CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Part I of the research is concerned with result of analysis which involves a 2x2x2 factorial design. The aim of this part is to study variations in dependent variables as a function of age, marital status and sex (personal factors) There are two categories of age, viz senior (above 74 years) and junior (below 74 years); two categories of sex viz. male and female, two levels of marital status viz. married and unmarried. Loneliness, locus of control, death anxiety, mental efficiency & old age problems are dependent variables and sex, age and marital status are independent variables

Part II of the research is also concerned with result of analysis which involved a 2x2x2 factorial design. The aim of this part of study is to known the variations in dependent variables as a function of caste, rule of residence and educational qualifications (social factors). There are two categories of caste viz. lower caste and higher caste, two levels of rule of residence viz rural & urban & two levels of educational qualifications viz below intermediate and above intermediate. Loneliness, locus of control, death anxiety, mental efficiency and old age problems are dependent variables and caste, rule of residence & educational qualifications are independent variables.

PART I - PERSONAL FACTOR

TABLE NO. 1

A 2 x 2 x 2 FACTORIAL DESIGN FOR LONELINESS

SOURCE	DF	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F SIG	SIG
SEX	1	100 00	100 00	4 07	> 05
MARITAL STATUS	1	11.84	11 84	0.84	N S
AGE	1	91.81	91.81	3.73	N S.
SEX x MARITAL STATUS	1	9.81	9.81	0.39	N.S
SEX x AGE	1	0 51	0 91	0 02	N S.
MARITAL STATUS x AGE	1	2 48	2 48	0 10	N S.
SEX x MARITAL STATUS x AGE	1	133 89	133 89		
BETWEEN GROUPS	7	350 34	50 05		
WITHIN GROUPS	192	4717.77	24 57		
TOTAL	199				

TABLE 2

NUMBER AND MEAN SCORES OF LONELINESS

	N	NUMBER SCORE	MEAN SCORE
MALE	100	906	9.06
FEMALE	100	1046	10.46
MARRIED	100	934	9.34
UNMARRIED	100	1018	10.18
JUNIOR	100	1027	10.27
SENIOR	100	1040	10.40

TABLE NO 3

SEX AND MARITAL STATUS

	MALE	FEMALE
MARRIED	N = 50 Ex = 416 M = 8 32	N = 50 Ex = 518 M = 10 36
UNMARRIED	N = 50 Ex = 490 M = 9 94	N = 50 Ex = 528 M = 10 46

TABLE NO 4

SEX AND AGE

	MALE	FEMALE
JUNIOR	N = 50 Ex = 528 M = 10 56	N = 50 Ex = 499 M = 9.98
SENIOR	N = 50 Ex = 501 M = 10 02	N = 50 Ex = 539 M = 10 78

TABLE NO 5

MARITAL STATUS AND AGE

	MARRIED	UNMARRIED
JUNIOR	N = 50 Ex = 519 M = 10 38	N = 50 Ex = 550 M = 11 00
SENIOR	N = 50 Ex = 494 M = 9 88	N = 50 Ex = 502 M = 10 02

TABLE NO. 6

SEX, MARITAL STATUS AND AGE

	MALE		FEMALE	
	Married	Unmarried	Married	Unmarried
JUNIOR	N = 25 Ex = 198 M = 7 92	N = 25 Ex = 234 M = 9 36	N = 25 Ex = 242 M = 9 68	N = 25 Ex = 254 M = 10.16
SENIOR	N = 25 Ex = 218 M = 8 72	N = 25 Ex = 256 M = 10.24	N = 25 Ex = 276 M = 11.04	N = 25 Ex = 274 M = 10.96

Table No 1 shows the main effects of sex, marital status and age on dependent variable loneliness It is observed that `F' value for main effect of sex variable is 4 07 which is significant at 0 05 level. This means that male and female subjects differ significantly on loneliness In the light of this result the null hypothesis is rejected The mean loneliness score for male is 9.06 and for female is 10 46 This means female subjects have higher tendency of loneliness as compared to male subjects In the light of results, it can be said that there is significant relationship between sex and loneliness Sex variable thus contributes to loneliness tendency

