Chapter II - METHOD OF THE STUDY
Details of the methodology adopted for the study has been mentioned below under suitable heads.

2.1. THE SAMPLE

2.1.1. Sampling Technique

Sampling may be defined as the selection of some part of an aggregate or totality on the basis of which a judgment or inference about the aggregate or totality is made. Two different bases may be considered for selection of the sample, viz., the element selection basis and the representation basis (Kothari, 1991). On the element selection basis, the sample may be either restricted (each sample element being drawn individually from the population at large), or unrestricted (elements not being selected individually). On the representation basis, the sample may be based on a probability sampling or it may be a non-probability sampling. A probability sample is based on random selection where every element of the population has an equal chance of being selected. Non-probability sampling is that sampling procedure which does not afford any basis for estimating the probability that each element in the population has of being included in the sample. This method is also known as purposive sampling, judgment sampling, and deliberate sampling. Here the investigator or organizers purposively chooses the particular units of the universe for constituting the sample on the consideration that the small
mass that are so selected will be typical or representative of the whole.

The method of sampling used in the present study can be classified as restricted non-probability sampling. The pitfalls in this method are: (1) personal elements could enter into the picture and bias the whole results; (2) sampling error cannot be estimated accurately; and (3) there could be non-representativeness of the sample which could again affect the results. Though ideally it is best to resort to random probability sampling for considerations of reliability and representativeness, purposive sampling was opted for the present study because of the limitations on the investigator's time, money and manpower. True random sampling based on the size of the population of the present study calls for a tremendous amount of work, time, and manpower.

2.1.2. The Nature of the Sample

The sample for the study was selected from three southern districts of Kerala, namely, Trivandrum, Quilon, and Kottayam.

The total sample comprised of 300 individuals with an age range of 17 to 59 (mean =25.88, SD=8.01). There were 200 males and 100 females. The sample could be divided into 142 Hindus 151 Christians and 6 Muslims. The relatively low sample size of the muslim group reflects the fact that the
area from which the data was collected (mainly South Kerala) is predominantly a Non-muslim area.

The total sample was made up of subjects drawn from four categories of the general population. These subgrouping were made primarily to ensure that there will be sufficient amount of variability in the main variable of the study, viz., meaning and purpose in life. The four groups included in the study are: (1) Professional College Students, (2) Non-Professional College Students, (3) Seminary Students, and (4) General Population. A brief description of the four sub samples follows:

(a) Professional College Students:

Researchers using the PIL test of Crumbaugh (1967) have found that well motivated professionals and successful business population have the highest score on the test (Crumbaugh, 1967, Crandall, 1975). The group of professional college students included in the study, though do not exactly fit into the category of successful professionals, is expected to be similar to them. In a country where unemployment ranks quite high and professional jobs are very much looked up to, being even a student of a professional college is a mark of distinction, because chances of a successful future was much greater for them.

One hundred and two students from two professional colleges - an engineering college and a police training college were included in this category. Forty engineering
students within the age range of 17-24 were selected from the first college and sixty two sub-inspector trainees within the age range of 25 to 37 were selected from the second college. The mean age of the whole group was 26.12 and the standard deviation was 1.33. Of the total of 102, there were 90 males and 12 females. The 12 females were from the engineering college. With regard to their marital status, all the engineering students were single whereas 41 of the Sub-Inspector trainees were single and 21 were married.

(b) Non-professional College Students:

This group consisted of students from the regular colleges. Eighty graduate students of two colleges, one from Quilon and one from Trivandrum, within the age range of 18 to 26, (mean = 19.6; SD=1.22) made up this group. There were 30 males and 50 females, all being single. This group was included mainly to serve as a comparison group for the group of professional students. Further, they can also be taken as representative of the youth of the area.

(c) Seminary Students:

The seminarians were selected to represent yet another group which may be expected to have high meaning and purpose in life. This group consisted of 55 students from a Catholic seminary. Being trained for Catholic priesthood, all of the students were unmarried males. Their age ranged from 21 to 28 (mean=23.67; S.D.=1.56). There were 54 graduates and 1 postgraduate in the group.
In terms of purpose in life, they may be expected to be different from the first group in that the nature of their purpose in life may be of a different kind from the first group. While the group of professional students can be considered successful on the materialistic outlook, the seminarians, by virtue of the spiritualistic nature of their vocation may be expected to possess meaning and purpose in life, which are qualitatively different. The nature of these differences are expected to surface during the course of the present study.

