

Table 20
Analysis of Variance
PIL Item 17 by Group
by Sex

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	PROB	SIG
Group	23.689	1	23.689	14.405	0.001	SIG
Sex	2.773	1	2.773	1.686	0.192	NS
Group x Sex	1.196	1	1.196	0.727	0.999	NS
Residual	345.350	210	1.645			
Total	370.927	213	1.741			

Based on this analysis, it was concluded that (a) there was significant main effect for group, (b) there was no significant main effect for sex, and (c) there was no significant interaction between group and sex.

The difference between the constructive mean (5.77) and the destructive mean (5.13) was significant.

Item 18

For subhypothesis 21: "My life is: in my hands and I am in control of it, or out of my hands and controlled by external factors" the hypotheses are: (a) There are no significant differences in the means between adolescents identified as constructive and those identified as destructive. (b) There are no differences between means for males and females. (c) The difference between constructive and destructive

means for males is the same as the difference between constructive and destructive means for females. The analysis of variance for this hypothesis is presented in Table 21.

Table 21
Analysis of Variance
PIL Item 18 by Group
by Sex

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	PROB	SIG
Group	38.915	1	38.915	14.688	0.001	SIG
Sex	3.267	1	3.267	1.233	0.267	NS
Group x Sex	2.251	1	2.251	0.850	0.999	NS
Residual	556.395	210	2.649			
Total	598.100	213	2.808			

Based on this analysis, it was concluded that (a) there was significant main effect for group, (b) there was no significant main effect for sex, and (c) there was no significant interaction between group and sex.

The difference between the constructive mean (5.63) and the destructive mean (4.51) was significant.

Item 19

For subhypothesis 19: "Facing my daily tasks is: a source of pleasure and satisfaction, or a painful and boring experience" the hypotheses are: (a) There are no significant differences in the means

between adolescents identified as constructive and those identified as destructive. (b) There are no differences between means for males and females. (c) The difference between constructive and destructive means for males is the same as the difference between constructive and destructive means for females. The analysis of variance for this hypothesis is presented in Table 22.

Table 22

Analysis of Variance
PIL Item 19 by Group
by Sex

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	PROB	SIG
Group	1.635	1	1.635	0.689	0.999	NS
Sex	0.152	1	0.152	0.064	0.999	NS
Group x Sex	0.833	1	0.833	0.351	0.999	NS
Residual	498.159	210	2.372			
Total	501.014	213	2.352			

Based on this analysis, it was concluded that (a) there was no significant main effect for group, (b) there was no significant main effect for sex, and (c) there was no significant interaction between group and sex.

Item 20

For subhypothesis 20: "I have discovered: no mission or purpose

in life, or clear-cut goals and a satisfying life purpose" the hypotheses are: (a) There are no significant differences in the means between adolescents identified as constructive and those identified as destructive. (b) There are no differences between means for males and females. (c) The difference between constructive and destructive means for males is the same as the difference between constructive and destructive means for females. The analysis of variance for this hypothesis is presented in Table 23.

Table 23
Analysis of Variance
PIL Item 20 by Group
by Sex

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	PROB	SIG
Group	19.865	1	19.865	10.752	0.001	SIG
Sex	0.219	1	0.219	0.119	0.999	NS
Group x Sex	0.799	1	0.799	0.432	0.999	NS
Residual	387.980	210	1.848			
Total	408.741	213	1.919			

Based on this analysis, it was concluded that (a) there was significant main effect for group, (b) there was no significant main effect for sex, and (c) there was no significant interaction between group and sex.

The difference between the constructive mean (5.63) and the

destructive mean (5.02) was significant.

Results of the Family Adjustment Test
and the Constructive-Destructive
Variable

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2_a states: There are no significant differences in the mean Family Adjustment Test scores (total and each of the 10 subtests) between adolescents identified as constructive and those who are identified as destructive.