The `F values for the main effects of marital status and age are 0 84 and 3 73 respectively Both the values are not significant at 0 05 level This implies that married & unmarried subjects and junior and senior subjects do not differ, significantly in the perception of loneliness Here again the null hypothesis are retained It can be said that marital status and age are also not related to loneliness

The `F' values for interaction effect of sex and age, sex and marital status, marital status and age, sex and marital status and age are not significant Thus, it can be said that sex, marital status & age in combination with each other do not give rise tto differences in perception of loneliness The hypothesis pertaining to interaction effect is retained

TABLE NO 7

A 2 X 2 X 2 FACTORIAL DESIGN FOR LOCUS OF CONTROL

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	DF	SS	MSS	F	SIG
SEX	1	48 20	48 20	0 96	N S
MARITAL STATUS	1	29.10	29 10	0 58	N S
AGE	1	36 19	36 19	0 78	N S
SEX X MARITAL STATUS	1	26 23	26 23	0 52	N S
SEX X AGE	1	17 13	17.13	0 34	N S.
MARITAL STATUS X AGE	1	23.09	23.09	0 46	N.S.
SEX X MARITAL ST. X AGE	1	19 12	19 12	0.38	N S.
BETWEEN GROUPS	7	199 06	28 43		
WITHIN GROUPS	192	9619 69	50 10		
TOTAL	199				

200 within 05 = 3 89

Bertween 01 = 6.76

TABLE NO. 8

NUMBER AND MEAN SCORES OF LOCUS OF CONTROL

	N	TOTAL SCORE	MEAN SCORE
MALE	100	995	9.95
FEMALE	100	1033	10.33
MARRIED	100	986	9 86
UNMARRIED	100	1042	10 42
JUNIOR	100	1011	10.11
SENIOR	100	1017	10 17

TABLE NO 9

SEX AND MARITAL STATUS

	MALE	FEMALE
MARRIED	N = 50 Ex = 486 M = 9 72	N = 50 Ex = 500 M = 10
UNMARRIED	N = 50 Ex = 509 M = 10 18	N = 50 Ex = 533 M = 10 66

TABLE NO. 10

SEX AND AGE

	MALE	FEMALE
JUNIOR	N = 50 Ex = 516 M = 10.32	N = 50 Ex = 495 M = 9 90
SENIOR	N = 50 Ex = 479 M = 9.58	N = 50 Ex = 538 M = 10.76

TABLE NO. 11

MARITAL STATUS AND AGE

	MARRIED	UNMARRIED
MARRIED	N = 50 Ex = 479 M = 9 58	N = 50 Ex = 532 M = 10 64
UNMARRIED	N = 50 Ex = 507 M = 10 14	N = 50 Ex = 510 M = 10 20

TABLE NO. 12

SEX, MARITAL STATUS AND AGE

	MALE		FEMALE	
	Married	Unmarried	Married	Unmarried
JUNIOR	N = 25 Ex = 240 M = 9.60	N = 25 Ex = 276 M = 11 04	N = 25 Ex = 239 M = 9.56	N = 25 Ex = 256 M = 10.24
SENIOR	N = 25 Ex = 246 M = 9 84	N = 25 Ex = 233 M = 9 32	N = 25 Ex = 261 M = 10.44	N = 25 Ex = 277 M = 11.08

Table No 7 shows the result of analysis of variance where locus of control is dependent variable and sex, marital status and age are independent variables The `F' value for the main effect of sex is 0 96 which is not significant of 0 05 level, this means there is no significant difference in the means of male and female subjects on locus of control This implies that the perception of male and female subjects with regard to locus of control is similar In the light of these result, null hypothesis is retained On the basis of this result, it can be said that there is no relation between sex and locus of control

The `f' values for marital status and age are 0 58 and 0 78 respectively Both the values are not significant at 0.5 level This implies that married and unmarried subjects and junior & senior subjects do not differ significantly in the perception of locus of control Here also the null hypothesis are retained It can be said that marital status and age are also not related to locus of control

The `F' value for interaction effect of sex and marital status; sex and age; marital status and age, sex, marital status and age are not significant. Thus it can be said that sex, marital status and age in combination with each other do not give rise to difference in the perception of locus of control The hypothesis pertaining to interaction effects are retained.