(d) General Population:

The group designated as 'general population' consisted of people from different walks of life, e.g., clerks, housewives, school teachers, cooks, students, salespersons, mechanics, managers, etc. The selection is believed to give a true representation of the normal population. This group, which may serve as a control group to compare all the other groups, had a strength of 63 with 25 males and 38 females. The age range of the group was 20 to 59 (mean=35.39, S.D.=9.73). There were 48 married individuals and 15 single. The subjects belonged to different socioeconomic strata. Nine of them had an income of less than Rs.750/- per month, 15 had income between Rs.750/- to Rs.1500/-, 16 had it between Rs.1500/- to Rs.3000/-, and 23 had income above Rs.3000/- per month. With regard to their educational qualification, 23 of them had qualification of passing
S.S.L.C. or below, 17 had completed their Pre-degree course, 15 were graduates, and 8 were professionally qualified or were post-graduates.

2.2. TOOLS

The following tools were used to procure the necessary information regarding the variables under study:

1. Self-Esteem Inventory.
2. Locus of Control Scale.
3. Adaptation of the 'Study of Values' of Allport, Vernon and Lindzey.
4. Mathew Maladjustment Inventory (Short Form).
5. Personal Data Questionnaire.
6. Purposeful Life Index.

All the tests were in Malayalam, the language of the people of Kerala. A few of the tests had English translations too along with each item. Brief descriptions of these tools including its psychometric properties are given below.

2.2.1. Self-esteem Inventory (SEI)

This is a standardized instrument developed by Thomas and Sanandaraj (1985) to measure self-esteem of the general population in Kerala. The inventory makes use of the self-report method, all the items being in the form of self-evaluative and/or self-descriptive statements. The items are expected to tap self-evaluation of the subjects from a
wide variety of behavioral domains including academic, social, emotional, and physical aspects.

The test contains 20 items, with equal number of positively worded and negatively worded items arranged in a random order. Each item has five response categories, viz., A, B, C, D, and E. A denotes 'Strongly Agree', B denotes 'Agree', C denotes 'Undecided', D denotes 'Disagree', and E denotes 'Strongly Disagree'. The respondent has to mark any one of the categories according to his choice. For scoring, a weight of 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 is given to category A, B, C, D, and E respectively for the positive items. The scores are in the reverse order for the negative items. The total count obtained in each category is taken and is multiplied by its respective weights. The scores for the separate categories are then summed to obtain the self-esteem score of the individual. The maximum score obtainable is 100 and the minimum score, 20. A copy of the Self-esteem Inventory used in the study is given in appendix I.

Reliability and Validity

The split-half reliability coefficient of the test after correction using the Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula is 0.95. The retest reliability after an interval of two weeks is 0.90, both coefficients being significant at the .01 level. The inventory is assumed to possess content validity as it is modeled after a few well known inventories. Further, validity is also established by the fact that a significant correlation coefficient of +0.41 was
obtained between the inventory and a Teachers Behavior Rating Form.

2.2.2. Locus of Control Questionnaire (LCQ)

The locus of control scale was used to measure the extent to which the individual believes that he is controlled by external events such as fate, chance, luck or more powerful others. The test used in this study to measure locus of control was developed by Mathew and Kunjikrishnan (1987) to suit the Malayalam speaking population in Kerala. The test containing 45 items is a shortened version of the original test which contained 70 items. It has 22 items expressing internal control and 23 items that reflect an external locus of control. The test is self-administering with printed instructions requesting the respondent to make a tick mark in the column provided at the end of each statement when they agree or feel that a statement reflects their behavior or belief, and mark a 'X' when they disagree with a statement.

A scoring key which endorsed all the external items and disagreed with the internal oriented items was aligned with the column where the response was marked. The score of the individual was the number of those items that were marked in the same way as the scoring key. Thus the higher the score, the more external the locus of control. Low score showed an internal locus of control. A copy of the inventory is given in Appendix II.
Reliability and Validity

The test has a split-half (odd-even) reliability of 0.825. The validity of the test was indicated by a correlation coefficient of .72 between this test and another test in English measuring locus of control called the Locus of Control Questionnaire (Kunjikrishnan, Chandran, and Kuru­villa, 1979). Norms based on sample of 208 males and 194 females within the age range of 18-25 years are also available.

