CHAPTER V

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The present chapter deals with the discussion of the obtained results. To see whether the hypotheses formulated in Chapter III are supported or contradicted, obtained data was put in to the form of tables and statistical treatment was given. Student's t-test was applied to find out the significance of difference in adjustment among urban and rural neurotics in family, personal social, cognitive and vocational areas.

Firstly, it was hypothesised that family adjustment would be better among rural neurotics than urban neurotics. To test this hypothesis, the mean dysfunctional scores of two groups were compared and t-test was applied to test the significance of difference. Table 1. Showing the significance of difference between the mean dysfunctional scores of urban and rural neurotics in family adjustment on t-test:
From the results it appears that the rural neurotics adjusted better than the urban neurotics. Table 1 clearly shows that mean dysfunctional scores of urban Ss is 74.61 which is much higher than the rural Ss, as it has been mentioned already that higher the dysfunctional scores, the higher will be the maladjustment, so mean scores clearly show the better family adjustment among rural Ss as compared to urban Ss.

In order to test the mean difference between the two groups were statistically different, 't' value was worked out. The 't' value came out 6.24 (See Appendix : C) which is highly significant at .01 level which clearly indicates that rural and urban Ss differ significantly in their family adjustment and it is better in rural Ss than urban Ss.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>'t'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>74.61</td>
<td>6.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .01
The mean dysfunctional scores of urban and rural Ss in family adjustment have been depicted graphically in figure one. The results, thus, lend support to the view that urban and rural Ss differ significantly in their family adjustment.

The obtained results are in the line with those obtained by Cedeblad et al. (1968). They found that homogenous culture in rural area offer the individual a state well defined role and strong support through extended family and lead to better adjustment.

Menon et al (1978) also found that emotionally disturbed women belonged more often to nuclear families than joint families, as the joint family system provides an enduring pattern of continuous or intermittent ties that play a significant part in maintaining the psychological and physical integrity of the individual and lead to better adjustment among them.

Sharma and Sethi (1984) suggested that a joint family system provides better support and security to individuals. The joint family system is prevalent in rural areas and nuclear
family system is prevalent in urban areas. Sharma, Sethi and Bhiman (1984) found that rural Ss spent more time in household interaction than urban persons. So the joint family system provides better adjustment ability among rural subjects.

Thus the first hypothesis which had predicted that family adjustment would be more among rural Ss than urban Ss is verified.

Second hypothesis was that personal adjustment would be better among rural than urban Ss. To test the hypothesis, mean dysfunctional scores of urban and rural neurotics were compared and t-value was worked out.

Table 2: Showing the significance of difference between the mean dysfunctional scores of urban and rural neurotics in personal adjustment on t-test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>'t'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>76.12</td>
<td>4.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .01
From table 2, it is quite clear that mean scores of urban Ss in personal adjustment is higher than the rural S, so the low mean dysfunctional scores of rural Ss indicate the better personal adjustment than urban Ss.

In order to test this difference statistically 't' was computed. The 't' value was 4.24 which is highly significant at .01 level (See Appendix:D). On the basis of this it is clear that rural Ss have better personal adjustment than urban Ss.

In figure 2: the mean dysfunctional scores of urban and rural Ss have been graphically depicted. The figure also clearly indicates the better adjustment or less dysfunctional ability among rural than urban Ss.

The obtained results of this study are in the line with those obtained by De Charms (1972). He found that supportive environment tend to increase personal adjustment. As, later on Sethi and Sharma (1984) suggested that rural environment gives more support to the individuals than urban environment. Therefore, personal adjustment was also found more among rural than urban Ss.
Ezeillo and Service (1983) observed that rural Ss scored higher in personal self than the urban Ss. Thus the results of this study also supported the view that personal adjustment would be more among rural Ss in comparison to urban Ss.

In comparison to urban environment rural environment gives more satisfaction to the people. In rural areas persons are not very much conscious about their status and money etc. so they have less conflicting, stressful and anxiety provoking situations. However in urban areas these situations are seen very often. Rural family system also give them support for better personal adjustment or better adjustment with self.

