66) as compared to the MO and MC groups.

Phase II : Defensive Retreat (Denial)

The results in (Table 5) also showed that the MC group had greater tendency toward disturbances in self-experience (6.61) and emotional experience (8.05) as compared to the MO and MF groups. However the MF group was found to be more disturbed (defensive) in regard to the reality perception(3.15) as compared to the MO and MC groups. The MO and MF groups

showed relatively more disturbed cognitive structure (2.77, 2.36) and their attitude toward physical disability (2.22, 3.94) as compared to the MC group. The MC and MF groups revealed relatively more disturbed attitude towards help and sympathy (4.76 , 3.15) as compared to the MO group during this phase.

Phase III : Acknowledgement

The results (Table 5) indicated that the MO group had greater tendency toward positive self-experience (13.89) as compared to the MF and MC groups. The MF group showed relatively renewed reality perception (3.94) and emotional experience (7.87) as compared to the MO and MC groups. However, the MO and MC groups revealed more balanced and organized cognitive structure (3.89 , 3.66) and more positive attitude towards physical disability (4.45 , 1.83) as compared to the MF group. The MF group was found to have relatively more positive attitude toward help and sympathy (7.87) as compared to the MO and MC groups during this phase.

Phase IV : Adjustment and change

The results (Table 5) also showed that the MC group had relatively greater tendency toward positive self-experience (6.61) and reality perception (5.49) as compared to the MO and MF groups. The MO group showed relatively more emotional

adjustment (7.23) as compared to the MF and MC groups. The MC group was found to have more organized and integrated cognitive structure (3.66) as compared to the MO and MF groups. The MF and MC groups showed relatively more acceptance of their physical disability (3.99 , 3.66) as compared to the MO group. The MC and MO groups were found to have more positive attitude toward help and sympathy (3.66 , 2.22) as compared to the MF group during the adjustment phase.

Table 5 :

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of the Dominant Orgaricists in Terms of the Phases and Dimensions of Crisis Experience.

		1. SHOCK PHASE						2. DEFENSIVE PHASE						3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT PHASE					4. ADJUSTMENT AND CHANGE PHASE							
		1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.6	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.6	Total
OF N=10 %=45.45	F	24	11	18	[illegible]	4	13	7	8	23	9	4	10	16	8	19	8	8	9	12	19	6	3	6	7	257
	P	9.34	4.28	7.00	1.94	1.56	5.06	2.72	3.11	8.95	3.50	1.56	3.89	6.22	3.11	7.39	3.11	3.11	3.50	4.67	7.39	2.33	1.17	2.33	2.72	100
OM N=7 %= 31.82	F	10	5	10	4	5	4	14	4	9	9	10	6	15	4	7	3	5	11	9	6	15	5	4	9	183
	P	5.46	2.73	5.46	2.18	2.73	2.18	7.65	2.18	4.92	4.92	5.46	3.28	8.20	2.18	3.82	1.64	2.73	6.01	4.92	3.28	8.20	2.73	2.18	4.92	100
OC N=5 %=22.93	F	9	9	4	7	3	2	10	1	3	7	2	2	10	3	13	3	2	7	4	6	4	6	1	5	123
	P	7.31	7.31	3.25	5.69	2.44	1.63	8.13	0.81	2.44	5.69	1.63	1.63	8.13	2.44	10.57	2.44	1.63	5.69	3.25	4.88	3.25	4.88	0.81	4.06	100
Total N = 22 %= 100	F	43	25	32	16	12	19	31	13	35	25	16	18	41	15	39	14	15	27	25	31	25	14	11	21	563
	P	7.64	4.44	5.68	2.84	2.13	3.37	5.51	2.31	6.22	4.44	2.84	3.20	7.28	2.66	6.93	2.49	2.66	4.79	4.44	5.51	4.44	2.49	1.95	3.73	100

3.5 The Effect of the Differential Patterns of World Hypotheses on Crisis Experience. The Organicist Group.

Given in Table 6 are the responses (Frequencies and percentages) of the dominant organicist group analysed in terms of phases and dimensions of crisis experience.

Phase I : Shock

The results (Table 6) indicated that the OF groups showed greater tendency toward disturbances in self experience (9.34) and emotional experience (7.00) as compared to the OM and OC groups. The OC group revealed more disturbances in reality perception (7.31) and cognitive structure (5.69) as compared to the OF and OM groups. It was seen that all the three OF , OM and OC groups did not differ much in regard to their attitude towards physical disability (1.56 , 2.73 , 2.44). The OF group showed more resistances towards help and sympathy (5.06) as compared to the OM and OC groups during this phase.

Phase II: Defensive Retreat (Denial)

It was observed that during this phase of the crisis experience the OC and OM groups (Table 6) showed greater tendency toward disturbances in self-experience (8.13 , 7.65) as compared to the OF group. The OF and OM groups revealed more disturbed reality perception (3.11 , 2.18) and emotional experience (8.95 , 4.92) as compared to the OC group. The OC

and OM groups indicated relatively more disorganised cognitive structure (5.69,4.92) as compared to the OF group. It was seen that the OM group showed relatively more defensive attitude in regard to their physical disability (5.46) as compared to the OF and OC groups. The OF and OM groups were found to have more defensive attitude toward help and sympathy (3.89,3.28) as compared to the OC group during this phase.

Phase III : Acknowledgement (Renewed Stress)

The results (Table 6) showed that the OM and OC groups had greater tendency toward disturbances in self-experience (8.20,8.13) as compared to the OF group. The OF group revealed relatively better reality perception (3.11) as compared to OM and OC groups. The OC group showed relatively more disturbed emotional experience (10.57) as compared to the OF and OM groups. The OF group indicated relatively more balanced and organized cognitive structure (3.11) as well as acceptance of their physical disability (3.11) as compared to the OM and OC groups. The OM and OC people were found to have relatively more positive attitude towards help and sympathy (6.01,5.69) as compared to the OF group during this phase.

Phase IV : Adjustment and change

As is indicated in (Table 6) the OF and OM groups showed greater tendency toward positive self-experience(4.67, 4.92) compared to the OC group. The OF group also revealed

more clear reality perception (7.39) as compared to the OM and OC groups. The OM group showed relatively more emotional adjustment (8.20) than the OF and OC groups. The OC group was found to have more integrated cognitive structure (4.88) as compared to the OF and OM groups. The OF and OM groups expressed more acceptance of their physical disability (2.33,2.18) as compared to the OC group. The OM and OC groups revealed more positive attitude towards help and sympathy (4.92,4.06) as compared to the OF group during the adjustment phase.

Table 7 :

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of the Dominant Contextualists in Terms of the Phases and Dimensions of Crisis Experience.

		1. SHOCK PHASE						2. DEFENSIVE PHASE						3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT PHASE						4. ADJUSTMENT AND CHANGE PHASE						
		1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.6	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.6	Total
CO N = 6 %= 33.33	F	13	8	4	4	5	2	16	1	6	7	0	1	12	7	9	3	4	9	6	1	6	3	3	10	140
	P	9.28	5.71	2.86	2.86	3.57	1.43	11.43	0.71	4.28	5.00	0	0.71	8.57	5	6.43	2.14	2.86	6.43	4.28	0.71	4.28	2.14	2.14	7.14	99.96
CM N=4 %=22.22	F	10	5	10	3	3	3	5	0	7	1	1	1	5	3	6	3	3	4	12	5	7	2	0	5	104
	P	9.61	4.81	9.61	2.88	2.88	2.88	4.81	0	6.73	0.96	0.96	0.96	4.81	2.88	5.77	2.88	2.88	3.85	11.54	4.81	6.73	1.92	0	4.81	99.97
CF N=8 %=44.44	F	14	5	15	3	2	5	8	9	7	6	1	4	19	8	12	3	4	13	8	5	8	0	5	6	170
	P	8.23	2.94	8.82	1.76	1.18	2.94	4.70	5.29	4.12	3.53	0.59	2.35	11.18	4.70	7.06	1.76	2.35	7.65	4.70	2.94	4.70	0	2.94	3.53	99.96
Total N=18 %= 100	F	37	18	29	10	10	10	29	10	20	14	2	6	36	18	27	9	11	26	26	11	21	5	8	21	414
	P	8.94	4.35	7.00	2.41	2.41	2.41	7.00	2.41	4.83	3.38	0.48	1.45	8.70	4.35	6.52	2.17	2.66	6.28	6.28	2.66	5.07	1.21	1.93	5.07	99.97

3.6 The Effect of Differential Patterns of World Hypotheses on Crisis Experience. The Contextualist Group.

Given in Table 7 are the responses (Frequencies and percentages) of the dominant contextualist group analysed in terms of phases and dimension of the crisis experience.

Phase I : Shock

As indicated in (Table 7) the results showed that the CO and CM groups had greater tendency towards disturbances in self-experience (9.28,9.61) and reality perception (5.71,4.81) as compared to the CF group. Both the CM and CF groups were found to have relatively greater tendency towards disturbance in emotional experience (9.61,8.82) as compared to the CO group. It was found that the CO and CM groups were almost equally disturbed in the cognitive structure (2.86,2.88) as compared to the CF group. Whereas the CO and CM groups did not reveal much differences in their attitude toward physical disability (3.57,2.88) the CF group did (1.18). The CF and CM groups showed comparatively more disturbed attitude towards help and sympathy (2.94,2.88) than the CO group during the shock phase.

Phase II : Defensive Retreat (Denial)

The table 7 also indicated that the CO group had relatively greater tendency towards disturbance in self-experience (11.43) as compared to the CM and CFgroups . The CF

group revealed more disturbed reality (denial) perception (5.29) as compared to the CO and CM groups. The CM group was found to have more disturbed emotional experience (6.73) as compared to the CO and CF groups. The CF group showed more disorganized cognitive structure (3.53) as compared to the CO and CM groups. All the three groups CO, CM and CF did not differ much in regard to their attitude towards physical disability. The CF group showed relatively more disturbed attitude towards help and sympathy (2.35) then the CO and CM groups during this phase.

Phase III : Acknowledgement

The results (Table 7) indicated that the CF group revealed greater tendency towards disturbances in self-experience (11.18) reality perception (4.70) and emotional experience (7.06) as compared to the CO and CM groups. While the CO and CM groups revealed relatively more disturbances in cognitive structure (2.14,2.88) the CF group did not. The results also showed that all the three groups i.e. CO , CM and CF were found to have more or less similar attitude toward physical disability (2.86,2.88,2.35). The CF and CO groups showed relatively more positive attitude toward help and sympathy (7.65,6.43) than the CM group.

