RESULTS

If you can't excel with talent, triumph with effort.

- Dave Weinbaum

RESULTS

In the present chapter an effort has been made to summarize the statistical analysis of the data to test the hypotheses. The obtained data was quantified and statistically tested to assess its level of significance. Parametric tests were used. The data have been analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOVA), correlation and graphical presentations. Overall care was taken to see that the data did not lose its meaningfulness

One of the first steps of any statistical analysis, regardless of how simple or complex it may be is examination of the individual variables The preliminary screening provides information about the variables distribution and permits identification of unusual or outlying values.

The following pages include the statistical interpretation of the different variables of the study in a tabular form with specific descriptions regarding the dependent variables like Parenting, Depression, Locus of Control, Adjustment and of the independent variable like Parents of Thalassaemic Children (male-female).

Table 2: shows the summary of (one-way) analysis of variance for Positive Parenting Dimensions in the factorial design:

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Love	Between Groups	86.700	1	86.700	0.753	0.387
	Within Groups	13585.800	118	115 134		
	Total	13672.500	119			

Encouragement	Between	50.700	1	50.700	1 012	0 316
	Groups	5909.000	118	50.076		
	Within Groups	5959.700	119			
	Total					
Acceptance	Between	197.633	1	197.633	3.839	0.052*
	Groups	6074.867	118	51.482		
	Within Groups	6272.500	119			
	Total					
Progressivism	Between	136.533	1	136.533	2.134	0 147
	Groups	7551.333	118	63.994		
	Within Groups	7687.867	119			
	Total					
Democratism	Between	36.300	1	36.300	0.373	0.543
	Groups	11490.067	118	97.273		
	Within Groups	11526.367	119			
	Total					
Independence	Between	563.333	1	563.333	7.285	0.008**
	Groups	9124 133	118	77 323		
	Within Groups	9687.467	119			
	Total					
Dominance	Between	294 533	1	294.533	1.962	0 164
	Groups	17712.933	118	150.110		
	Within Groups	18007.467	119			
	Total					
Positive as a whole	Between	91.875	1	91.875	1.472	0.227
	Groups	7365 717	118	62.421		
	Within Groups	7457.592	119			
	Total					

** Significant at the 0 01 level

* Significant at the 0.05 level

Table 2 shows that the dimension of love (F=0 753, df=1) is statistically not significant This indicates that mothers and fathers do not differ in their responses to the dimension of love of the parenting scale.

It can also be seen from Table 2 that the dimension of encouragement (F=1 012, df=1) is statistically not significant, indicating no difference in responses of mothers and fathers regarding the dimension of encouragement of the parenting scale

The dimension of acceptance (F=3.839, df=1) in Table 2 is statistically significant at 0 05 level This indicates that the responses given on the dimension of acceptance of the parenting scale are different for mothers and fathers.

From Table 2 we can see that the dimension progressivism (F=2 134, df=1) is not significant statistically, indicating that the responses given by mothers and fathers do not differ on the dimension of progressivism of the parenting scale

Table 2 also shows that the dimension of democratism (F=0 373, df=1) is statistically not significant This indicates that mothers and fathers do not differ in their responses to the dimension of democratism of the parenting scale

From Table 2 it is evident that the dimension independence (F=7 285, df=1) differ significantly at 0 01 level This indicates that there is a difference in the responses given by mothers and fathers on the dimension of independence of the parenting scale

The dimension of dominance (F=1 962, df=1) in Table 2 is not significant statistically. indicating that mothers and fathers do not differ in their responses regarding the dimension of dominance of the parenting scale

Finally, from Table 2 it is evident that the positive dimensions as a whole (F=1 472, df=1) is statistically not significant This indicates that there is hardly any difference on the responses given by mothers and fathers on the positive dimensions as a whole of the parenting scale

Table 3: shows the summary of (one-way) analysis of variance for Negative Parenting Dimensions in the factorial design·

		Sum of Squares	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Significance**
Hate	Between Groups	374.533	1	374 533	3 293	0.050*
	Within Groups	11264.933	118	95.466		
	Total	11639.467	119			
Discouragement	Between Groups	1116.300	1	1116.300	16.239	0.000**
	Within Groups	8111.667	118	68.743		
	Total	9227.967	119			
Rejection	Between Groups	2707.500	1	2707.500	24.905	0 000**
	Within Groups	12828.200	118	108 714		
	Total	15535.700	119			
Conservatism	Between Groups	2253.333	1	2253.333	24 765	0.000**
	Within Groups	10736.533	118	90.988		
	Total	12989.867	119			