Hypothesis 2_b states: There are no significant differences in the mean Family Adjustment Test scores (total and each of the 10 subtests) between males and females.

Hypothesis 2_c states: The difference between the constructive and destructive means for males on the Family Adjustment Test scores (total and each of the 10 subtests) is the same as the difference between the constructive and destructive means for females.

A summary of the means for this hypothesis is presented in Table 24. The high scores reflected in the table represent low family adjustment and a perceived attitude of rejection and noncaring family relationships. Low scores reflect good family adjustment and a perceived attitude of caring and love.

destructive mean (5.02) was significant.

Results of the Family Adjustment Test
and the Constructive-Destructive
Variable

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2_a states: There are no significant differences in the mean Family Adjustment Test scores (total and each of the 10 subtests) between adolescents identified as constructive and those who are identified as destructive.

Hypothesis 2_b states: There are no significant differences in the mean Family Adjustment Test scores (total and each of the 10 subtests) between males and females.

Hypothesis 2_c states: The difference between the constructive and destructive means for males on the Family Adjustment Test scores (total and each of the 10 subtests) is the same as the difference between the constructive and destructive means for females.

A summary of the means for this hypothesis is presented in Table 24. The high scores reflected in the table represent low family adjustment and a perceived attitude of rejection and noncaring family relationships. Low scores reflect good family adjustment and a perceived attitude of caring and love.

Table 24

Mean Family Adjustment Total and Subtest Scores
by Group, by Sex, by Group by Sex

	N	Total FAT	FAT A	FAT B	FAT C	FAT D	FAT E	FAT F	FAT G	FAT H	FAT I	FAT J
Constructive	107	250.87	65.34	69.06	1.06	13.06	24.36	53.95	30.05	31.86	36.29	30.08
Destructive	107	280.83	73.08	81.07	1.14	15.54	25.97	58.27	35.62	35.95	40.79	33.63
Male	134	268.16	70.09	76.30	1.10	14.31	25.48	57.30	32.88	34.49	38.72	32.02
Female	80	261.99	67.74	72.99	1.09	14.27	24.65	54.13	32.75	32.93	38.25	31.56
Total	214	265.85										
Constructive M	58	248.59	65.52	68.21	1.04	12.72	24.41	54.22	29.48	31.50	35.78	29.95
Constructive F	49	243.57	65.12	70.06	1.08	13.45	24.31	53.63	30.71	32.29	36.90	30.22
Destructive M	76	283.09	73.58	82.47	1.14	15.53	26.29	59.65	35.47	36.78	40.96	33.61
Destructive F	31	275.29	71.87	77.61	1.12	15.58	25.19	54.90	35.97	33.94	40.39	33.68



Property of the Erich Fromm Document Center. For personal use only. Citation or publication of material prohibited without express written permission of the copyright holder.
Eigentum des Erich Fromm Dokumentationszentrums. Nutzung nur für persönliche Zwecke.
Veröffentlichungen - auch von Teilen - bedürfen der schriftlichen Erlaubnis des Rechteinhabers.

Total Score

The subhypothesis for total score would be: (a) There are no significant differences in the mean Family Adjustment total score between adolescents identified as constructive and those who are identified as destructive. (b) There are no differences between means for males and females. (c) The difference between constructive and destructive means for males is the same as the difference between constructive and destructive means for females. The analysis of variance for this hypothesis is presented in Table 25.

Table 25
Analysis of Variance
FAT Total Score by
Group by Sex

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	PROB	SIG
Group	46155.492	1	46155.492	11.903	0.001	SIG
Sex	31.909	1	31.909	0.008	0.999	NS
Group x Sex	1968.412	1	1968.412	0.508	0.999	NS
Residual	814334.750	210	3877.784			
Total	864365.187	213	4058.052			

Based on this analysis, it was concluded that (a) there was significant main effect for group, (b) there was no significant main effect for sex, and (c) there was no significant interaction between group and sex.

The difference between the constructive mean (250.87) and the destructive mean (280.83) was significant.