Phase IV : Adjustment and change

The Table (no.7) revealed that the CM group had relatively greater tendency toward positive self-experience

(11.54). This group was also found to have better reality perception (4.81) as well as emotional adjustment (6.73) compared to the CO and CF groups. It was seen that the CO and CM groups indicated relatively more balanced and organized cognitive structure (2.14,1.92) as compared to the CF group. The CO and CF groups expressed more acceptance of their physical disability (2.14,2.94) as compared to the CM group. The CO group indicated more positive attitude toward help and sympathy (7.14) whereas the CM and CF groups did not during the adjustment phase.

Table 8 :

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of the Unclassified World Hypotheses Group in Terms of the Phases and Dimensions of Crisis Experience.

		1. SHOCK PHASE						2 DEFENSIVE PHASE						3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT PHASE						4. ADJUSTMENT AND CHANGE PHASE						
		1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.6	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.6	Total
FC N = 4 %=21.05	F	7	2	2	2	0	2	4	2	4	1	0	7	5	2	4	2	6	2	4	3	1	2	1	4	69
	P	10.14	2.90	2.90	2.90	0	2.90	5.80	2.90	5.80	1.44	0	10.14	7.25	2.90	5.80	2.90	8.70	2.90	5.80	4.35	1.44	2.90	1.44	5.80	100
FN N = 7 %=36.84	F	13	3	5	5	5	8	14	6	4	3	7	9	15	5	10	5	1	6	12	5	4	8	1	6	160
	P	8.12	1.88	3.12	3.12	3.12	5.00	8.75	3.75	2.5	1.88	4.38	5.62	9.38	3.12	6.25	3.12	0.62	3.75	7.5	3.12	2.5	5.00	0.62	3.75	100
OC N=6 %=26.31	F	6	6	6	7	0	5	9	2	7	1	3	3	4	8	6	5	5	5	8	4	5	3	2	4	114
	P	5.26	5.26	5.26	6.14	0	4.38	7.90	1.75	6.14	0.87	2.63	2.63	3.51	7.01	5.26	4.38	4.38	4.38	7.01	3.51	4.38	2.63	1.75	3.51	100
MO N=3 %=15.79	F	5	2	1	3	4	2	0	0	1	1	1	4	5	4	6	1	1	2	4	2	4	3	1	1	54
	P	8.62	3.45	1.72	5.17	6.90	3.45	0	0	1.72	1.72	1.72	6.90	8.62	6.90	10.34	1.72	1.72	3.45	6.90	3.45	6.90	5.17	1.72	1.72	100
Total N=19 %=100	F	31	13	14	17	9	17	27	10	16	6	11	23	29	19	26	13	13	15	28	14	14	16	5	15	397
	P	7.73	3.24	3.49	4.24	4.24	4.24	6.73	2.49	3.99	1.50	2.74	5.73	7.23	4.74	6.48	3.24	3.24	3.74	6.98	3.49	3.49	3.99	1.25	3.74	100

3.7 The Effect of Differential Patterns of World Hypotheses on Crisis Experience. The Unclassified Group.

Presented in Table 8 are the responses (Frequencies and percentages) of the unclassified groups analysed in terms of phases and dimensions of crisis experience.

Phase I : Shock

The results (Table 8) indicated that the FC group showed greater tendency toward disturbances in self-experience (10.14) whereas the FM and MO groups showed relatively more (8.12,8.62) and the OC group did not show much disturbances in self-experience (5.26) during the shock phase. The OC and MO groups revealed more disturbances in reality perception (5.26,3.45) as compared to the FC and FM groups. The OC and FM groups showed more emotional disturbances (5.26,3.12) as compared to the FC and MO groups. The OC and MO groups indicated more disturbed cognitive structure (6.14,5.17) as compared to the FC and FM groups. It was found that the MO and FM groups showed more disturbed attitude toward their physical disability (6.90,3.12) as compared to the FC and OC groups. The FM and OC groups showed more resistances toward help and sympathy (5.00,4.38) as compared to the FC and MO groups at this phase.

Phase II : Defensive Retreat (Denial)

As is indicated in (Table 8) the FM, OC and FC groups were found to have greater disturbances in self-experience

(8.75,7.90,5.80) as compared to the MO group. The FM and FC groups also revealed relatively more disturbed attitude toward reality perception (3.75,2.90) as compared to the OC and MO groups. It was seen that the OC and FC groups indicated relatively more disturbed emotional experience (6.14,5.80) than the FM and MO groups while all the four groups i.e. FC, FM, OC and MO did not differ much in regard to their cognitive structure (1.44,1.88,0.87,1.72). The FM group was found to have more disturbances in their attitudes toward physical disability (4.38) as compared to the FC, OC and MO groups. The FC group revealed greater degree of resistance toward help and sympathy (10.14) as compared to the FM, OC and MO groups.

Phase III : Acknowledgement

The table 8 also showed that the FM, MO and FC groups showed greater tendency toward positive self-experience (9.31, 8.62, 7.25) as compared to the OC group. However, the OC and MO groups revealed relatively more tendency toward positive reality perception (7.01,6.90) than the FC and FM groups. It was seen that the MO group showed greater tendency toward emotional adjustment (10.34) as compared to the FC, FM and OC groups. The OC group showed relatively more balanced and organized cognitive structure (4.38) as compared to the FC, FM and MO groups. The FC group was found to have more acceptance of their physical disability (8.70) as compared to the FM, OC and MO groups. The OC group showed relatively more positive

attitude toward help and sympathy (4.38) than the FC, FM and MO groups during this phase.

Phase IV : Adjustment and change

As is revealed in (Table 8) the FM, OC and MO groups showed relatively more positive self-experience (7.5, 7.01, 6.90) compared to the FC group while all the four groups i.e. FC , FM , OC and MO were not found to differ much in regard to their reality perception (4.35, 3.12, 3.51, 3.45). The MO and OC groups showed comparatively more emotional adjustment (6.90 , 4.38) than the FC and FM groups. The MO and FM groups were found to have more integrated cognitive structure (5.17, 5.00) as compared totthe FC and OC groups. The OC , MO and FC groups were not found to differ much in their attitude toward the acceptance of their physical disability (1.44,1.75,1.72) whereas the FM group did (0.62). The FC group showed relatively more positive attitude toward help and sympathy (5.80) than the FM , OC and MO groups during the adjustment phase.

Table 6 :

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Subjects with Differential Patterns of Values in Terms of the Phases and Dimensions of Crisis Experience.

		1. SHOCK PHASE						2. DEFENSIVE PHASE						3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT PHASE						4. ADJUSTMENT AND CHANGE PHASE						
		1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.6	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.6	Total
Theoretical N=14 %=12.73	F	27	12	22	9	2	6	[illegible]	4	7	8	18	11	27	19	26	7	11	16	16	12	8	0	1	5	302
	P	8.94	3.97	7.28	2.98	0.66	1.99	9.27	1.32	2.32	2.65	5.96	3.64	8.94	6.29	8.61	2.32	3.64	5.30	5.30	3.97	2.65	0	0.33	1.65	99.98
Economic N=37 %=33.64	F	63	35	45	25	16	25	44	17	49	16	14	26	67	30	59	29	21	50	51	36	39	18	11	18	804
	P	7.83	4.35	5.60	3.11	1.99	3.11	5.47	2.11	6.09	1.99	1.74	3.23	8.33	3.75	7.34	3.61	2.61	6.22	6.34	4.48	4.85	2.24	1.37	2.24	99.98
Aesthetic N=12 %=10.91	F	18	8	17	5	9	16	11	12	22	16	3	10	16	3	18	9	6	15	19	16	7	12	14	14	296
	P	6.08	2.70	5.74	1.69	3.04	5.41	3.72	4.05	7.43	5.41	1.01	3.38	5.41	1.01	6.08	3.04	2.02	5.07	6.42	5.41	2.36	4.05	4.73	4.73	99.99
Social N=7 %= 6.36	F	23	9	8	7	2	8	9	5	3	9	0	14	9	7	10	4	0	8	8	6	9	3	4	6	171
	P	13.45	5.26	4.68	4.09	1.17	4.68	5.26	2.92	1.75	5.26	0	8.19	5.26	4.09	5.85	2.34	0	4.68	4.68	3.51	5.26	1.75	2.34	3.51	99.98
Political N=8 %=7.27	F	9	9	15	7	6	3	20	4	12	5	6	5	6	9	9	8	4	8	12	3	7	1	6	13	187
	P	4.81	4.81	8.02	3.74	3.21	1.60	10.69	2.14	6.42	2.67	3.21	2.67	3.21	4.81	4.81	4.28	2.14	4.28	6.42	1.60	3.74	0.53	3.21	6.95	99.98
Religious N = 32 %= 29.09	F	57	33	44	16	19	30	30	13	31	10	12	23	65	26	39	14	24	38	45	23	36	22	11	30	691
	P	8.25	4.77	6.37	2.31	2.75	4.34	4.34	1.88	4.49	1.45	1.74	3.33	9.41	3.73	5.64	2.03	3.47	5.50	6.51	3.33	5.21	3.18	1.59	4.34	100
Total N=110 %= 100	F	197	106	151	69	54	88	142	55	124	64	53	89	190	94	161	71	66	135	151	96	106	56	47	86	2451
	P	8.04	4.32	6.16	2.81	2.20	3.59	5.79	2.24	5.06	2.61	2.16	3.63	7.75	3.83	6.57	2.90	2.69	5.51	6.16	3.92	4.32	2.28	1.92	3.51	99.97

3.8 The Effect of Differential Patterns of Value-Types on Crisis Experience.

Presented in Table 9 are the responses (Frequencies and percentages) of the various dominant value groups analysed in terms of the phases and dimensions of crisis experience.