2.2.3. A Study Of Values (SOV)

This scale is an adaptation in Malayalam of the Allport, Vernon and Lindzey (1960) 'A Study of Values' for the college student population above the Pre-Degree level in Kerala, by Mathew (1968). The test is based on Spranger's view that personalities of people are best known through a study of their values. Spranger (1928) regards value as a primary organizing facet of personality. The test measures the relative strength of six values in an individual, viz., (1) Theoretical (2) Aesthetic (3) Political (4) Social (5) Economic, and (6) Religious. Below is given a brief description of the six values included in the scale.

T- Theoretical: Interested in the discovery of truth, in observing and reasoning, having a 'cognitive' attitude, being empirical, critical, rational, intellectualistic, frequently a scientist or philosopher and chief aim in life is to order and systematize knowledge.
E - Economic: Interested in what is useful (originally in self-preservation), production, marketing and consumption of goods, accumulation of wealth, being practical, business minded and utilitarian.

A - Aesthetic: Values form and harmony, evaluation in terms of grace, symmetry and fitness, concerned with the identities of experience, appreciative, self-sufficient, individualistic and valuing beauty for its own sake.

S - Social: Loves people, kind, sympathetic, unselfish and humanitarian (the test emphasizes the altruistic or philanthropic aspect).

P - Political: Interested in power and leadership, competitive, desire for personal power, influence and renown.

R - Religious: Values unity, is mystical, seeks to comprehend the cosmos as a whole, seeks the highest and absolutely satisfying experience, and finds religious expression either in actively participating in life or in withdrawal from it.

The scale has a total of 45 items which are divided into two parts. The first part consists of items which are statements with two choices, the choices representing the different values. The respondent has to choose one over the other and assign a maximum score of 3 to the choice when he/she definitely prefers it over the other choice and 2 when one is not very strong about the preference. As there is a maximum score of 3 per item, when one strongly endorses
one choice, the other should be assigned 0. When it is 2 then the relatively less preferred or agreed choice takes the value of 1. There are a total of 30 items in part I.

Part II which consists of 15 items has four responses for each item. The respondent is required to assign the maximum score of 4 to the most preferred response, 3 to the next, 2 to the one preferred after that and 1 to the least preferred one. A separate answer sheet is provided.

Of the total of 120 responses available for the 45 items, each value is represented by 20 of the responses. There are six separate scoring keys for measuring the six values. Each key has windows over the responses that represents that particular value and the weight assigned to the responses are added together to form the score for that value. The sum of the six scores will be 240. Appendix III contains a copy of the inventory.

Reliability and Validity

The items measuring each values were divided into two subscales and the test scores for these subscales were correlated to find out the reliability coefficient. The split-half reliability obtained for the various components of the scale are as follows (N=151):

\[ T = .83, \ E = .66, \ A = .86, \ S = .78, \ P = .70, \ R = .87. \]

Validity of the scale estimated against Vocational Interest Inventory as external criterion range between 0.29
to 0.59 (N= 151). C score values are available in a table of norms and a profile may be drawn. Interpretations are made in terms of large peaks or depressions. However, for finding group differences and correlations with other variables, the raw scores may be used.

2.2.4. Mathew Maladjustment Inventory (MMI)

The MMI was used to measure the overall maladjustment of the subject. This test, developed by Mathew (1970), consists of 25 items, and is a shortened version of the original test which consisted of 100 items. The test consists of items which identifies the presence of Anxiety, Paranoia, Depression, Inferiority and Mania. The present shortened version gives only an overall maladjustment score and not separate scores for each of the above mentioned behavior problems.

In the printed instruction the subject is requested to evaluate each statement and if they feel the experience is relevant or pertinent to them more than normal, they are asked to make a '+' mark in the column at the end of the statement. If it is not very pertinent to them a '-' sign is marked. In situations when it becomes extremely difficult to judge whether one has too much or too little of the behavioural problem mentioned, it may be indicated by a '?' mark.

The total number of '+' and '?' made are added.
separately. The '+' marks are assigned a value of 2 and the '?' marks, a value of 1. The sum of these are added on to a base score of 25 to get the final score of a subject on the MMI. A copy of the inventory is given in Appendix IV.

Reliability and Validity

This test was prepared and standardized by Mathew in 1975 on the Kerala population. The split-half reliability of the test estimated by George (1987) is 0.86 for men and 0.82 for women. Test-retest reliability for men is 0.53 and .55 for women.