TABLE NO. 13

A 2 X 2 X 2 FACTORIAL DESIGN FOR

DEATH ANXIETY

SOURCE	df	SS	MSS	f	Sig
Sex	1	37 28	37 28	0.69	N S
Marital Status	1	41 63	41 63	0 78	N S
Age	1	29 41	29 41	0 55	N S
Sex x Marital Status	1	31 39	31 39	0.58	N.S
Sex x Age	1	46.21	46 21	0 86	N S
Marital Status x Age	1	29 26	29 26	0 54	N S
Sex x Marital Status x Age	1	21 37	21 37	0 40	N S
Between Groups	7	236.55	33 79		
Within Groups	192	10241 6 1	53 34		
TOTAL	197				

TABLE NO 14

NUMBER & MEAN SCORES OF DEATH ANXIETY

	N	TOTAL SCORE	MEAN SCORE
Male	100	1482	14.82
Female	100	1674	16 74
Married	100	1634	16.34
Unmarried	100	1522	15 22
Junior	100	1617	16.17
Senior	100	1612	16.12

TABLE NO 15

SEX AND MARITAL STATUS

MALE	FEMALE
N = 50 Ex = 788 M = 15 78	N = 50 Ex = 846 M = 16 92
N = 50 Ex = 694 M = 13 82	N = 50 Ex = 828 M = 16 46

TABLE NO. 16

SEX AND AGE

MALE	FEMALE
N = 50 Ex = 816 M = 16 32	N = 50 Ex = 801 M = 16.02
N = 50 Ex = 791 M = 15.82	N = 50 Ex = 821 M = 16 42

TABLE NO. 17

MARITAL STATUS AND AGE

MARRIED	UNMARRIED
N = 50 Ex = 799 M = 15 98	N = 50 Ex = 764 M = 15 28
N = 50 Ex = 809 M = 16 18	N = 50 Ex = 797 M = 15 94

TABLE NO. 18

SEX, MARITAL STATUS AND AGE

	MALE		FEMALE	
	Married	Unmarried	Married	Unmarried
JUNIOR	N = 25 Ex = 400 M = 16	N = 25 Ex = 304 M = 12.16	N = 25 Ex = 419 M = 16.76	N = 25 Ex = 409 M = 16.36
SENIOR	N = 25 Ex = 388 M = 15 52	N = 25 Ex = 390 M = 15 60	N = 25 Ex = 427 M = 17.08	N = 25 Ex = 419 M = 16.76

Table No 13 shows the result of analysis of variance where death anxiety is dependent variable and sex, marital status and age are independent variables The 'F' vaule for sex is 0 69 which is not significant at 0 05 level, this means that there is no significant difference in the means of male and female subjects on death anxiety This implies that the perception of male and female subjects with regard to death anxiety is similar Considering these results, null hypothesis is retained On the basis of this result, it can be said that there is no relation between sex and death anxiety

The 'F' vaules for the main effects of marital status and age are 0.78 and 0 55 respectively Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level. This implies that married and unmarried subjects and junior and senior subjects do not differ significantly in the perception of death anxiety Here again the null hypotheses are retained It can be said that marital status and age are also not related to death anxiety.

The 'F' values for interaction effect of sex and age, sex and marital status; marital status and age; sex, and marital status and age are not significant Thus it can be said that sex, marital status and age in combination with each other do not give rise to differences in the perception of death anxiety. The hypothesis pertaining to interaction effect are retained

TABLE NO. 19

A 2 x 2 x 2 FACTORIAL DESIGN FOR MENTAL EFFICIENCY

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	DF	SUM OF VARIANCE	MEAN SQUARES	F	SIG
SEX	1	68 72	68 72	2.64	N S
MARITAL STATUS	1	72 84	72.84	2.79	N S
AGE	1	82.91	82 91	3 18	N S
SEX x MARITAL STATUS	1	66 80	66.80	2.56	N.S.
SEX x AGE	1	49 57	49 57	1 90	N S
MARITAL STATUS x AGE	1	52 62	52 62	2 02	N S.
SEX x MARITAL STATUS x AGE	1	79 81	79 81	3 06	N S
BETWEEN GROUPS	7	473 27			
WITHIN GROUPS	192	4996 21	26 02		
TOTAL	199				