Phase I : Shock

The results (Table 9) indicate that the SV group showed greater tendency toward disturbances in self-experience (13.45) and reality perception (5.26) as compared to the dominant TV, EV, AV, PV and RV groups. The TV and PV groups showed relatively more disturbed emotional experience (7.28, 8.02) than the EV, AV, SV and RV groups. The SV and PV groups were found to have more disturbed cognitive structure (4.09, 3.74) as compared to the TV, EV, AV and RV groups. The PV and AV groups revealed relatively more disturbed attitude toward physical disability (3.21,3.04) as compared to the TV, EV, SV and RV groups. The AV, SV, RV groups showed comparatively more resistance toward help and sympathy (5.41,4.68,4.34) than the TV, EV and PV groups during the shock phase.

Phase II : Defensive Retreat (Denial)

The table 9 also showed that the dominant TV and PV groups revealed greater tendency toward disturbances in self-experience (9.27,10.69) as compared to the EV, AV, SV and RV groups.

The dominant AV and SV groups showed more disturbances in reality perception (4.05,2.92) as compared to the TV, EV, PV and RV groups. The dominant AV, PV and EV groups showed greater degree of emotional disturbances (7.43,6.42,6.09) as compared to the TV, SV and RV groups. The dominant AV and SV groups indicated relatively more disturbed cognitive structure (5.41,5.26) as compared to the TV, EV, PV and RV groups. The TV group alone was found to have relatively more disturbed attitude toward its physical disability (5.96) than the EV, AV, SV, PV and RV groups. The SV group showed more resistance toward help and sympathy (8.19) as compared to the TV, EV, AV, PV and RV groups during this phase.

Phase III : Acknowledgement

The results indicated in Table 9 showed that the dominant TV, EV and RV groups showed greater tendency toward disturbances in self-experience (8.94,8.33,9.41) as compared to the AV, SV and PV groups. The TV, SV and PV groups revealed relatively more disturbed reality perception (6.29,4.09,4.81) as compared to the EV, AV and RV groups. The dominant TV,EV and AV groups were found to have more emotional disturbances (8.61,7.34,6.08) as compared to the SV, PV and RV groups. The PV, AV and EV groups showed more balanced organized cognitive structure (4.28,3.04,3.61) as compared to the TV, SV and RV groups. The dominant TV and RV groups indicated greater degree of acceptance of their physicalldisability

(3.64,3.47) as compared to the EV, AV, SV and PV groups. The EV, TV, AV and RV groups showed comparatively more positive attitude toward help and sympathy (6.22,5.30,5.07 and 5.50) than the SV and PV groups during this phase.

Phase IV : Adjustment and change

As is indicated in Table 9 the EV, AV, PV and RV groups showed relatively more positive self-experience (6.34,6.42,6.42,6.51) than the TV and SV groups. The AV and EV groups showed relatively more positive reality perception (5.41,4.48) as compared to the TV, SV, PV and RV groups. The SV, RVa and EV groups revealed more emotional adjustment (5.26, 5.21, 4.85) as compared to the TV, AV and PV groups. The AV and RV groups were found to have more integrated and organized cognitive structure (4.05,3.18) as compared to the TV, EV, SV and PV groups. It was seen that the AV, PV and SV groups showed relatively more acceptance of their physical disability (4.73,3.21,2.34) than the TV, EV and RV groups. The PV, AV, RV and SV groups showed more positive attitude toward help and sympathy (6.95,4.73,4.34,3.51) as compared to the TV and EV groups during this phase.

PART TWO:

In order to study the effects of the type of limb-injury and amputation (Leg or Arm), disability causing situation (Accident, illness and War), differential patterns of world hypotheses (Formism, Mechanicism, Organicism and Contextualism) and the various types of value orientations (Theoretical, Economic, Aesthetic, Social, Political and Religious) on the problems of adjustment, the Means, Standard Deviations, F-ratios, t-values and chi-squares of the obtained data were determined.

3.9 The Effects of the Type of Limb-Injury Amputation (leg or arm) On The Various Areas of Adjustment.

To study the effects of the type of limb-injury and amputation (leg or arm) in the areas of adjustment means and standard deviations of adjustment scores for each of the LA and AA groups were calculated and from these analyses of variancewere computed. Means and standard deviations are shown in Table10, for various areas of adjustment under study.

Table10:

Means, Standard Deviations and t-values of the Leg Amputed and Arm Amputed Subjects in Different Areas of Adjustment.

	Leg Amputation (N = 70) % = 63.64		Arm Amputation (N = 40) % = 36.36			
	Means	Standard Deviation	Means	Standard Deviation	df	t-values
Home	14.94	8.13	15.47	7.75	108	.34
Health	15.07	10.51	15.25	9.68	108	.09
Social	13.66	5.51	13.27	5.82	108	0.34
Emotional	15.63	9.92	15.57	9.68	108	.03
Occupational	14.40	6.30	15.4	5.26	108	.89
Total Means and Standard Deviations	14.74	8.35	14.99	7.91	108	.16

P > .05 Not Significant.

The results did not indicate the differences in terms of t-values (Table10). Whereas some differences in some areas were observed in terms of means. AA group revealed unsatisfactory home adjustment (M = 15.47) compared to LA group (M = 14.94). AA group showed more dissatisfactory occupational adjustment (M = 15.4) compared to LA group (M = 14.40).

As indicated in the results (Table10) both the groups LA and AA did not differ much in the areas of health, social and emotional adjustment.

Table 11:

Relationship between the Type of Injury and Home Adjustment.

Type of Injury		Home Adjustment: Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatis-factory	Very unsati-sfactory	Total
Leg Amp. N=70 % = 63.64	F	0	4	25	7	34	70
	P	(00)	(5.71)	(35.71)	(10)	(48.57)	(100)
Arm Amp. N = 40 % = 36.36	F	0	0	16	5	19	40
	P	(00)	(00)	(40)	(12.50)	(47.50)	(100)
Total	F	0	4	41	12	53	110
	P	(00)	(03.64)	(37.27)	(10.91)	(48.18)	(100)

$\chi^2 = 2.55$ df = 4 P > .05

P >.05 Not Significant.

The above results support the null hypothesis (no.5). In other words, there was no significant difference in the problems of home adjustment between the two groups viz; LA and AA. However, both the groups showed very unsatisfactory home adjustments(LA = 48.57 and AA = 47.50).

Table 12:

Relationship between the Type of Injury and Health Adjustment.

Type of Injury		Health Adjustment: Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatis-factory	Very umsati-sfactory	Total
Leg Amp. N = 70 % = 63.64	F	2	7	20	2	39	70
	P	(02.86)	(10.00)	(28.57)	(02.86)	(55.71)	(100)
Arm Amp. N = 40 % = 36.36	F	1	4	8	6	21	40
	P	(02.50)	(10.00)	(20.00)	(15.00)	(52.50)	(100)
Total N=110	F	3	11	28	8	60	110
	P	(02.73)	(10.00)	(25.45)	(07.27)	(54.54)	(100)
		$\chi^2 = 5.96$ df = 4 P >.05					

P >.05 Not Significant

The above results support the null hypothesis (no.5). In other words there was no significant difference in the problems of health adjustment of the two groups LA and AA. However, both the groups showed very unsatisfactory overall health adjustment (LA = 55.71 and AA = 52.50).

Table 13:

Relationship between the Type of Injury and Social Adjustment.

Type of Injury		Social Adjustment: Very Aggressive	Aggressive	Average	Retiring	Very Retiring	Total
Leg Amp. N=70 % = 63.64	F	1	7	31	28	3	70
	P	(01.43)	(10.00)	(44.28)	(40.00)	(04.28)	(100)
Arm Amp. N = 40 % = 36.36	F	1	4	20	13	2	40
	P	(02.50)	(10.00)	(50.00)	(32.50)	(05.00)	(100)
Total N = 110	F	2	11	51	41	5	100
	P	(01.82)	(10.00)	(46.36)	(37.27)	(04.54)	(100)

$\chi^2 = .73$ df = 4 $P > .05$

$P > .05$ Not Significant.

The results support the null hypothesis (no.5) that the two groups i.e. LA and AA do not differ significantly in their problems of social adjustment.

Table 14 :

Relationship between the Type of Injury and Emotional Adjustment.

Type of Injury		Emotional Adjustment: Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatis-factory	Very unsatis-factory	Total
Leg Amp. N = 70 % = 63.64	F	8	10	14	8	30	70
	P	(11.43)	(14.28)	(20.00)	(11.43)	(42.86)	(100)
Arm Amp. N = 40 % = 36.36	F	5	6	8	4	17	40
	P	(12.50)	(15.00)	(20.00)	(10.00)	(42.50)	(100)
Total N=110	F	13	16	22	12	47	110
	P	(11.82)	(14.54)	(20.00)	(10.91)	(42.73)	(100)

$\chi^2 = .47$ df = 4 $P > .05$

$P > .05$ Not Significant.

The results support the null hypothesis (no.5) that the two groups i.e. LA and AA do not differ significantly in their problems of emotional adjustment. However, both the groups showed unsatisfactory emotional adjustment (LA = 54.29 ; AA = 52.50).

Table 15 :

Relationship between the Type of Injury and Occupational Adjustment.

Type of Injury		Occupational Adjustment					
		Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatis-factory	Very unsati-sfactory	Total
Leg Amp. N = 70 % = 63.64	F	3	3	23	15	26	70
	P	(4.28)	(4.28)	(32.86)	(21.43)	(37.14)	(100)
Arm Amp. N = 40 % = 36.36	F	0	2	11	11	16	40
	P	(0.00)	(05.00)	(27.50)	(27.50)	(40.00)	(100)
Total	F	3	5	34	26	42	110
	P	(2.72)	(04.54)	(30.90)	(23.63)	(38.18)	(100)

$P > .05$ Not Significant

The above results support the null hypothesis (no.5) that the two groups i.e. LA and AA do not differ significantly in their problems of occupational adjustment. However, both the groups revealed unsatisfactory occupational adjustment (LA = 58.57 ; AA = 67.50).

3.10 The Effects of the Disability-Causing Situation on the Problems of Adjustment.

Given in Table 16 are means and standard deviations of adjustment scores for the Disabled-Civilians and War-Disabled subjects in various areas of adjustment, i.e. home, health, social, emotional and occupational.

Table 16 :

Means, Standard Deviations and t-values for the Disabled Civilians and War Disabled Subjects in Different Areas of Adjustment.