So the results of present study are in the line with the findings of other studies conducted by different people. Thus the second hypothesis, which had predicted that family adjustment would be more among rural Ss than urban Ss is verified.

Next hypothesis of the study was that there would be better social adjustment among rural Ss than urban Ss. Mean dysfunctional scores and t-value for these two groups have been shown in Table No.3.
Table 3: Showing the significance of difference between the mean dysfunctional scores of urban and rural neurotics in social adjustment area on t-test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>'t'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>77.25</td>
<td>4.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .01

Table 3 shows that mean dysfunctional scores of urban and rural Ss are different with a gap of 13.45 scores which indicate these groups differ on this dimension.

In order to test whether the difference between the two groups were statistically significant, 't' test was applied. The t-value came out 4.25 which is highly significant at .01 level (See Appendix: E) which shows that these groups are significantly different from each other and rural neurotics do have better social adjustment in comparison to their urban counterparts.
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The mean dysfunctional scores of urban and rural Ss in social adjustment area have been graphically depicted in figure 3. In figure 3 rural Ss are showing less dysfunctional ability scores, it implies that their social adjustment is better than urban Ss.

Cedelbad (1968) found that village environment makes small demands on the functional ability of the individual and leads to better adjustment in society.

McKimm et al. (1982) compared the interpersonal problem solving skills and adjustment of urban and rural Ss. They found that adjustment was found to be less among urban than rural Ss.

Rutter and Micheal (1982) also found that social adjustment problems of various kinds tend to much higher in inner cities than the small town or in rural environment.

Chu-Chung (1985) findings suggest that rural Ss have better social adjustment and a higher level of expectation of social activities than urban people. Majority of rural respondents were engaged in agriculture whereas in the urban almost
in service which required them to be away from their primary group and family member.

These studies conducted by different psychologists at different places clearly indicate that rural environment is the best source for better adjustment in the individual to deal with the society or the surroundings and lead to interpersonal relationship. Thus, the results of present study are also in the same line and therefore, the third hypothesis which predicted better social adjustment in rural Ss is hereby confirmed.

Next hypothesis of present study was that there would be better cognitive adjustment among rural than urban neurotics. The mean scores of the two groups were then tested on t-test.

Table 4: Showing the significance of difference between the mean dysfunctional scores of urban and rural neurotics in cognitive adjustment area on t-test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>'t'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>6.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01
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From table 4, it is quite clear that mean dysfunctional scores of urban Ss in cognitive adjustment area was higher than rural Ss. So the high mean dysfunctional scores of urban Ss mean higher maladjustment or less adjustment among them.

The t-value came out 6.03 (See Appendix: F). Which is again highly significant at .01 level of significance. So on the basis of such a higher level of significance it can be said that rural Ss are better adjusted in cognitive area.

The mean dysfunctional scores of urban and rural Ss have been graphically depicted in figure 4. The figure support the view that urban and rural groups differ in their cognitive adjustment.

There is, however, no enough earlier evidence related to better adjustment of rural Ss in cognitive area is available but in 1983 a study conducted by Mc Kimm studied the comparison of the problem solving ability. Results showed that rural Ss did better than the urban subjects on problem solving ability. As problem solving ability is directly related with cognitive adjustment, so cognitive adjustment was also better among rural Ss than
urban Ss. On the basis of obtained results and statistical analysis, it can be said that the hypothesis which predicted that cognitive adjustment among rural Ss would be better than urban Ss is verified. The results have been shown graphically in figure 4.

In the last, it has been hypothesised that vocational adjustment would be better among rural Ss than urban Ss. The obtained results and statistical t-value have been shown in table 5.