TABLE 20

NUMBER AND MEAN SQUARES OF MENTAL EFFICIENCY

	N	TOTAL SCORE	MEAN SCORE
MALE	100	842	8.42
FEMALE	100	862	8.62
MARRIED	100	854	8.54
UNMARRIED	100	850	8.50
JUNIOR	100	838	8.38
SENIOR	100	768	7.68

TABLE NO 21

SEX AND MARITAL STATUS

	Male	Female
MARRIED	N = 50 Ex = 376 M = 7 52	N = 50 Ex = 474 M = 9 48
UNMARRIED	N = 50 Ex = 466 M = 9 32	N = 50 Ex = 388 M = 7 76

TABLE NO 22

SEX AND AGE

	MALE	FEMALE
JUNIOR	N = 50 Ex = 412 M = 8.24	N = 50 Ex = 426 M = 8 52
SENIOR	N = 50 Ex = 352 M = 7 04	N = 50 Ex = 416 M = 8 32

TABLE NO 23

MARITAL STATUS AND AGE

	MARRIED	UNMARRIED
JUNIOR	N = 50 Ex = 384 M = 7.68	N = 50 Ex = 454 M = 9 08
SENIOR	N = 50 Ex = 406 M = 8 12	N = 50 Ex = 362 M = 7 24

TABLE NO. 24

SEX, MARITAL STATUS AND AGE

	MALE		FEMALE	
	MARRIED	UNMARRIED	MARRIED	UNMARRIED
JUNIOR	N = 25 Ex = 194 M = 7.76	N = 25 Ex = 222 M = 8.88	N = 25 Ex = 232 M = 9 28	N = 25 Ex = 212 M = 8.48
SENIOR	N = 25 Ex = 182 M = 7.28	N = 25 Ex = 244 M = 9 76	N = 25 Ex = 242 M = 9 68	N = 25 Ex = 176 M = 7.04

Table No. 19 shows the result of analysis of variance where mental efficiency is dependent variable and sex, marital status and age are independent variables The 'F' value for sex is 2.64 which is not significant at 0 05 level, this means that there is no significant difference in the means of male and female subjects on mental efficiency. This implies that the perception of male and female subjects with regard to mental efficiency is identical. In the light of these results, null hypothesis is retained On the basis of this result it can be said that there is no relation between sex and mental efficiency

The 'F' values for marital status and age are 2.79 and 3 18. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level. This implies that married and unmarried subjects and junior and senior subjects do not differ significantly in the perceptions of mental efficiency Here again the null hypothesis are retained It can be said that marital status and age are also not related to mental efficiency.

The 'F' value for interaction effect of sex and marital status, sex and age, marital status and age; sex, marital status and age are not significant. Thus, it can be said that sex, marital status and age in combination with each other do not give rise to differences in the perception of mental efficiency. The hypothesis pertaining to interaction effect are retained

TABLE NO 25

A 2 x 2 x 2 FACTORIAL DESIGN FOR HEALTH

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	DF	SS	MS	F	SIG.
SEX	1	8.12	8 12	0.19	N S
MARITAL STATUS	1	13 20	13 20	0 31	N S
AGE	1	9 29	9 29	0.22	N.S.
SEX x MARITAL STATUS	1	17 19	17 19	0 41	N.S
SEX x AGE	1	23 13	23 13	0.55	N.S.
MARITAL STATUS x AGE	1	11 78	11.78	0 28	N.S
SEX x MARITAL STATUS x AGE	1	9 27	9 27	0 22	N S
BETWEEN GROUPS	7	91 98	13 14		
WITHIN GROUPS	192	7986 05	41.59		
TOTAL	199				

TABLE 26

NUMBER AND MEAN SCORES OF HEALTH AS AN OLD AGE PROBLEM

	N	TOTAL SCORE	MEAN SCORE
MALE	100	980	9.80
FEMALE	100	1018	10.18
MARRIED	100	990	9.90
UNMARRIED	100	1008	10.08
JUNIOR	100	908	9.08
SENIOR	100	1024	10.24