Areas of Adjustment	Disabled-Civilians (N = 70) % = 63.64		War-Disabled (N = 40) % = 36.36			
	Means	Standard Deviations	Means	Standard Deviations	df	t-value
Home	12.24	7.49	20.12	6.20	108	5.92*
Health	11.6	9.28	21.32	8.72	108	5.49*
Social	11.41	5.39	17.20	3.89	108	6.58*
Emotional	12.06	9.34	21.82	7.24	108	6.1*
Occupational	12.3	5.69	19.07	3.44	108	7.78*
Total Means and Standard Deviations	11.92	7.64	19.91	5.90	108	6.44

* All the t-values are significant at .05

The WD group revealed more unsatisfactory home adjustment (M=20.12) compared to DC group (M=12.24). WD group also indicated more unsatisfactory health adjustment (M=21.32) compared to DC group (M=11.6). WD group was found to be more submissive and retiring in their social adjustment (M=17.20) compared to DC group (M=11.41). WD group also showed significantly greater degree of emotional unstability (M21.82) compared to DC group (M=12.06). Above data (Table 16) indicates that WD group revealed overall poor adjustment (M=19.91) compared to DC group (M=11.92).

In order to pinpoint the direction and amount of the mean difference between various areas of adjustment scores of the disabled-civilians and War-disabled people, t-values for the above data were also calculated (Table 16).

All the t-values were highly significant.

$P < .01$; Home adjustment, $t(108) = 5.92$.

$P < .01$; Health adjustment, $t(108) = 5.49$.

$P < .01$; Social adjustment, $t(108) = 6.58$.

$P < .01$; Emotional adjustment, $t(108) = 6.01$.

$P < .01$; Occupational adjustment, $t(108) = 7.78$.

Table 17 :

Relationship between the Disability-Causing Situation and Home Adjustment.

		Home Adjustment					
		Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatisfactory	Very unsatisfactory	Total
Disabled Civilians N = 70 % = 63.64	F	0	4	35	7	24	70
	P	(00.00)	(05.71)	(50.00)	(10.00)	(34.29)	(100)
War Disabled N = 40 % = 36.36	F	0	0	6	5	29	40
	P	(00.00)	(00.00)	(15.00)	(12.50)	(72.50)	(100)
Total N = 110	F	0	4	41	12	53	110
	P	(00.00)	(03.64)	(37.27)	(10.91)	(48.18)	(100)

$\chi^2 = 18.49$ df = 4 $P < .01$ Significant

The above results do not support the null hypothesis (no.6). In other words the two groups i.e. DC and WD were found to be significantly different in their problems of home adjustment. War disabled people had more home adjustment problems (72.50) compared to the Disabled-civilians (34.29).

Table 18 :

Relationship between the Disability-Causing Situation and Health Adjustment.

		Health Adjustment					
		Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatisfactory	Very unsatisfactory	Total
Disabled Civilians N = 70 % = 63.64	F	3	10	22	7	28	70
	P	(04.29)	(14.28)	(31.43)	(10.00)	(40.00)	(100)
War Disabled N = 40 % = 36.36	F	0	1	6	1	32	40
	P	(00.00)	(02.50)	(15.00)	(02.50)	(80.00)	(100)
Total N = 110	F	3	11	28	8	60	110
	P	(02.73)	(10.00)	(25.45)	(07.27)	(54.54)	(100)

$\chi^2 = 17.21$ df = 4 $P < .01$ Significant

The above results do not support the null hypothesis (no.6). In other words the two groups CD and WD differed significantly in regards to their problems of health adjustment. The disabled civilians have more unsatisfactory health adjustment (40.00) as compared to the War-disabled people (80.00).

Table 19 :

Relationship between the Disability-Causing Situation and Social Adjustment.

		Social Adjustment					
		Very Aggressive	Aggressive	Average	Retiring	Very Retiring	Total
Disabled Civilians N = 70 % = 63.64	F	2	11	38	19	0	70
	P	(02.86)	(15.71)	(54.29)	(27.14)	(00.00)	(100)
War Disabled N = 40 % = 36.36	F	0	0	13	22	5	40
	P	(00.00)	(00.00)	(32.50)	(55.00)	(12.50)	(100)
Total N = 110	F	2	11	51	41	5	110
	P	(01.82)	(10.00)	(46.36)	(37.27)	(04.54)	(100)

$\chi^2 = 24.39$ df = 4 $P < .01$ Significant

The above results do not support the null hypothesis (no.6). In other words the two groups i.e. CD and WD differ significantly in their problems of social adjustment. The war disabled subjects show greater social problems (67.50) than the civil disabled (27.14).

Table 20 :

Relationship between the Disability-Causing Situation and Emotional Adjustment.

		Emotional Adjustment					
		Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatisfactory	Very unsatisfactory	Total
Disabled Civilians N = 70 % = 63.64	F	13	15	15	6	21	70
	P	(18.57)	(21.43)	(21.43)	(08.57)	(30.00)	(100)
War Disabled N = 40 % = 36.36	F	0	1	7	6	26	40
	P	(00.00)	(02.50)	(17.50)	(15.00)	(65.00)	(100)
Total N = 110	F	13	16	22	12	47	110
	P	(11.82)	(14.54)	(20.00)	(10.91)	(42.73)	(100)

$\chi^2 = 22.18$ df = 4 $P < .01$ Significant

The above results do not support the null hypothesis (no.6). In other words the two groups i.e. CD and WD were found to be significantly different in their problems of emotional adjustment.

Table 21 :-

Relationship between Disability-Causing Situation and Occupational Adjustment.

		Occupational Adjustment					
		Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatisfactory	Very unsatisfactory	Total
Disabled Civilians N = 70 % = 63.64	F	3	5	31	15	16	70
	P	(04.29)	(07.14)	(44.28)	(21.43)	(22.86)	(100.00)
War Disabled N = 40 % = 36.36	F	0	0	3	11	26	40
	P	(00.00)	(00.00)	(07.50)	(27.50)	(65.00)	(100.00)
Total N = 110	F	3	5	34	26	42	110
	P	(02.73)	(04.54)	(30.91)	(23.64)	(38.18)	(100)

$\chi^2 = 29.35$ df = 4 $P < .01$ Significant

The results do not support the null hypothesis (no.6). In other words the two groups i.e. CD and WD were found to be significantly different in their problems of occupational adjustment. However, the war disabled showed very unsatisfactory (65.00) occupational adjustment as compared to the disabled civilians (22.86).

3.11 The Effect of the Differential Patterns of the World Hypotheses on the Problems of Adjustment.

Presented in Table 22 are means and standard deviations of adjustment scores for the disabled people with differential patterns of World-Hypotheses in various areas of adjustment i.e. home, health, social, emotional and occupational.

Table 22:

Means and Standard Deviations of the Disabled Subjects with different Dominant World-Hypotheses in Different Areas of Adjustment.

Areas of Adjustment	Dominant World Hypotheses							
	Formist (N = 24) % = 26.37		Mechanicist (N = 27) % = 29.67		Organicist (N = 22) % = 24.17		Contextualist (N = 18) % = 19.78	
	Means	Standard Deviation	Means	Standard Deviation	Means	Standard Deviation	Means	Standard Deviation
Home	14.58	7.47	16.26	6.67	14.54	7.74	16.17	9.29
Health	15.71	10.09	15.15	10.65	14.54	9.79	16.05	10.97
Social	14.08	5.45	14.52	6.35	11.86	5.82	13.72	5.69
Emotional	16.33	9.71	15.96	9.97	13.41	10.27	16.11	10.84
Occupational	15.04	5.80	15.92	5.25	14.27	6.11	14.33	6.05
Total Means and Standard Deviations	15.15	7.98	15.56	8.25	13.73	8.25	15.28	8.93

It was found that the dominant Mechanicist and contextualists had more unsatisfactory home adjustment (M=16.26) compared to the organicists (14.54) and formists (M=14.58). Contextualists were found to have more unsatisfactory health adjustment (M=16.05) compared to the Organicists (M=14.54) Formists (M=15.71) and Mechanicists (M=15.15). Further, it was seen that the Mechanicists and the Formists were found to be more submissive and retiring in their Social adjustment (M=14.54 and 14.08 respectively) than the Organicists (M=11.86) and the Contextualists (M=13.7). It was also seen that dominant Formists and Contextualists had poorer emotional adjustment (M=16.33,16.11) when compared to the Organicists (M=13.4) and Mechanicists (M=15.96). The Mechanicists and Formists were also found to be more dissatisfied with their occupations (M=15.92,15.04) compared to the Organicists (M=14.27) and the Contextualists (M=14.33).

Table 23 :

Relationship between Differential Patterns of World Hypotheses and Home Adjustment.

Dominant World-Hypotheses		Home Adjustment: Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatisfactory	Very unsatisfactory	Total
Formist N = 24 % = 26.37	F	0	6	4	1	13	24
	P	(00.00)	(25.00)	(16.67)	(04.17)	(54.16)	(100)
Mechanicist N = 27 % = 29.67	F	0	4	9	0	14	27
	P	(00.00)	(14.81)	(33.33)	(00.00)	(51.85)	(99.99)
Organicist N = 22 % = 24.17	F	0	1	8	4	9	22
	P	(00.00)	(04.54)	(36.36)	(18.18)	(40.91)	(99.99)
Contextualist N = 18 % = 19.78	F	1	0	4	0	13	18
	P	(05.56)	(00.00)	(22.22)	(00.00)	(72.22)	(100)
Total N = 91 % = 100	F	1	11	25	5	49	91
	P	(01.10)	(12.09)	(27.47)	(05.49)	(53.85)	(100)

$\chi^2 = 22.39$ df = 12 $P < .05$

$P < .05$ Significant

The above results do not support the null hypotheses (no.7). In other words the various dominant W.H. groups differ significantly in their problems of home adjustment. The contextualists had more home adjustment problems (72.22) as compared to the Formists (54.16)Mechanicists(51.85) and the Organicists(40.91).

Table 24 :

ANOVA of the Home Adjustment Scores
for the World-Hypotheses Groups.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
World-Hypotheses	3	62.51	20.84	3.22 *
Error S. S.	87	5848.03	67.22	
Total	90	5910.54		

* $P < .05$ Significant

The analysis of variance of the Home Adjustment scores for the different dominant World-Hypotheses groups showed statistically significant difference, $F(87.3) = 3.22$, P .05 between different dominant world-hypotheses groups with regard to their adjustment at home. In order to pinpoint the direction and amount of the mean difference between home adjustment scores of the various dominant world-hypotheses groups, t-values were calculated, but significant differences were not found between the means of any of the groups.