Autocratism	Between Groups	2150.533	1	2150.533	19.111	0.000**
	Within Groups	13278 133	118	112.527		
	Total	15428.667	119			
Dependence	Between Groups	1165.633	1	1165.633	14.857	0.000**
	Within Groups	9258.067	118	78.458		
	Total	10423 700	119			
Submission	Between Groups	563.333	1	563.333	5.396	0.022**
	Within Groups	12318.133	118	104.391		
	Total	12881.467	119			
Negative as a whole	Between Groups	1598.700	1	1598.700	16.359	0.000**
	Within Groups	11531.667	118	97.726		
	Total	13130.367	119			

** Significant at the 0.01 level

* Significant at the 0 05 level.

Table 3 shows that the dimension of hate (F=3.923, df=1) is statistically significant at 0.05 level This indicates that mothers and fathers differ in their responses to the dimension of hate of the parenting scale

It can also be seen from Table 3 that the dimension of encouragement (F=16.239, df=1) is statistically significant at 0 01 level, indicating differences in response of mothers and fathers regarding the dimension of discouragement of the parenting scale

The dimension of rejection (F=24.905, df=1) in Table 3 is statistically significant at 0 01 level This indicates that the responses given on the dimension of rejection of the parenting scale are different for mothers and fathers

From Table 3 we can see that the dimension conservatism (F=24 765, df=1) is statistically significant at 0 01 level, indicating that the responses given by mothers and fathers differ on the dimension of conservatism of the parenting scale

Table 3 also shows that the dimension of autocratism (F=19 111, df=1) is statistically significant at 0 01 level This indicates that mothers and fathers do differ in their responses to the dimension of autocratism of the parenting scale

From Table 3 it is evident that the dimension dependence (F=14.857, df=1) differ significantly at 0 01 level. This indicates that there is a difference in the responses given by mothers and fathers on the dimension of dependence of the parenting scale

The dimension of submission (F=1 962, df=1) in Table 3 is significant statistically at 0 01 level, indicating that mothers and fathers differ in their responses regarding the dimension of submission of the parenting scale

Finally, from Table 3 it is evident that the negative dimensions as a whole (F=16 359, df=1) is also statistically significant at 0 01 level. This indicates that there are differences on the responses given by mothers and fathers on the negative dimensions as a whole of the parenting scale.

Table 4: shows the summary of (one-way) analysis of variance for Depression in the factorial design:

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Depression	Between Groups	607.500	1	607.500	8.820	0.004**
	Within Groups	8127.700	118	68.879		
	Total	8735.200	119			

** Significant at the 0.01 level

From Table 4 it is evident that the variable depression (F=8.820, df=1) differs significantly at 0 01 level. This indicates that the responses given by mothers on the depression scale differ from fathers on the variable of depression

Table 5: shows the summary of (one-way) analysis of variance for Locus of Control (internal and external) in the factorial design:

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Internal Locus of Control	Between Groups	17.633	1	17 633	1.993	0.161
	Within Groups	1044.233	118	8 849		
	Total	1061.867	119			
External Locus of control	Between Groups	17 633	1	17.633	1.993	0.161
	Within Groups	1044.233	118	8.849		
	Total	1061.867	119			

Table 5 shows that the variable internal locus of control (F=1 993, df=1) is statistically not significant. This indicates that mothers and fathers do not differ

in their responses to the variable internal locus of control of the locus of control scale

From Table 5 it is evident that the variable external locus of control (F=1 993, df=1) is statistically not significant This indicates that mothers and fathers do not differ in their responses to the variable external locus of control of the locus of control scale.

Table 6: shows the summary of (one-way) analysis of variance for Adjustment in the factorial design.