Subtest A

For subhypothesis Subtest A: "Attitude toward Mother" the hypotheses are: (a) There are no significant differences in the means between adolescents identified as constructive and those identified as destructive. (b) There are no differences between means for males and females. (c) The difference between constructive and destructive means for males is the same as the difference between constructive and destructive means for females. The analysis of variance for this hypothesis is presented in Table 26.

Table 26

Analysis of Variance FAT Subtest A
Attitude Toward Mother by
Group by Sex

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	PROB	SIG
Group	2981.900	1	2981.900	8.388	0.004	SIG
Sex	47.608	1	47.608	0.134	0.999	NS
Group x Sex	20.762	1	20.762	0.058	0.999	NS
Residual	74652.625	210	355.489			
Total	77932.437	213	365.880			

Based on this analysis, it was concluded that (a) there was significant main effect for group, (b) there was no significant main

effect for sex, and (c) there was no significant interaction between group and sex.

The difference between the constructive mean (65.34) and the destructive mean (73.08) was significant.

Subtest B

For subhypothesis Subtest B: "Attitude toward Father" the hypotheses are: (a) There are no significant differences in the means between adolescents identified as constructive and those identified as destructive. (b) There are no differences between means for males and females. (c) The difference between constructive and destructive means for males is the same as the difference between constructive and destructive means for females. The analysis of variance for this hypothesis is presented in Table 27.

Table 27

Analysis of Variance FAT Subtest B
Attitude Toward Father by
Group by Sex

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	PROB	SIG
Group	7235.555	1	7235.555	15.435	0.001	SIG
Sex	68.712	1	68.712	0.147	0.999	NS
Group x Sex	542.858	1	542.858	1.158	0.283	NS
Residual	98442.125	210	468.772			
Total	106769.750	213	501.266			

Based on this analysis, it was concluded that (a) there was significant main effect for group, (b) there was no significant main effect for sex, and (c) there was no significant interaction between group and sex.

The difference between the constructive mean (69.06) and the destructive mean (81.07) was significant.

Subtest C

For subhypothesis Subtest C: "Father-Mother Attitude Quotient" the hypotheses are: (a) There are no significant differences in the means between adolescents identified as constructive and those identified as destructive. (b) There are no differences between means for males and females. (c) The difference between constructive and destructive means for males is the same as the difference between constructive and destructive means for females. The analysis of variance for this hypothesis is presented in Table 28.

Table 28

Analysis of Variance FAT Subtest C
 Father-Mother Attitude Quotient
 by Group by Sex

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	PROB	SIG
Group	0.296	1	0.296	5.094	0.024	SIG
Sex	0.002	1	0.002	0.028	0.999	NS
Group x Sex	0.048	1	0.048	0.823	0.999	NS
Residual	12.186	210	0.058			
Total	12.533	213	0.059			

Based on this analysis, it was concluded that (a) there was significant main effect for group, (b) there was no significant main effect for sex, and (c) there was no significant interaction between group and sex.

The difference between the constructive mean (1.06) and the destructive mean (1.14) was significant.

Subtest D

For subhypothesis Subtest D: "Oedipal" the hypotheses are:

(a) There are no significant differences in the means between adolescents identified as constructive and those identified as destructive. (b) There are no differences between means for males and females. (c) The difference between constructive and destructive means for males is the same as the difference between constructive and destructive means for

females. The analysis of variance for this hypothesis is presented in Table 29.

Table 29
Analysis of Variance FAT Subtest D
Oedipal by Group by Sex

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	PROB	SIG
Group	339.169	1	339.169	15.154	0.001	SIG
Sex	8.608	1	8.608	0.385	0.999	NS
Group x Sex	5.413	1	5.413	0.242	0.999	NS
Residual	4700.109	210	22.381			
Total	5044.766	213	23.684			

Based on this analysis, it was concluded that (a) there was significant main effect for group, (b) there was no significant main effect for sex, and (c) there was no significant interaction between group and sex.