Table 25:

Relationship between Differential Patterns of World Hypotheses of the Subjects and Health Adjustment.

Dominant Whrld-Hypotheses		Health Adjustment: Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatisfactory	Very unsatisfactory	Total
Formist N = 24 % = 26.37	F	0	3	5	7	9	24
	P	(00.00)	(12.50)	(20.83)	(29.17)	(37.50)	(100)
Mechanicist N = 27 % = 29.67	F	0	2	7	8	10	27
	P	(00.00)	(07.41)	(25.92)	(29.63)	(37.04)	(100)
Organicist N = 22 % = 24.17	F	0	0	12	3	7	22
	P	(00.00)	(00.00)	(54.54)	(13.64)	(31.82)	(100)
Contextualist N = 18 % = 19.78	F	1	0	5	4	8	18
	P	(05.56)	(00.00)	(27.78)	(22.22)	(44.44)	(100)
Total N = 91 % = 100	F	1	5	29	22	34	91
	P	(01.10)	(05.49)	(31.87)	(24.18)	(37.36)	(100)

$\chi^2 = 25.57$ df = 12 $P < .05$

$P < .05$ Significant

The results do not support the null hypothesis (no.7). In other words the various dominant W.H. groups differ significantly in their problems of health adjustment.

The Formists, Mechanicists and Contextualists had poorer health adjustment as compared to the organicists.

Table 26 :

ANOVA of Health Adjustment scores
for the World-Hypotheses Groups.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Means squares	F
World Hypotheses	3	27.33	9.11	12.340 *
Error S. S.	87	9780.78	112.42	
Total	90	9808.11		

$P < .01$ Significant

The analysis of variance of the health adjustment scores for the different dominant World-Hypotheses groups showed statistically significant difference, $F(87.3) = 12.340$, P .01 between different World-Hypotheses groups with regard to their health adjustment. In order to pinpoint the direction and amount of the mean difference between the health adjustment scores of the various dominant World-Hypotheses groups, t-test was calculated, but t-values were found to be insignificant between the means of any of the dominant world-hypotheses groups.

Table **27** :

Relationship between Differential Patterns of World Hypotheses of the Subjects and Social Adjustment.

Dominant World-Hypothesis		Social Adjustment: Very Aggressive	Aggressive	Average	Retiring	Very Retiring	Total
Formist N = 24 % = 26.37	F	1	3	11	7	2	24
	P	(04.17)	(12.50)	(45.83)	(29.17)	(08.33)	(100)
Mechanicist N = 27 % = 29.67	F	0	1	13	12	1	27
	P	(00.00)	(03.70)	(48.15)	(44.44)	(03.70)	(99.99)
Organicist N = 22 % = 24.17	F	1	4	10	6	1	22
	P	(04.54)	(18.18)	(45.45)	(27.27)	(04.54)	(99.99)
Contextualist N = 18 % = 19.78	F	0	2	6	9	1	18
	P	(00.00)	(11.11)	(33.33)	(50.00)	(05.55)	(99.99)
Total N = 91 % = 100	F	2	10	40	34	5	91
	P	(02.20)	(10.99)	(43.96)	(37.36)	(05.49)	(100)

$\chi^2 = 9.833$ df = 12 $P > .05$

$P > .05$ Not Significant.

The results support the null hypothesis (no.7) showing that the various dominant W.H.groups did not differ significantly in their problems of social adjustment.

However, the contextualists had poorer social adjustment (55.55) as compared to the Formists (37.50), Mechanicists (48.14) and Organicists (31.81).

Table 28 :

ANOVA of Social Adjustment Scores

for the World-Hypotheses Groups.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
World Hypotheses	3	94.99	31.66	1.12
Error S. S.	87	3088.77	35.50	
Total	90	3183.76		

$P > .05$ Not Significant

Analysis of variance of the social adjustment scores for the different dominant WH groups showed statistically insignificant differences $F(87 , 3) = 1.12$, $P > .05$.

Table 29:

Relationship between Differential Patterns of World Hypotheses of the Subjects and Emotional Adjustment.

Dominant World-Hypothesis		Emotional Adjustment: Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatisfactory	Very unsatisfactory	Total
Formist N = 24 % = 26.37	F	2	3	5	2	12	24
	P	(08.33)	(12.50)	(20.83)	(08.33)	(50.00)	(99.99)
Mechanicist N = 27 % = 29.67	F	1	4	7	5	10	27
	P	(03.70)	(14.81)	(25.92)	(18.52)	(37.03)	(99.98)
Organicist N = 22 % = 24.17	F	2	4	6	2	8	22
	P	(09.09)	(18.18)	(27.27)	(09.09)	(36.36)	(99.99)
Contextualist N = 18 % = 19.78	F	3	2	1	2	10	18
	P	(16.66)	(11.11)	(05.55)	(11.11)	(55.55)	(99.98)
Total N = 91 % = 100	F	8	13	19	11	40	91
	P	(08.79)	(14.28)	(20.88)	(12.09)	(43.96)	(100)

$\chi^2 = 12.54$ df = 12 P >.05

P >.05 Not Significant.

The results support the null hypothesis (no.7) and the various dominant WH groups i.e. Formists, Mechanicists, Organicists and Contextualists did not differ significantly in their problems of emotional adjustment.

As indicated in Table 32 the contextualists showed poorer emotional adjustment (66.66) as compared to the Formists (58.33) Mechanicists (55.55) and Organicists (45.45).

Table 30 :

ANOVA of Emotional Adjustment Scores

for the World-Hypotheses Groups.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
World Hypotheses	3	125.29	41.76	2.493
Error S. S.	87	9059.39	104.13	
Total	90	9184.68		

$P > .05$ Not Significant

The above ANOVA Table indicated that the different dominant world hypotheses groups do not differ significantly in their emotional adjustment $F(87 , 3) = 2.493$, $P > .05$.

Table 31:

Relationship between Differential Patterns of World Hypotheses of the Subjects and Occupational Adjustment.

Dominant World-Hypotheses		Occupational Adjustment					
		Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatisfactory	Very unsatisfactory	Total
Formist N = 24 % = 26.37	F	1	2	5	7	9	24
	P	(04.17)	(08.33)	(20.83)	(29.17)	(37.50)	(100)
Mechanicists N = 27 % = 29.67	F	0	2	7	8	10	27
	P	(00.00)	(07.41)	(25.92)	(29.63)	(37.04)	(100)
Organicist N = 22 % = 24.17	F	1	0	11	3	7	22
	P	(04.54)	(00.00)	(50.00)	(13.64)	(31.82)	(100)
Contextualist N = 18 % = 19.78	F	0	1	5	4	8	18
	P	(00.00)	(05.55)	(27.78)	(22.22)	(44.44)	(99.99)
Total N = 91 % = 100	F	2	5	28	22	34	91
	P	(02.20)	(05.49)	(30.77)	(24.17)	(37.36)	(99.99)

$\chi^2 = 20.97$ df = 12 $P > .05$

$P > .05$ Not Significant

The results support the null hypothesis (no.7) that the various dominant WH groups i.e. Formists, Mechanicists, Organicists and Contextualist did not differ significantly in their problems of occupational adjustment.

However, as indicated in Table 31 Formists, Mechanicists and Contextualists showed poorer occupational adjustment as compared to the organicists.

Table 32 :

ANOVA of Occupational Adjustment Scores

for the World-Hypotheses Groups.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
World Hypotheses	3	42.78	14.26	2.44
Error S. S.	87	3033.18	34.86	
Total	90	3075.96		

$P > .05$ Not significant.

The above findings indicated that the different World Hypotheses groups did not differ significantly in the area of occupational adjustment $F(87, 3) = 2.44$, $P > .05$.

Given in Table 33 are means and standard deviations of adjustment scores for the Formist groups in different areas of adjustment i.e.,home, health,social,emotional and occupational.

Table 33 :

Means and Standard Deviations Scores of the Formists in Different Areas of Adjustment.

Areas of Adjustment	Formist-Organicist (N = 9) % = 37.5		Formist-Mechanicist (N = 9) % = 37.5		Formist-Contextualist (N = 6) % = 25.00	
	Means	Standard Deviations	Means	Standard Deviations	Means	Standard Deviations
Home	16.00	7.36	13.22	7.34	14.50	7.43
Health	16.11	9.51	14.89	10.53	16.33	10.16
Social	13.55	4.37	14.55	5.44	14.17	6.72
Emotional	17.88	9.50	14.77	9.45	16.33	10.01
Occupational	16.00	6.38	14.67	6.43	14.17	3.02
Total Means and Standard Deviations	15.91	7.80	14.42	8.09	15.10	7.98

It was found that FO group had unsatisfactory home-adjustment (M=16.00) compared to FC group (M=14.5) and FM group (M=13.22). The FC group and FO groups showed more unsatisfactory health adjustment (M=16.33,16.11) compared to

FM group (M=14.89).FM and FC groups indicated socially more submissive and retiring (M=14.55,14.17) as compared to FO group (M=13.55). The dominant FO group was found to be emotionally more unstable (M = 17.88) compared to FC group (M=16.33) and FM group (M=14.77). FO group was also found to be more dissatisfied with occupational adjustment (M=16.00) as compared to FM group (M=14.67) and FC group (M=14.17). FO group revealed overall poor adjustment (M=15.91) as compared to FC group (M=15.1) and FM group (M=14.42).

Table 34 :

ANOVA of Home Adjustment Scores for the Formist Group.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Formism	2	34.78	17.39	3.57
Error S. S.	21	1305.06	62.15	
Total	23	1339.84		

$P < .05$ Significant

The analysis of variance of home adjustment scores for the dominant Formist world hypothesis group showed statistically significant difference, $F(21 , 2) = 3.57$, $P < .05$ between the various Formist groups i.e. FO , FM and FC.

Table **35** :

ANOVA of Health Adjustment Scores
for the Formist Group.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Formism	2	9.84	4.92	23.55
Error S. S.	21	2433.12	115.86	
Total	23	2442.96		

$P < .01$ Significant

The analysis of variance of health adjustment scores for the dominant Formist group showed statistically significant difference, $F(21 , 2) = 23.55$, $P < .01$ between the various dominant Formist groups i.e. FO , FM and FC.