Validity for the test is claimed on the basis of its content. Besides, significant correlation with many measures of abnormality have been reported in several studies in which this test was used.

2.2.5. The Personal Data Questionnaire

This questionnaire was developed by the investigator for the present study to tap information regarding various personal, familial and social aspects of the subjects. The questionnaire elicits information regarding the subject's:

if so, to elaborate on it. A copy of the Personal Data Questionnaire used in the study is given in Appendix V.

2.2.6. *Purposeful Life Index (PIL)*

This test measures the main variable of the present study, namely, purpose in life. It was constructed for the present investigation by the author to suit the needs of the population under study, according to psychometric specifications.

The *Purpose in Life Test (PIL)* developed by J.C. Crumbaugh and L. Maholick in 1964 based on Frankl's concept of noogenic neurosis is the most popular instrument used in studies regarding meaning in life. But a scrutiny of the items of the PIL test (given in Appendix VI) indicated that the PIL is culturally biased reflecting the values of the predominantly white, middle class, American sample on whom it was developed.

Many of the items of the PIL test (e.g., item no. 1, 2, 5, 7, and 9) reflect the Protestant work ethics together with the Western ideal, eulogizing high and varied levels of intellectual and sensory stimulation which imply that activity and excitement is what makes life worthwhile and meaningful and passivity is equivalent to meaninglessness. For example, Item 2 reads: "Life to me seems: always exciting- 7..6..5..4..3..2..1-completely routine". This need not be the case with regard to an Indian. The Indian culture...
values a relatively more sedentary and calm mode of existence.

The Western concept of self which is evidenced by items like - "My life is: 7 (in my hands and I am in control of it)...6..5..4..3..2..1 (out of my hands and controlled by external factors)" is biased in favor of an internal locus of control and is not very suited to the Indian sample (Other examples of this type are items 8,13, 14, and 17). These items assume that personal and complete control of one's life is possible and is needed for a meaningful life. This goes against the principle of Karma prevalent in Indian thought where one's life is influenced by the stars, activities in former births, and many other things. This does not mean that Indian thought negates man's freedom but only that it puts limits to it. In other words, it allows for the experience of meaningful life without one's full control over life and its events.

Apart from the above considerations, another discouraging factor for the use of PIL was that the items in the test are supposed to be subscales in itself with each item having quantitative extremes 'set by qualitative phrases which seemed a priori to be identified with quantitative extremes of attitude's' (Crumbaugh, 1967). This creates a tendency towards unidimensional conceptualization of certain aspects being measured, resulting in situations where the extremes represented by the items do not represent an identifiable or appropriate choice but one is still forced to choose.
Examples are items 1, 2, 5, 14, 18, and 19.

Besides, the necessity for translation of the items from English to the regional language, Malayalam, puts up additional problems relating to changes in meaning and comparability of the items in two cultural contexts. Based on all these considerations, it was decided that a new test to index purposeful life for the Kerala population may be developed as part of the present study.

**Construction of the PLY**

A draft scale consisting of 44 items was first developed. These items were prepared on the basis of an extensive survey of the related literature on the conceptualization and measurement of the concept. The survey revealed that literature relating to the neurotic condition resulting from the absence of meaning in life was more available than those relating to the experience of meaningful life. Thus the items of the test to measure meaningful life was based also on the absence of the symptoms of existential neurosis. Foremost among the literature used was Salvatore R. Maddi's (1967) conceptualization of existential neurosis. As mentioned in the earlier chapter, Maddi has divided the symptoms of existential neurosis into cognitive, affective, and actional components. Items adequately representing these three components as well as other new items were created to fully encompass the concept of meaningful life.
Items from the currently available tests found suitable for the present population were also included with modifications. Eight items from the PIL test which seemed suitable and were relatively free from the criticisms mentioned earlier were modified and used for this test. One of the extremes given for each item was chosen to make it a statement and in some cases the statements were even further modified. The items chosen were item numbers 1, 2, 6, 9, 10, 11, 16, and 19.

In addition to the above, thirteen items from John Battista's Life Regard Index (IRI) (Battista, 1973) were also accepted with modifications for the present test. Eight of them were from the Framework Scale (FR) which measures the capacity of an individual to see his life within some perspective or context and five were from the Fulfillment Scale (FU) which measures the experience of fulfillment on having a meaningful life.