The difference between the constructive mean (13.06) and the destructive mean (15.54) was significant.

Subtest E

For subhypothesis Subtest E: "Struggle for Independence" the hypotheses are: (a) There are no significant differences in the means between adolescents identified as constructive and those identified as destructive. (b) There are no differences between means for males and

females. (c) The difference between constructive and destructive means for males is the same as the difference between constructive and destructive means for females. The analysis of variance for this hypothesis is presented in Table 30.

Table 30
Analysis of Variance FAT Subtest E
Struggle for Independence by
Group by Sex

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	PROB	SIG
Group	118.928	1	118.928	2.880	0.087	NS
Sex	14.996	1	14.996	0.363	0.999	NS
Group x Sex	11.758	1	11.758	0.285	0.999	NS
Residual	8672.734	210	41.299			
Total	8837.730	213	41.492			

Based on this analysis, it was concluded that (a) there was no significant main effect for group, (b) there was no significant main effect for sex, and (c) there was no significant interaction between group and sex.

Subtest F

For subhypothesis Subtest F: "Parent-Child Friction-Harmony" the hypotheses are: (a) There are no significant differences in the means between adolescents identified as constructive and those identified as

destructive. (b) There are no differences between means for males and females. (c) The difference between constructive and destructive means for males is the same as the difference between constructive and destructive means for females. The analysis of variance for this hypothesis is presented in Table 31.

Table 31

Analysis of Variance FAT Subtest F
Parent-Child Friction-Harmony by
Group by Sex

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	PROB	SIG
Group	789.884	1	789.884	4.710	0.029	SIG
Sex	296.960	1	296.960	1.771	0.181	NS
Group x Sex	207.351	1	207.351	1.236	0.267	NS
Residual	35221.191	210	167.720			
Total	36722.906	213	172.408			

Based on this analysis, it was concluded that (a) there was significant main effect for group, (b) there was no significant main effect for sex, and (c) there was no significant interaction between group and sex.

The difference between the constructive mean (53.95) and the destructive mean (58.27) was significant.

Subtest G

For subhypothesis Subtest G: "Interparental Friction-Harmony" the

hypotheses are: (a) There are no significant differences in the means between adolescents identified as constructive and those identified as destructive. (b) There are no differences between means for males and females. (c) The difference between constructive and destructive means for males is the same as the difference between constructive and destructive means for females. The analysis of variance for this hypothesis is presented in Table 32.

Table 32
Analysis of Variance FAT Subtest G
Interparental Friction-Harmony
by Group by Sex

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	PROB	SIG
Group	1698.144	1	1698.144	17.086	0.001	SIG
Sex	39.111	1	39.111	0.394	0.999	NS
Group x Sex	6.547	1	6.547	0.066	0.999	NS
Residual	20872.055	210	99.391			
Total	22577.602	213	105.998			

Based on this analysis, it was concluded that (a) there was significant main effect for group, (b) there was no significant main effect for sex, and (c) there was no significant interaction between group and sex.

The difference between the constructive mean (30.05) and the destructive mean (35.62) was significant.

Subtest H

For subhypothesis Subtest H: "Family Inferiority-Superiority" the hypotheses are: (a) There are no significant differences in the means between adolescents identified as constructive and those identified as destructive. (b) There are no differences between means for males and females. (c) The difference between constructive and destructive means for males is the same as the difference between constructive and destructive means for females. The analysis of variance for this hypothesis is presented in Table 33.

Table 33
Analysis of Variance FAT Subtest H
Family Inferiority-Superiority
by Group by Sex

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	PROB	SIG
Group	809.143	1	809.143	8.981	0.003	SIG
Sex	35.764	1	35.764	0.397	0.999	NS
Group x Sex	158.331	1	158.331	1.757	0.183	NS
Residual	18919.266	210	90.092			
Total	20009.828	213	93.943			

Based on this analysis, it was concluded that (a) there was significant main effect for group, (b) there was no significant main effect for sex, and (c) there was no significant interaction between group and sex.