Table **36** :

ANOVA of Social Adjustment Scores

for the Formist Group.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Formism	2	4.54	2.27	14.88
Error S. S.	21	709.3	33.78	
Total	23	713.84		

$P < .01$ Significant.

The analysis of variance of social adjustment scores for the Formist group showed statistically significant difference, $F\ (21\ ,\ 2) = 14.88\ ,\ P < .01$ between the various groups FO , FM and FC. Means scores of the same groups (Table 37) also showed differences in their social adjustment.

Table **37** :

ANOVA of Emotional Adjustment Scores

for the Formist Group.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Formism	2	43.55	21.78	4.85
Error S. S.	21	2217.79	105.61	
Total	23	2261.34		

$P < .05$ Significant

The analysis of variance of emotional adjustment scores for the Formist group showed statistically significant difference $F(21 , 2) = 4.85 , P < .05$ between the various Formist groups i.e. FO , FM and FC. Mean scores of the same groups (Table 37) also indicated differences in the emotional adjustment.

Table 38 :

ANOVA of Occupational Adjustment Scores for the Formist Group.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Formism	2	14.12	7.06	5.35
Error S. S.	21	792.84	37.75	
Total	23	806.96		

$P < .05$ Significant.

The analysis of variance of occupational adjustment scores for the Formist group showed statistically significant difference, $F(21 , 2) = 5.35$, $P < .05$ between the various Formist groups i.e. FO , FM and FC. Mean scores of the Formist-Organicist and Formists-Mechanicist (Table 37) also indicated differences in their occupational adjustment.

Given in Table 39 are means and standard deviations of adjustment scores for the Mechanicists in different areas of adjustment i.e., home, health, social, emotional and occupational.

Table 39 :

Means and Standard Deviation of Scores of the Mechanicist Group in Different Areas of Adjustment.

Areas of Adjustment	Mechanicist-Organicist (N = 8) % = 29.63		Mechanicist Formist (N = 7) % = 25.92		Mechanicist-Contextualist (N = 12) % = 44.44	
	Means	Standard Deviations	Means	Standard Deviations	Means	Standard Deviations
Home	19.75	5.82	18.71	6.71	12.5	7.60
Health	17.00	11.09	20.43	8.76	10.83	9.56
Social	17.37	5.89	16.57	5.39	11.42	5.45
Emotional	20.5	8.94	18.43	9.56	11.5	8.95
Occupational	17.37	3.80	17.43	3.20	14.08	6.36
Total Means and Standard Deviations	18.40	7.7	18.31	7.23	12.07	7.82

It was found MO group indicated unsatisfactory home adjustment (M = 19.75) as compared to MF group (M = 18.71) and MC group (M = 12.5). MF group showed more unsatisfactory health

adjustment (M = 20.43) as compared to the MO group (M=17.00) and MC group (M=10.83). The MO and MF groups were also found to be socially more submissive and retiring (M = 17.73, 16.57) as compared to MC group (M = 11.42). MO group felt emotionally more unstable (M = 20.5) as compared to MF group (M = 18.43) and MC group (M = 11.5). The MF and MO groups were also seen to be more dissatisfied with their occupation (M = 17.43 , 17.37) as compared to the MC group (M = 14.08). The MO and MF groups were found to be poor in the overall adjustment (M=18.40, 18.31) as compared to the MC group (M = 12.07).

Table 40 :

ANOVA of Home Adjustment Scores
for the Mechanicist Group.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Mechanicism	2	309.26	154.63	2.899
Error S. S.	24	1279.93	53.33	
Total	26	1589.19		

$P > .05$ Not Significant.

It was seen that the various Mechanicist groups i.e., MO ,MF and MC did not differ significantly in their problems of home adjustment $F(2,24) = 2.899$, $P > .05$.

Table **41** :

ANOVA of Health Adjustment Scores
for the Mechanicist Group.

Source	df	Sumsof squares	Mean squares	F
Mechanicism	2	1598.61	799.30	7.324
Error S. S.	24	2619.39	109.14	
Total	26	4218.00		

$P > .05$ Not Significant.

The above results indicated that the various mechanicist groups (Table 41) did not differ significantly in their problems of health adjustment $F(2,24) = 7.324$, $P > .05$.

Table **42** :

ANOVA of Social Adjustment Scores
for the Mechanicist Group.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Mechanicism	2	210.23	105.11	3.008
Error S. S.	24	838.52	34.94	
Total	26	1048.75		

$P > .05$ Not Significant.

The results indicated that the various Mechanicist groups did not differ significantly in their problems of social adjustment $F(2,24) = 3.008$, $P > .05$.

Table **43** :

ANOVA of Emotional Adjustment Scores
for the Mechanicist Group.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Mechanicism	2	446.25	223.12	2.389
Error S. S.	24	2240.72	93.36	
Total	26	2686.97		

$P > .05$ Not Significant.

It was seen that the various Mechanicist groups did not differ significantly in their problems of emotional adjustment $F(2,24) = 2.389$, $P > .05$.

Table **44** :

ANOVA of Occupational Adjustment Scores
for the Mechanicist Group.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Mechanicism	2	73.34	36.67	1.309
Error S. S.	24	672.52	28.02	
Total	26	745.86		

$P > .05$ Not Significant.

The results showed that the various Mechanicist groups did not differ significantly in their problems of Occupational adjustment $F(2,24) = 1, 309$, $P > .05$.

Presented in Table 54 are means and standard deviations of adjustment scores for the organicist group in different areas of adjustment i.e. home, health, social, emotional and occupational.

Table 45:

Means and Standard Deviations of Scores of the Organicist in Different Areas of Adjustment.

Areas of Adjustment	Organicist-Formist (N = 10) % = 45.45		Organicist-Mechanicist (N = 7) % = 31.82		Organicist-Contextualist (N = 5) % = 22.73	
	Means	Standard Deviations	Means	Standard Deviations	Means	Standard Deviations
Home	12.7	7.69	15.14	7.83	17.4	6.62
Health	11.9	9.28	14.71	8.60	19.6	10.31
Social	9.6	5.90	11.71	5.20	16.6	2.94
Emotional	10.4	10.35	13.86	9.76	18.8	8.28
Occupational	12.0	5.97	15.71	5.28	16.8	5.84
Total Means and Standard Deviations	11.32	8.12	14.23	7.68	17.84	7.32

From the above table it was seen that the OC group indicated more unsatisfactory home adjustment (M=17.4) compared to OM group (M=15.14) and OF (M=12.7). The OC group also revealed more unsatisfactory health adjustment (M=19.6) compared to the OM group (M=14.7) and OF group (M=11.9). It was seen

that OC group was socially more submissive and retiring (M=16.6) compared to OM (M=11.71) and OF (M=9.6). OC group was found to be emotionally more unstable (M=18.8) compared to OM (M=13.86) and OF (M=10.4); further the OC group was also found to be more dissatisfied with their occupations (M=16.8) compared to OM (M=15.71) and OF (M=12.0). OC group indicated overall poorer adjustment (M=17.84) compared to OM (M=14.23) and OF (M=11.32).

Table **46** :

ANOVA of Home Adjustment Scores
for the Organicist Group.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Organicism	2	77.30	38.65	1.69
Error S. S.	19	1240.16	65.27	
Total	21	1317.46		

$P > .05$ Not Significant

The above ANOVA indicated that the various organicist groups i.e. OF , OM and OC did not differ significantly in the area of home adjustment $F(19,2) = 1.69$, $P > .05$.

Table **47** :

ANOVA of Health Adjustment Scores
for the Organicist Group.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Organicism	2	252.5	126.25	2.01
Error S. S.	19	1192.96	62.79	
Total	21	1445.46		

$P > .05$ Not Significant

The above ANOVA showed that the various organicist groups i.e. OF , OM and OC did not difer significantly in health adjustment $F(2,19) = 2.01$, $P > 05$.

Table **48** :

ANOVA of Social Adjustment Scores
for the Organicist Group.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Organicism	2	163.56	81.78	2.674
Error S. S.	19	581.03	30.58	
Total	21	744.59		

$P > .05$ Not Significant

The results indicated that the various organicist groups i.e. OF , OM and OC did not differ significantly in the area of social adjustment $F(2,19) = 2.674$, $P > .05$.

Table 49 :

ANOVA of Emotional Adjustment Scores
for the Organicist Group.

Source	df	Sums of squares	Mean squares	F
Organicism	2	255.44	127.72	1.590
Error S. S.	19	1526.06	80.32	
Total	21	1781.5		

$P > .05$ Not Significant

It was seen that (Table 49) the various organicist groups i.e. OF , OM and OC did not differ significantly in the area of emotional adjustment $F(2,19) = 1.590$, $P > .05$.

Table 50 :

ANOVA of Occupational Adjustment Scores
for the Organicist Groups.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Organicism	2	98.13	49.065	1.291
Error S. S.	19	722.23	38.01	
Total	21	820.36		

$P > .05$ Not Significant

The results indicated that the various organicist groups i.e. OF , OM and OC did not differ significantly in the area of occupational adjustment $F(2,19) = 1.291$, $P > .05$.

Given in Table 51 are means and standard deviations of adjustment scores for the contextualist group in different areas of adjustment i.e. home, health, social, emotional and occupational.

Table 51 :

Means and Standard Deviations of Scores of the Contextualists in Different Areas of Adjustment.

Areas of Adjustment	Contextualist-Organicist (N = 6) % = 33.33		Contextualist-Mechanicist (N = 4) % = 22.22		Contextualist-Formist (N = 8) % = 44.44	
	Mean	Standard Deviations	Mean	Standard Deviations	Mean	Standard Deviations
Home	17.33	9.16	10.00	8.75	18.37	8.24
Health	19.5	12.08	9.25	8.70	16.87	9.52
Social	12.83	7.13	9.5	3.20	16.5	3.5
Emotional	18.00	11.24	8.00	8.21	18.75	9.67
Occupational	14.67	6.39	8.5	4.39	17.00	4.24
Total Means and Standard Deviations	16.47	9.76	9.05	7.10	17.50	7.57

Results indicated that CF group had more unsatisfactory home adjustment (M=18.37) compared to CO group (M=17.33) and CM group (M=10.00). CO group had more unsatisfactory health adjustment (M=19.5) compared to CF group (M=16.87) and CM group (M=9.25). CF group was found to be socially more submissive and

retiring (M=16.5) compared to CO (M=12.83) and CM (M=9.5). CF group was also found to be emotionally more unstable (M=18.75) compared to CO group (M=18.00) and CM (M=8.00). CF group was found to be more dissatisfied with the occupations (M=17.00) compared to CO group (M=14.67) and CM group (M=8.5). CF group was found to be poorer in overall adjustment (M=17.50) compared to CO (M=16.47) and CM (M=9.05).