Thus among the 44 items in the draft scale, 21 were modified items adapted from the other available tests, while 23 items were newly added which were generated to represent the concept as described by the various experts in the field. It is hoped that the entire content area ranging from complete meaninglessness and feeling of existential vacuum on the one end to the experience of meaningfulness and purposefulness indicated by the presence of some philosophy or goal(s) in life together with the feeling of fulfillment
on the other end, is adequately represented by the different items in the inventory. Special care was taken to avoid value laden items. There were equal number of items worded positively and negatively to counter the response set. All the items were in the form of statements for which the respondent could answer whether he/she 'strongly agreed', 'agreed', 'strongly disagreed', 'disagreed' or was 'undecided' about, in a column given at the end of the statement. The items and the instructions regarding responding were printed both in English and Malayalam, the local language. The test was named 'Purposeful Life Index' (The draft scale is presented in appendix VII).

The test was administered to a sample of 300 people. The sample consisted of an assorted lot of people - students, teachers, professors, clerks, and other people of the general public. There were 131 males and 163 females in the total population and their age ranged from 20 to 62, with a mean of 27.96, and S.D. of 8.82. After the questionnaires were returned, they were scored on a five point scale. The scoring was done as follows: A score or weight of 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 was given to the category 'Strongly agree', 'Agree', 'Undecided', 'Disagree', and 'Strongly Disagree', for the positive items. The scores were in the reverse order for the negative items. The sum of the scores for the 44 items was the total score. The maximum score obtainable was 220 and the minimum score obtainable, 44.
**Selection of items**

Item analysis was done using the Likert's method of summated ratings (Edwards, 1969). The upper and lower 33.33% of the total sample rank-ordered according to their PLI scores formed the high and low groups respectively. Thus the sample size of the three groups were 100 each. According to Likert's method, the t-values of all the items were calculated in accordance with the Likert's method. The t-tests showed that all the 44 items differentiated between the high and low scorers significantly, indicating that all the items had high discriminative power. The 't' values ranged from 14.66 to 5.29. The table containing the t-values for the 44 items is given in appendix VIII.

However, for considerations of parsimony and viability, it was decided to shorten the scale. Accordingly, a final form of the test consisting of 30 items was prepared. These 30 items were selected from among the first 35 items rank-ordered according to their 't' values, making sure that all the content areas were adequately represented and that equal number of positive and negative items were present. The items were scored on a five point scale; the five alternatives being, Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. The scoring technique was similar to that of the draft scale. The maximum score obtainable was 150 and minimum, 30. The final scale is presented in Appendix IX.
Reliability and Validity

Split-half reliability coefficient of the test was calculated. Spearman-Brown and Guttman coefficient for odd-even split was .935. Cronbach alpha was .832. Split-half reliability coefficient by splitting the test into the first half and second half was .915.

Correlation between the 44 item test and the 30 item test given to a sample of 53 subjects with a time gap of two months between them was .678.

Attempts at validating the tests have been done in the course of the present study using content analysis of the verbal descriptions given by the subjects regarding the aims and goals in their lives (vide chapter III, section 3.2.1. for details). Validity for the tests may be claimed on the basis of significant correlation of 0.351 (P < 0.001, N=300) that was obtained between the scores on Purposeful Life Inventory and the reported purpose in life which was analysed and rated by an independent judge for the strength of the purpose in life and the commitment to it.

2.3. DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

Prior permission from the proper authorities was obtained to procure data using the questionnaires from the students who made up the first three groups of the sample. As per the arrangements made, the investigator met the different groups of students on the days decided upon. To
facilitate and ease administration and retrieval of the questionnaires, the students of a particular class were encountered in their classrooms. The investigator established a good rapport with the students to make them feel comfortable. A brief introduction to the topic was given and the subjects were then supplied with the clipped set of six questionnaires in the order - the Personal Data Questionnaire, Purposeful Life Index (PLI), Self-Esteem Inventory, Locus of Control Questionnaire, Adapted version of 'A Study of Values', and Mathew Maladjustment Inventory.