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Home Adjustment	Between Groups	180.075	1	180.075	7.075	0.009**
	Within Groups	3003.517	118	25.454		
	Total	3183.592	119			
Health Adjustment	Between Groups	180 075	1	180 075	12.254	0.001**
	Within Groups	1734.050	118	14.695		
	Total	1914.125	119			
Social Adjustment	Between Groups	350.208	1	350.208	12.110	0.001**
	Within Groups	3412 383	118	28.919		
	Total		119			
Emotional Adjustment	Between Groups	572.033	1	572.033	14.473	0.000**
	Within Groups	4663.933	118	39.525		
	Total	5235.967	119			

Overall	Between	4826.008	1	4826.008	16 789	0.000**
Adjustment	Groups	33919.917	118	287.457		
	Within Groups	38745.925	119			
	Total					

** Significant at the 0.01 level

Table 6 shows that the variable home adjustment (F=7.075, df=1) is statistically significant at 0.01 level. This indicates that mothers and fathers differ in their responses to the area of home of the adjustment scale

It can also be seen from Table 6 that the area of health adjustment (F=12 254, df=1) is statistically significant at 0.01 level, indicating differences in response of mothers and fathers regarding the area of health of the adjustment scale.

The area of social adjustment (F=12.110, df=1) in Table 6 is statistically significant at 0.01 level. This indicates that the responses given on the area of social of the adjustment scale are different for mothers and fathers.

From Table 6 we can see that the area emotional adjustment (F=14 473, df=1) is statistically significant at 0.01 level, indicating that the responses given by mothers and fathers differ on the area of emotion of the adjustment scale

Finally, from Table 6 it is evident that area of overall adjustment (F=16.789, df=1) is also statistically significant at 0.01 level This indicates that there are differences on the responses given by mothers and fathers on the overall area of the adjustment scale.

Table 7: shows Correlations (r) between Parenting, Depression, Locus of Control and Adjustment:

		Parenting Positive Dimension	Parenting Negative Dimension	Depression	Internal Locus of Control	External Locus of Control	Overall Adjustment
Parenting Positive Dimension	Pearson's Correlation		0.106	0.000	-0.024	0.024	-0.083
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.250	0 999	0.791	0.791	0.370
	N		120	120	120	120	120
Parenting Negative Dimension	Pearson's Correlation	0.106		0.175	0.082	-0.082	0.245**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.250		0.056	0.373	0.373	0.007
	N	120		120	120	120	120
Depression	Pearson's Correlation	0 000	0.175		0.276**	-0.276**	0.299**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.999	0.056		0.002	0.002	0.001
	N	120	120		120	120	120
Internal Locus of Control	Pearson's Correlation	0 024	0.082	0.276**		-1.00**	0.227*
	Sig (2-tailed)	0.791	0.373	0.002		0.01	0.013
	N	120	120	120		120	120

External Locus of Control	Pearson's Correlation	-0.024	0.082	-0.276**	-1 00**		-0 227*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0 791	0.373	0 002	0.01		0.013
	N	120	120	120	120		120
Adjustment	Pearson's Correlation	-0.083	0.245**	0.299**	0.227*	-0.227*	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.370	0.007	0.001	0.013	0.013	
	N	120	120	120	120	120	

** Correlation is significant at the 0 01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at the 0 05 level (2-tailed).

From Table 7 it is indicated that there is a positive correlation between negative parenting functions and overall adjustment (r=0 245) This indicates that when the overall adjustment scores are high, negative parenting function scores are high too and vice versa This means that the more the person adopts negative parenting functions, poorer the adjustment (higher scores indicate poor adjustment) the person will have.

It is also seen from table 7 that there is a positive correlation between depression and internal locus of control (r=0.276) This indicates that when depression scores are high, internal locus of control scores will be high too and vice versa. This means that the more depressed the person, the more internally controlled the person will be

Similarly, a positive correlation between depression and overall adjustment (r=0 299) has been observed. This indicates that when depression scores are high, overall adjustment scores will be high too and vice versa. This means that the more depressed the person, the poorer the adjustment.

Whereas, a negative correlation has been found between depression and external locus of control (r=-0.276), indicating that when depression scores are high, external locus of control scores are low and vice versa This means that the more depressed the person, the less externally controlled

A negative correlation has been found between internal locus of control and external locus of control (r=-1.00). This indicates that when internal locus of control scores is high, external locus of control scores will be low and vice versa

A positive correlation has also been observed between internal locus of control and overall adjustment (r=0 227), indicating that when internal locus of control scores are high, overall adjustment scores are high too and vice versa This means the more the person is internally controlled, the poorer is the adjustment

Whereas, a negative correlation has been observed between external locus of control and overall adjustment (r=-0 227), indicating high external locus of control scores relating to low overall adjustment scores and vice versa. This means that the more externally controlled the person is, the better the adjustment

From Table 7 it is also seen that no other correlation has been found to be significant. Therefore, we can also say that none of the other variables considered are significantly related in anyway, thus no predictions for these can be made