Table **52** :

ANOVA of Home Adjustment Scores for the Contextualist Group.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Contextualism	2	199.28	99.64	1.104
Error S. S.	15	1353.22	90.21	
Total	17	1552.5		

$P > .05$ Not Significant

The results indicated that the various Contextualist groups i.e. CO , CM and CF did not differ significantly in the area of home adjustment $F(2,15) = 1.104$, $P > .05$.

Table **53** :

ANOVA of Health Adjustment Scores
for the Contextualist Group.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Contextualism	2	268.81	134.40	1.079
Error S. S.	15	1868.97	124.60	
Total	17	2137.78		

$P > .05$ Not Significant

The results indicated that the various contextualist groups i.e. CO , CM and CF did not differ significantly in the area of health adjustment $F(2,15) = 1,079$, $P > .05$.

Table **54** :

ANOVA of Social Adjustment Scores
for the Contextualist Group.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Contextualism	2	137.78	68.89	2.328
Error S. S.	15	443.84	29.59	
Total	17	581.62		

$P > .05$ Not Significant

The results indicated that the various contextualist groups i.e. CO,CM and CF did not differ significantly in the area of social adjustment $F(2,15) = 2.328$, $P > .05$.

Table 55 :

ANOVA of Emotional Adjustment Scores
for the Contextualist Group.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Contextualism	2	308.62	154.31	2.284
Error S. S.	15	1013.5	67.57	
Total	17	1322.12		

$P > .05$ Not Significant.

The results indicated that the various contextualist groups i.e. CO , CM and CF did not differ significantly in the area of emotional adjustment $F(2,15) = 2.284$, $P > .05$.

Table 56 :

ANOVA of Occupational Adjustment Scores
for the Contextualist Group.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Contextualism	2	250.78	125.39	4.033
Error S. S.	15	466.34	31.09	
Total	17	717.12		

$P > .05$ Not Significant

The above results showed that the various contextualist groups i.e. CO , CM and CF did not differ significantly in the area of occupational adjustment $F(2,15) = 4.003$, $P > .05$.

Presented in Table 66 are means and standard deviations of adjustment scores for the unclassified (equal dominant) groups in different areas of adjustment i.e. home, health,social,emotional and occupational.

Table 57 :

Means and Standard Deviations of Scores of the Unclassified* Group in Different Areas of Adjustment.

Areas of Adjustment	Formist-Contextualist (N = 4) % = 21.05		Formist-Mechanicist (N = 7) % = 36.84		Organicist-Contextualist (N = 5) % = 26.31		Mechanicist-Organicist (N = 3) % = 15.79	
	Means	Standard Deviations	Means	Standard Deviations	Means	Standard Deviations	Means	Standard Deviations
Home	6.5	3.5	14.43	9.30	15.8	5.77	18.67	2.05
Health	5.25	1.92	15.00	10.41	16.4	7.23	20.67	6.85
Social	11.5	3.20	13.43	3.15	13.8	3.76	13.33	5.91
Emotional	9.5	3.5	17.43	8.50	18.6	4.96	18.67	8.34
Occupational	18.75	3.96	14.14	6.36	15.4	6.89	16.67	5.31
Total Means and Standard Deviations	8.3	3.96	14.80	8.08	16.0	6.07	17.60	6.55

* Unclassified Group : The subjects who had equal scores on two world-hypotheses were described as unclassified group

From the above table it is seen that the MO group showed greater unsatisfactory home adjustment (M=18.67) as compared to OC group (M=15.8) FM group (M=14.43) and FC group (M=6.5). The MO group indicated unsatisfactory health adjustment (M=20.67) as compared to OC group (M=16.4), FM group (M=15.00) and FC group (M=5.25). OC group also was found to be socially more submissive and retiring (M=13.8) as compared to FC group (M=11.5). MO and OC groups were also seen to be emotionally more unstable (M=18.67, 18.60) as compared to FM group (M=17.43) and FC group (M=9.5). MO group indicated more dissatisfaction with their occupations (M=16.67) as compared to FM group (M=14.14) and FC group (M=8.75). MO group was found to have poorer overall adjustment (M=17.60) as compared to OC (M=16.0), FM (14.80) and FC groups (M=8.3).

Table **59** :

ANOVA of Home Adjustment Scores
for the Unclassified Group.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Unclassified Groups	3	306.97	102.32	1.849
Error S. S.	15	834.19	55.61	
Total	18	1141.16		

$P > .05$ Not Significant

The results indicated that the various unclassified groups i.e. FC , FM , OC and MO (see Table 60) were not found to be significantly different in the area of home adjustment $F(3,15) = 1.849$, $P > .05$.

Table 59 :

ANOVA of Health Adjustment Scores
for the Unclassified Group.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Unclassified Groups	3	474.54	158.18	2.02
Error S. S.	15	1174.62	78.31	
Total	18	1649.16		

$P > .05$ Not Significant

The above results showed that the various unclassified groups i.e. FC , FM , OC and MO did not differ significantly in their problems of health adjustment $F(3,15)=2.02$, $P > .05$.

Table 60 :

ANOVA of Social Adjustment Scores
for the Unclassified Group.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Unclassified Groups	3	13.60	4.53	4.212
Error S. S.	15	286.19	19.08	
Total	18	299.79		

$P < .05$ Significant

The analysis of variance of social adjustment scores for the unclassified groups i.e. (Formists-contextualists, Formists-Mechanicists, Organicists-contextualists and Mechanicists-organicists) showed statistically significant difference, $F(15,3)=4.212$, $P < .05$. Mean scores (Table 66) also indicated differences in the area of social adjustment of the Formists-contextualists and organicists-contextualists.

Table 61 :

ANOVA of Emotional Adjustment Scores
for the Unclassified Group.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Unclassified Groups	3	237.69	79.23	1.341
Error S. S.	15	885.99	59.07	
Total	18	1123.68		

$P > .05$ Not Significant

The above results indicated that the various unclassified groups i.e. FC , FM , OC and MO did not differ significantly in the area of emotional adjustment $F(3,15) = 1.341$, $P > .05$.

Table 62 :

ANOVA of Occupational Adjustment Scores
for the Unclassified Group.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Unclassified Groups	3	140.2	46.73	1.05
Error S. S.	15	667.48	44.50	
Total	18	807.68		

$P > .05$ Not Significant

The findings revealed that the unclassified groups i.e. FC , FM , OC and MO, did not differ significantly in the area of occupational adjustment $F(3,15) = 1.05$, $P > .05$.

3.12 The Effects of Different Value-Types on Areas of Adjustment.

Presented in Table 63 are the means and standard deviations of adjustment scores for the disabled subjects with differential patterns of value-types in various areas of adjustment i.e. home, health, social, emotional and occupational.

Table 63 :

Means and Standard Deviations of Scores of Subjects (with Different Dominant Values) in Various Areas of Adjustment.

Areas of Adjustment ↓	Theoretical N = 14 % = 12.73		Economic N = 37 % = 33.64		Aesthetic N = 12 % = 10.91		Social N = 7 % = 6.36		Political N = 8 % = 7.27		Religious N = 32 % = 29.09	
	Means	Standard Deviations	Means	Standard Deviations	Means	Standard Deviations	Means	Standard Deviations	Means	Standard Deviations	Means	Standard Deviations
Home	18.57	6.04	15.49	8.09	11.67	6.64	16.71	7.40	14.62	7.55	14.22	8.63
Health	21.5	7.79	15.13	9.62	11.00	7.96	14.86	11.87	16.00	9.01	13.75	11.13
Social	17.21	4.11	12.46	5.26	12.08	4.72	13.28	4.65	14.75	4.60	13.41	6.54
Emotional	19.78	7.86	15.70	9.77	11.92	9.525	15.86	10.29	15.37	7.10	15.06	10.60
Occupational	17.78	4.44	14.62	6.34	13.17	4.81	15.86	4.32	14.12	5.86	14.12	6.31
Total Means and Standard Deviations	18.97	16.44	14.68	8.08	11.97	7.01	15.31	8.35	14.97	7.02	14.11	8.89

It was found from the above table that the subjects with dominant theoretical values (Table 63) showed more unsatisfactory home adjustment (M=18.57) compared to these with dominant social values (M=16.71), economic values (M=15.49), Political values (M=14.62), religious values (M=14.22) and aesthetic values (M=11.67). Those with dominant theoretical values indicated more unsatisfactory health adjustment (M=21.5) as compared to those with economic values (M=15.13) aesthetic values (M=11.00).Social values (M=14.86) Political values (16.00) and religious values (M=13.75). The subjects with theoretical values were also found to be more submissive and retiring in their social adjustment (M=17.21) compared to the those with dominant religious values (M=13.41), Social values (M=13.28), Political values (M=14.75), economic values (M=12.40) and aesthetic values (M=12.08). These subjects also were found to be emotionally more unstable (M = 19.78) compared to those with dominant social values (M = 15.86) economic values (M=15.70), Political values(M=15.37) religious values (M=15.06) and aesthetic values (M=11.92). The group with dominant theoratical values were found to be more dissatisfied with their occupations also (M=17.78) as compared to the those with dominant social values (M=15.86), economic values (M=14.62), Political (14.12) religious values(M=14.12) and aesthetic values (M=13.17). Results also indicated (Table 65) that the subjects with dominant theoretical values were found to be poorer in over-all adjustment(M=18.97),compared to those with dominant social values(M=15.31) Political values(M=14.97) economic values(M=14.68) religious values(M=14.11)and aesthetic values(M=11.97).

Table 64:

Relationship between the various Dominant Values and Home Adjustment.