The difference between the constructive mean (31.86) and the destructive mean (35.95) was significant.

Subtest I

For subhypothesis Subtest I: "Rejection of Child" the hypotheses are: (a) There are no significant differences in the means between adolescents identified as constructive and those identified as destructive. (b) There are no differences between means for males and females. (c) The difference between constructive and destructive means for males is the same as the difference between constructive and destructive means for females. The analysis of variance for this hypothesis is presented in Table 34.

Table 34
Analysis of Variance FAT Subtest I
Rejection of Child by
Group by Sex

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	PROB	SIG
Group	1080.803	1	1080.803	11.599	0.001	SIG
Sex	6.074	1	6.074	0.065	0.999	NS
Group x Sex	34.609	1	34.609	0.371	0.999	NS
Residual	19568.508	210	93.183			
Total	20694.820	213	97.159			

Based on this analysis, it was concluded that (a) there was

significant main effect for group, (b) there was no significant main effect for sex, and (c) there was no significant interaction between group and sex.

The difference between the constructive mean (36.29) and the destructive mean (40.79) was significant.

Subtest J

For subhypothesis Subtest J: "Parental Qualities" the hypotheses are: (a) There are no significant differences in the means between adolescents identified as constructive and those identified as destructive. (b) There are no differences between means for males and females. (c) The difference between constructive and destructive means for males is the same as the difference between constructive and destructive means for females. The analysis of variance for this hypothesis is presented in Table 35.

Table 35
Analysis of Variance FAT Subtest J
Parental Qualities by Group
by Sex

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	PROB	SIG
Group	665.812	1	665.812	9.271	0.003	SIG
Sex	1.640	1	1.640	0.023	0.999	NS
Group x Sex	0.501	1	0.501	0.007	0.999	NS
Residual	15081.996	210	71.819			
Total	15758.906	213	73.985			

Based on this analysis, it was concluded that (a) there was significant main effect for group, (b) there was no significant main effect for sex, and (c) there was no significant interaction between group and sex.

The difference between the constructive mean (30.08) and the destructive mean (33.63) was significant.

Results of the Correlations Between Purpose
in Life and Family Adjustment for
the Constructive Variable

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 states: There are no significant correlations between Purpose in Life total score and Family Adjustment total and subtest scores among adolescents who have been identified as constructive.

A summary of the correlations for this hypothesis is presented in Table 36. A low score on FAT represents a positive family relationship, whereas a high score on PIL represents a high purpose in life. The correlation, though negative in sign, represents a positive correlation between the constructs.

Table 36
 Correlation Coefficients Between PIL Total
 and FAT Total and Subtests Among
 Constructive Adolescents

FAT	N = 107	r	PROB	SIG
FAT Total		-.2451	.011	SIG
A	Attitude Toward Mother	-.2411	.012	SIG
B	Attitude Toward Father	-.2292	.018	SIG
C	Mother-Father Preference	-.0120	.903	NS
D	Oedipal	-.0979	.316	NS
E	Struggle for Independence	-.3434	.001	SIG
F	Parent-Child Friction-Harmony	-.2846	.003	SIG
G	Interparental Friction-Harmony	-.1440	.139	NS
H	Family Inferiority-Superiority	-.2357	.015	SIG
I	Rejection	-.2000	.039	SIG
J	Parental Qualities	-.2204	.023	SIG

Based on this analysis, it was concluded that there are significant correlations between PIL total score and FAT total score and subtests

scores for A, B, E, F, H, I, and J, therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected for the total score and these subtests. Inspection of the results, as shown in the table, reveals an inverse relationship, suggesting that as PIL scores increase, FAT scores decrease.

Further inspection of the results revealed nonsignificant correlations between PIL total and Subtest C, D, and G, therefore, the null hypotheses were retained for these subtests.