Since instructions were printed clearly at the beginning of each questionnaire, it was not considered necessary to go into the details regarding the answering of each questionnaire. But some general instructions were given. The respondents were given the options of preserving their anonymity by not making it necessary to write their names. Those who opted to do so were instructed to mark any similar initials on all the questionnaires so that it would just serve the purpose of identifying any of the questionnaires, in case they got separated from the parent set. Though mentioned in the printed instructions, it was reiterated that the respondents need not ponder too deeply on each question. Rather the first answer, spontaneous and thereby honest, was what was more welcome. The subjects were requested not to use the response category 'undecided' or '?' too often and also to make sure that they answered all the items. Since the investigator was present throughout
the time taken to answer all the six questionnaires by everybody, doubts which came up were looked into and cleared immediately. After the subjects completed responding to all the questionnaires, they were collected back. A few of them were checked by the investigator to make sure that they had been answered in the proper fashion. After all the questionnaires were returned, the students were thanked sincerely for the time and attention they devoted to answering the questionnaires. In most colleges, a few of the students often stayed back to enquire more on the topic and in the discussions that followed the investigator gained a few more insights regarding the nature of the topic under study.

For the three sub-groups in the total sample which consisted only of students of various institutions, data were thus obtained by group administration and immediate collection of the questionnaire after they were answered. But for the last group representing the general population, the individual's who were selected were met separately and given the set of six questionnaires. After self introduction, their cooperation was solicited for answering the set of questionnaires for research purposes. After making sure that they were comfortable and not wary, a brief introduction to the topic was given as mentioned earlier, before giving them the questionnaires. They were also given the option of anonymity, requested to be spontaneous and honest in their responses and above all to ensure that every item
had been answered and nothing overlooked. Most often, the subjects involved were not in a position to return the questionnaires by answering them immediately, due to familial and job pressures on their time. They offered to give the completed forms in a day or two. They were then requested to go through the instructions and a few items of the questionnaires to make sure that they had understood what was required of them. The investigator went back to them on the day mentioned and collected the filled up questionnaires from them after making sure that no items had been overlooked and that no mistakes had been made in the format of answering. The respondents were thanked for the cooperation they had shown in the midst of the many other demands on their time.

All the questionnaires given during the group administration could be collected back, whereas, a few were lost or returned unanswered by the subjects of the control group who were given the questionnaires individually. On the whole complete data were obtained from 300 subjects.

2.4. **STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES**

The responses of the subjects contained in the questionnaires were coded and fed to a computer, for various statistical analyses.

First, the Purposeful Life Index (PLI) which measured the main variable under study was subjected to R factor
analysis, i.e. factor analysis to identify a set of dimensions that are latent in a large set of variables (Hair, et al., 1987). The principal axis method of extraction was used for the purpose. It may be noted that the common factor method is generally preferred over component analysis when the primary objective is to identify the latent dimensions or constructs represented in the original variables and also when there is no prior knowledge of the amount of unique or error variance contained in each of the variables. Since few studies, especially in the social sciences, can be expected to be error free, the common factor methods of factor extraction is generally recommended. Besides, the common factor method produces the same results as the component analysis if it is appropriate. The method of rotation used was the orthogonal varimax method. After rotation, factor scores for the extracted factors were computed using the regression method for each individual in the sample. At the end of factor analysis the total score of each individual on the PLI test was represented by three factor scores which were used for all further analyses.

Pearson \( r \) was calculated between the factor scores as well as the total PLI scores and all the variables in the study. The correlation coefficient obtained was tested for statistical significance. The obtained \( r \) was compared with the limits established using the standard error of \( r \) which is calculated for the three levels of significance, viz., 0.1%, 1%, and 5%. A coefficient of correlation was
considered significant at .001 level if it exceeded 0.1899, at .01 level if it exceeded 0.1489 and at the level of .05 level if it exceeded 0.1131.

In order to identify the combination of correlates which could best predict scores in the dependent variable (dimensions of purposeful life), Multiple Regression analysis was conducted. The step-wise method of selection of independent variables for entry into the equation was used. Regression equations were built separately for the three factors and the total PLI score taken as dependent variables.

The results revealed the amount of variance in each of the dependent variables that could be accounted for by the combination of variable included in the equation.

Analysis of mean differences in the purposeful life and its different dimensions among the subcategories formed on the basis of variables measured in discrete categories (e.g. sex, income level, education, etc.) was done using one way ANOVA. The same analysis was used to investigate into the mean differences among the four sub-samples included in the study also. The results of ANOVA was followed by Scheffe's multiple range tests in order to identify pairs of means which differ significantly. The details of the various statistical analysis and the results obtained are discussed in the following three chapters.