Dominant values		Home Adjustment: Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatisfactory	Very unsatisfactory	Total
Theoretical N = 14 % = 12.73	F	0	0	3	1	10	14
	P	(00.00)	(00.00)	(21.43)	(07.14)	(71.43)	(100)
Economic N = 37 % = 33.64	F	0	2	12	6	17	37
	P	(00.00)	(05.40)	(32.43)	(16.22)	(45.94)	(99.99)
Aesthetic N = 12 % = 10.91	F	0	1	7	1	3	12
	P	(00.00)	(08.33)	(58.34)	(08.33)	(25.00)	(99.99)
Social N = 7 % = 6.36	F	0	0	2	2	3	7
	P	(00.00)	(00.00)	(28.57)	(28.57)	(42.86)	(100)
Political N = 8 % = 7.27	F	0	0	4	0	4	8
	P	(00.00)	(00.00)	(50.00)	(00.00)	(50.00)	(100)
Religious N = 32 % = 29.09	F	0	1	13	2	16	32
	P	(00.00)	(03.12)	(40.62)	(06.25)	(50.00)	(99.99)
Total N = 110 % = 100	F	0	4	41	12	53	110
	P	(00.00)	(03.64)	(37.27)	(10.91)	(48.18)	

$\chi^2 = 13.105$ df = 20 P > .05

P > .05 Not Significant.

The above results support the null hypothesis (no.8). In other words the various dominant value groups i.e. Theoretical, Economic, Aesthetic, Social, Political and Religious do not differ significantly in the area of home adjustment. However, the Theoretical group indicated poorer home adjustment (71.43) as compared to the Economic (45.94), Aesthetic (25.00), Social (42.86), Political (50.00) and Religious(50.00) groups.

Table 65 :

ANOVA of Home Adjustment Scores for the Different Dominant Value Groups.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Factor Value	5	360.57	72.114	1.122
Error S. S.	104	6682.12	64.25	
Total	109	7042.69		

$P > .05$ Not Significant.

The above results indicated that the various dominant value groups did not differ significantly in the area of home adjustment $F(5,104) = 1.122$, $P > .05$.

Table 66:

Relationship between the Dominant values and Health Adjustment.

Dominant values		Health Adjustment: Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatisfactory	Very unsatisfactory	Total
Theoretical N = 14 % = 12.73	F	0	0	2	2	10	14
	P	(00.00)	(00.00)	(14.28	(14.28)	(71.43)	(99.99)
Economic N = 37 % = 33.64	F	2	3	8	1	23	37
	P	(05.40)	(08.11)	(21.62)	(02.70)	(62.16)	(99.99)
Aesthetic N = 12 % = 10.91	F	0	1	4	3	4	12
	P	(00.00)	(08.33)	(33.33)	(25.00)	(33.33)	(99.99)
Social N = 7 % = 6.36	F	1	1	1	1	3	7
	P	(14.28)	(14.28)	(14.28)	(14.28)	(42.86)	(99.98)
Political N = 8 % = 7.27	F	0	0	3	0	5	8
	P	(00.00)	(00.00)	(37.50)	(00.00)	(62.50)	(100)
Religious N = 32 % = 29.09	F	0	6	10	1	15	32
	P	(00.00)	(18.75)	(31.25)	(03.12)	(46.87)	(99.99)
Total N = 110 % = 100	F	0	3	11	28	8	110
	P	(00.00)	(02.73)	(10.00)	(25.45)	(07.27)	

$\chi^2 = 22.46$ df = 20 P > .05

P > .5 Not Significant.

The above results support the null hypothesis (no.8) that the various dominant value groups i.e. Theoretical, Economic, Aesthetic, Social, Political and Religious do not differ significantly in the area of health adjustment. As shown in results (Table 66) the Theoretical group had poorer health adjustment (71.43) as compared to Economic (62.16) Aesthetic (33.33), Social (42.86), Political (62.50) and Religious (46.87) groups.

Table 67 :

ANOVA of Health Adjustment Scores for the Differential Dominant Values Groups.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Factor Value	5	848.06	169.61	1.689
Error S. S.	104	10445.26	100.44	
Total	109	11293.32		

$P > .05$ Not Significant.

The results indicated that the various dominant value groups did not differ significantly in the area of health adjustment $F(5,104) = 1.689$, $P > .05$.

Table 78:

Relationship between the Dominant values and Social Adjustment.

Dominant values		Social Adjustment					
		Very Aggressive	Aggressive	Average	Retiring	Very Retiring	Total
Theoretical N = 14 % = 12.73	F	0	0	5	7	2	14
	P	(00.00)	(00.00)	(35.71)	(50.00)	(14.28)	(99.99)
Economic N = 37 % = 33.64	F	1	4	21	10	1	37
	P	(02.70)	(10.81)	(56.76)	(27.03)	(02.70)	(100)
Aesthetic N = 12 % = 10.9	F	0	3	6	3	0	12
	P	(00.00)	(25.00)	(50.00)	(25.00)	(00.00)	(100)
Social N = 7 % = 6.36	F	0	1	3	3	0	7
	P	(00.00)	(14.28)	(42.86)	(42.86)	(00.00)	(100)
Political N = 8 % = 7.27	F	0	0	4	4	0	8
	P	(00.00)	(00.00)	(50.00)	(50.00)	(00.00)	(100)
Religious N = 32 % = 29.09	F	1	3	12	14	2	32
	P	(03.12)	(09.37)	(37.50)	(43.75)	(06.25)	(99.99)
Total N = 110 % = 100	F	2	11	51	41	5	110
	P	(01.82)	(10.00)	(46.36)	(37.27)	(04.54)	(100)

$\chi^2 = 15.39$ df = 20 P $>$ .05

P $>$ .05 Not Significant.

The above results support the null hypothesis (no.8). In other words the various dominant value groups do not differ significantly in the area of social adjustment. However, the Theoretical group indicated poorer social adjustment(64.28) as compared to the Economic (29.73), Aesthetic (25.00), Social (42.86), Political (50.00) and Religious (50.00) groups.

Table 69 :
ANOVA of Social Adjustment Scores for the Different Dominant Value Groups.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Factor Value	5	246.6	49.32	1.759
Error S. S.	104	2915.12	28.03	
Total	109	3161.72		

$P > .05$ Not Significant.

The results showed that the various dominant value groups did not differ significantly in area of social adjustment $F(5,104) = 1.759$, $P > .05$.

Table 70:

Relationship between the Dominant values and Emotional Adjustment.

Dominant values		Emotional Adjustment: Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatisfactory	Very unsatisfactory	Total
Theoretical N = 14 % = 12.73	F	0	1	4	0	9	14
	P	(00.00)	(07.14)	(28.57)	(00.00)	(64.28)	(99.99)
Economic N = 37 % = 33.64	F	5	5	6	6	15	37
	P	(13.51)	(13.51)	(16.22)	(16.22)	(40.54)	(100)
Aesthetic N = 12 % = 10.91	F	2	2	4	1	3	12
	P	(16.67)	(16.67)	(33.33)	(08.33)	(25.00)	(100)
Social N = 7 % = 6.36	F	1	0	2	1	3	7
	P	(14.28)	(00.00)	(28.57)	(14.28)	(42.86)	(99.99)
Political N = 8 % = 7.27	F	1	0	2	2	3	8
	P	(12.50)	(00.00)	(25.00)	(25.00)	(37.50)	(100)
Religious N = 32 % = 29.09	F	4	8	4	2	14	32
	P	(12.50)	(25.00)	(12.50)	(06.25)	(43.75)	(100)
Total N = 110 % = 100	F	13	16	22	12	47	110
	P	(11.82)	(14.54)	(20.00)	(10.91)	(42.73)	

$\chi^2 = 17.482$ df = 20 $P > .05$

$P > .05$ Not Significant.

The results support the null hypothesis (no.8) that the various dominant value groups do not differ significantly in their problems of emotional adjustment. However, as indicated in Table 70, the Theoretical group had poorer emotional adjustment (64.28) compared to Economic (40.54), Aesthetic (25.00), Social (42.86), Political (37.50) and Religious (43.75) groups.

Table 71 :

ANOVA of Emotional Adjustment Scores for the Different Dominant Value Groups.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Factor Value	5	418.56	83.71	1.174
Error S. S.	104	10223.63	98.30	
Total	109	10642.19		

$P > .05$ Not Significant.

The results showed that the various dominant value groups did not differ significantly in area of emotional adjustment $F(104,5) = 1.174$, $P > .05$.

Table 72:

Relationship between the Dominant values and Occupational Adjustment.

Dominant values		Occupational Adjustment: Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatisfactory	Very unsatisfactory	Total
Theoretical N = 14 % = 12.73	F	0	0	2	5	7	14
	P	(00.00)	(00.00)	(14.28)	(35.71)	(50.00)	(99.99)
Economic N = 37 % = 33.64	F	1	3	9	10	14	37
	P	(02.70)	(08.11)	(24.32)	(27.03)	(37.84)	(100)
Aesthetic N = 12 % = 10.91	F	1	0	5	5	1	12
	P	(08.33)	(00.00)	(41.67)	(41.67)	(08.33)	(100)
Social N = 7 % = 6.36	F	0	0	3	0	4	7
	P	(00.00)	(00.00)	(42.86)	(00.00)	(57.14)	(100)
Political N = 8 % = 7.27	F	1	0	2	3	2	8
	P	(12.50)	(00.00)	(25.00)	(37.50)	(25.00)	(100)
Religious N = 32 % = 29.09	F	0	2	13	3	14	32
	P	(00.00)	(06.25)	(40.62)	(09.37)	(43.75)	(99.99)
Total N = 110 % = 100	F	3	5	34	26	42	110
	P	(02.73)	(04.54)	(30.91)	(23.64)	(38.18)	(100)

$\chi^2 = 23.03$ df = 20 $P > .05$

$P > .05$ Not Significant.

The results support the null hypothesis (no.8). In other words, the various dominant value-groups, viz. Theoretical, Economic, Aesthetic, Social, Political and Religious, do not differ significantly in their problems of occupational adjustment. However, the social group showed poorer occupational adjustment (57.14) as compared to the Theoretical (50.00) Economic (37.84), Aesthetic (8.33), Political (25.00) and Religious (43.75) groups.

Table 73 :

ANOVA of Occupational Adjustment Scores
for the Different Dominant Value Groups.

Source	df	Sum of squares	Mean squares	F
Factor Value	5	183.88	36.78	1.027
Error S. S.	104	3723.97	35.81	
Total	109	3907.85		

$P > .05$ Not Significant.

The results revealed that the various dominant value groups did not differ significantly in the area of occupational adjustment $F(5,104) = 1.027$, $P > .05$.