TABLE NO 27

SEX AND MARITAL STATUS

	MALE	FEMALE
MARRIED	N = 50 Ex = 488 M = 9 76	N = 50 Ex = 502 M = 10.04
UNMARRIED	N = 50 Ex = 492 M = 9 84	N = 50 Ex = 516 M = 10 32

TABLE NO 28

SEX AND AGE

	MALE	FEMALE
JUNIOR	N = 50 Ex = 408 M = 8.16	N = 50 Ex = 500 M = 10 00
SENIOR	N = 50 Ex = 510 M = 10 20	N = 50 Ex = 514 M = 10.28

TABLE NO 29

MARITAL STATUS AND AGE

	MARRIED	UNMARRIED
JUNIOR	N = 50 Ex = 486 M = 9 72	N = 50 Ex = 520 M = 10 40
SENIOR	N = 50 Ex = 510 M = 10 20	N = 50 Ex = 494 M = 9 88

TABLE NO 30

SEX, MARITAL STATUS AND AGE

MALE		FEMALE	
MARRIED	UNMARRIED	MARRIED	UNMARRIED
N = 25 Ex = 237 M = 9.48	N = 25 Ex = 239 M = 9.56	N = 25 Ex = 242 M = 9 68	N = 25 Ex = 250 M = 10 00
N = 25 Ex = 251 M = 10 04	N = 25 Ex = 253 M = 10 12	N = 25 Ex = 260 M = 10.40	N = 25 Ex = 266 M = 10.64

Table No 25 shows the result of analysis of variance where health as a problem of old age is dependent variable and sex, marital status and age independent variables. The `F' value for sex is 0 19 which is not significant at 0 05 level, this means that there is no significant difference in the means of male and female subjects of health This implies that the perception of male and female subjects with regard to health as a old age health problem is similar. In the light of these results, null hypothesis is retained On the basis of this result it can be said that there is no relation between sex and health

`F' values for marital status and age are .31 and 22 respectively Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level This implies that married and unmarried subjects and junior and senior subjects do not differ significantly in the perception of health as a problem. Here also the null hypothesis are retained. It can be said that marital status and age are also not related to health of elderly.

The `F' values for interaction effect of sex and marital status; sex and age; marital status and age; are not significant Thus, it can be said that sex, marital status and age in combination with each other do not give rise to differences in the perception of health. The hypothesis pertaining to interaction effect are retained

TABLE NO. 31

A 2 x 2 x 2 FACTORIAL DESIGN FOR FAMILY AND EMOTIONAL TIES

SOURCE OF VARIANCE.	DF	SS	MSS	F	SIG
SEX	1	7 99	7 99	0 22	N S
MARITAL STATUS	1	11.23	11 23	0 31	N S
AGE	1	10 34	10 34	0 28	N S
SEX x MARITAL STATUS	1	9.75	9 75	0.27	N S.
SEX x AGE	1	10 73	10.73	0 29	N S
MARITAL STATUS x AGE	1	20 19	20 19	0.56	N S
SEX x MARITAL STATUS x AGE	1	13 20	13.20	0 36	N S
BETWEEN GROUPS	7	83 43	11 91		
WiTHIN GROUPS	192	6891.06	35 89		
TOTAL	199				

TABLE 32

NUMBER AND MEAN SCORES OF FAMILY AND EMOTIONAL TIES AS AN OLD AGE PROBOEM

	N	TOTAL SCORE	MEAN SCORE
MALE	100	962	9 62
FEMALE	100	986	9.86
MARRIED	100	976	9.76
UNMARRIED	100	972	9.72
JUNIOR	100	990	9.90
SENIOR	100	996	9.96

TABLE NO 33

SEX AND MARITAL STATUS

	MALE	FEMALE
MARRIED	N = 50 Ex = 480 M = 9 60	N = 50 Ex = 496 M = 9 92
UNMARRIED	N = 50 Ex = 482 M = 9 64	N = 50 Ex = 490 M = 9 80

TABLE NO 34

SEX AND AGE

	MALE	FEMALE
JUNIOR	N = 50 Ex = 488 M = 9 76	N = 50 Ex = 502 M = 10.04
SENIOR	N = 50 Ex = 496 M = 9 92	N = 50 Ex = 500 M = 10.00