Results of the Correlations Between Purpose
in Life and Family Adjustment for
the Destructive Group

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 states: There are no significant correlations between Purpose in Life total score and Family Adjustment total and subtest scores among adolescents who have been identified as destructive.

A summary of the correlations for this hypothesis is presented in Table 37. A high score on FAT represents a negative family relationship, whereas a low score on the PIL represents low purpose in life. The correlation, though negative in sign, represents a positive correlation between the constructs.

Table 37
Correlation Coefficients Between PIL Total
and FAT Total and Subtests Among
Destructive Adolescents

FAT	N = 107	r	PROB	SIG
FAT Total		-.4318	.001	SIG
<u>Subtests</u>				
A	Attitude Toward Mother	-.3767	.001	SIG
B	Attitude Toward Father	-.3758	.001	SIG
C	Mother-Father Preference	-.0622	.524	NS
D	Oedipal	-.2118	.028	SIG
E	Struggle for Independence	-.4185	.001	SIG
F	Parent-Child Friction-Harmony	-.4008	.001	SIG
G	Interparental Friction-Harmony	-.3446	.001	SIG
H	Family Inferiority-Superiority	-.3581	.001	SIG
I	Rejection	-.4417	.001	SIG
J	Parental Qualities	-.3501	.001	SIG

Based on this analysis, it was concluded that there are significant correlations between PIL total and FAT total and all subtest, with the exception of E. The null hypothesis for E is retained and is rejected in all other situations where there was significance.

Inspection of the results revealed negative correlations which indicate that there is an inverse relationship between PIL and FAT subtests which suggests a decrease in PIL scores with an increase in FAT scores.

Results of the Differences in Correlations Between
the Constructive and Destructive Group on Purpose
in Life Total Score and Family Adjustment
Total and Subtest Scores

Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 states: There are no significant differences in the correlations between Purpose in Life total score and Family Adjustment total and subtest scores between adolescents identified as constructive and among those who are identified as destructive.

Based on this analysis, the null hypothesis is retained. There are no significant differences in the correlations between PIL total score and FAT total and subtest scores between adolescents who are identified as constructive and those who are identified as destructive. Though there exist no significant differences in the correlations, this however does not indicate there is no relationship.

Inspection of the results reveals an inverse relationship between PIL and FAT for both Group 1 and Group 2. As PIL scores increase for Group 1 and decrease for Group 2, FAT scores decrease and increase respectively. The results reveal a higher negative correlation between FAT and PIL for Group 2 than for Group 1.

Summary

This chapter presents the complete findings of the study. Five hypotheses were tested for purposes of determining the relationships between constructive-destructive behavior, purpose in life and family adjustment.

The first hypothesis, analyzed by analysis of variance consisted of 21 subhypotheses to determine if there was a difference between the groups on PIL total score and 20 items scores. The results revealed significant differences on the total score and 13 of the PIL items, and nonsignificant differences on 7 items. Significant sex differences were found on 2 of the items and significant group by sex interaction were found on 3 items.

The second hypothesis, analyzed by analysis of variance consisted of 11 subhypotheses to determine if there were differences between the groups on FAT total score and 10 subtest scores. The results revealed significant differences on total score and 9 of 10 subtests with no sex differences and no group by sex interactions.

The third hypothesis, analyzed by Pearson correlation revealed that there was a significant negative relationship between PIL total and FAT total. Significant negative correlations were found between PIL total and 7 of the 10 FAT subtests among the constructive group.

The fourth hypothesis, analyzed by Pearson correlation, revealed a significant negative relationship between PIL total and FAT for the destructive group. Significant negative correlations were found in 9 of the 10 subtests.

The fifth hypothesis, analyzed by the t -test for the Fisher Z transformation, revealed no significant differences in the correlations between the two groups.

A summary of the study, discussion of the findings, conclusions and recommendations will be presented in the next chapter.