Table 5: Showing the significance of difference between the mean dysfunctional scores of rural and urban neurotics in vocational area on t-test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>'t'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>77.50</td>
<td>3.96*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01

The mean scores shown in table 5 indicate that urban Ss scored high dysfunctional scores than rural Ss. On analyzing the main effect with
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**FIG. 5**: Mean dysfunctional scores of urban & rural areas.
't' test ($t=3.96$) which is significant at .01 level (See Appendix: G) it can be inferred that the difference between the means of two groups is different and vocational adjustment is found more among rural Ss than urban Ss.

The mean dysfunctional scores of two groups were also graphically depicted in figure 5 and bars clearly show the better vocational adjustment among rural than urban neurotics.

The obtained results are in the line with those obtained by Kalanidhi (1973) and Mair and Kulkarni (1984). In his study, Kalanidhi had observed that poorly adjusted subjects in those with personal, financial or family has less job satisfaction and vocational adjustment.

Mair and Kulkarni (1984) found that urban people who are found to be low in home, social, emotional adjustment were low in job satisfaction. As vocational adjustment is related to job satisfaction so people who are less satisfied with their jobs would be less adjusted in their vocational area also.
Thus on the basis of above discussion and obtained results, the hypothesis predicting that the vocational adjustment would be better among rural than urban neurotics is verified.

At last the overall psychosocial adjustment of urban and rural neurotics was measured and it was predicted that overall psychosocial adjustment would be better among rural than urban Ss. The obtained data have been shown in table 6.

Table 6: Showing the significance of difference between the mean dysfunctional scores of urban and rural neurotics in psychosocial adjustment (overall) on t-test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>'t'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>74.71</td>
<td>6.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .01

The mean dysfunctional scores of urban and rural Ss are different as it appears from table 6. The urban Ss scored much higher than the rural Ss. These mean scores indicate the more
FIG. 6: Mean dysfunction scores of urban & rural neurotics in Family, Social, Personal, Cognitive & Vocational areas.
dysfunctional ability among urban Ss than rural Ss.

On analysing the main effect with t-test, it was revealed that psychosocial adjustment was found to be more among rural than urban neurotics. As the obtained t-value is highly significant even beyond .01 level (See Appendix: H). The results have been shown graphically in figure 6.

Murphy et al. (1975) found that urban location was most associated with poor adjustment than rural because there are much anxiety provoking situations in urban areas then in rural areas.

Rutter et al. (1984) also observed that psychosocial adjustment problems were much higher in cities than in villages.

Chu-Chung (1986) found that psychosocial adjustment was found to be more among rural psychiatric patients than urban. As urban people have not much space and time for interaction with their primary group and with their family members, whereas in case of rural Ss the occupation was mainly agriculture in which they were easily accessible to household members, being close to home most of the time and not bound by time schedule of service condition.
The results of present study and other studies by different people at different places are in the same line. However, while making conclusions one should be aware of the factors such as the pattern of living and environment which can easily effect the adjustment.

The information on social interaction, the family and the primary group obtained jointly, is especially important because within the entire social network the most important component to an individual is his primary group and his family. The family provides an enduring pattern of continuous or intermittent ties that play a significant part in maintaining the psychological integrity of the individual over time. An individual's interactions with family members or with his primary group provide the basis for formation of social bonds.

Central to our study, that favours the joint family over the nuclear one, is the concept that a large and closely knit knitship system, as represented by a joint family, allow for formation of strong bonds of attachment with persons, groups and society among joint family members than among nuclear family members.
Dube (1969) found that the rate of mental disorders are more among urban population than rural.

In cities individual have to face many financial or economic problems and stressful situations which lead to malfunctioning. The rate of mental disorders is highest among unemployed urban persons. Most of the people in rural areas are engaged in agriculture and therefore they do not have as much vocational problems as there are seen in the cities. Therefore non-earning employment in urban areas and unremunerative work with all the monotony and lack of motivation and in some cases lack of security may lead to stressful conditions contributing to maladjustment and to more mental illness.

Thus on the basis of above discussion all the five proposed hypotheses are verified and it can be concluded that psychosocial adjustment (family, personal, social, cognitive and vocational) is more in rural neurotics in comparison to urban neurotics.
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