TABLE NO 35

MARITAL STATUS AND AGE

	MARRIED	UNMARRIED
JUNIOR	N = 50 Ex = 484 M = 9.68	N = 50 Ex = 402 M = 8.04
SENIOR	N = 50 Ex = 510 M = 10 20	N = 50 Ex = 416 M = 8 32

TABLE NO 36

SEX, MARITAL STATUS AND AGE

	MALE		FEMALE	
	MARRIED	UNMARRIED	MARRIED	UNMARRIED
JUNIOR	N = 25 Ex = 233 M = 9 32	N = 25 Ex = 238 M = 9.52	N = 25 Ex = 233 M = 9 32	N = 25 Ex = 239 M = 9 56
SENIOR	N = 25 Ex = 247 M = 9.88	N = 25 Ex = 244 M = 9.76	N = 25 Ex = 263 M = 10.52	N = 25 Ex = 251 M = 10.4

Table No. 31 shows the result of analysis of variance of family and emotional ties as an old age problem where family and emotionalities is dependent variable and sex, marital status and age are independent variables The `F' value for sex is 0 22 which is not significant at 0 05 level, this means that there is no significant difference in the means of male and female subjects. This implies that the perception of male and female subjects with regard to family and emotional ties is similar. In the light of these results, null hypothesis is retained On the basis of this result, it can be said that there is no relation between sex and family and emotional ties

`F' values for marital status, age are 0.31 and 0 28 respectively. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level This implies that married and unmarried subjects and junior and senior subjects do not differ significantly in the perceptions of family and emotional ties. Here also the null hypothesis are retained It can be said marital status and age are also not related.

The `F' values for interaction effect of sex and marital status; sex and age; marital status and age are not significant. Thus, it can be said that sex, marial status and age in combination with each other do not give rise to differences in the perception of family and emotional ties The hypothesis pertaining to interaction effect are retained.

TABLE NO 37

A 2 x 2 x 2 FACTORIAL DESIGN FOR ECONOMIC PROBLEM

SOURCE OF VARIANCE	DF	SS	MSS	F	SIG
SEX	1	18.14	18 14	0 39	N.S
MARITAL STATUS	1	16 21	16 21	0.35	N S
AGE	1	10 24	10 24	0 22	N S
SEX x MARITAL STATUS	1	19.16	19 16	0.41	N S
SEX x AGE	1	20 14	20 14	0.44	N S
MARITAL STATUS x AGE	1	14 19	14 19	0 31	N.S
SEX x MARITAL STATUS x AGE	1	11 73	11 73	0 25	N S
BETWEEN GROUPS	7	109 81	15 68		
WITHIN GROUPS	192	8768 27	45 66		
TOTAL	199				

TABLE 38

NUMBER AND MEAN SCORES OF ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

	N	TOTAL SCORE	MEAN SCORE
MALE	100	990	9.90
FEMALE	100	958	9.58
MARRIED	100	1008	10.08
UNMARRIED	100	936	9.36
JUNIOR	100	976	9.76
SENIOR	100	1023	10.23

TABLE NO 39

SEX AND MARITAL STATUS

	MALE	FEMALE
MARRIED	N = 50 Ex = 482 M = 9.64	N = 50 Ex = 436 M = 8 72
UNMARRIED	N = 50 Ex = 508 M = 10.16	N = 50 Ex = 522 M = 10 44

TABLE NO 40

SEX AND AGE

	MALE	FEMALE
JUNIOR	N = 50 Ex = 480 M = 9 60	N = 50 Ex = 464 M = 9 28
SENIOR	N = 50 Ex = 510 M = 10 20	N = 50 Ex = 494 M = 9 88

TABLE NO 41

MARITAL STATUS AND AGE

	MARRIED	UNMARRIED
JUNIOR	N = 50 Ex = 496 M = 9 92	N = 50 Ex = 488 M = 9.76
SENIOR	N = 50 Ex = 512 M = 10 24	N = 50 Ex = 448 M = 8 96

TABLE NO 42

SEX, MARITAL STATUS AND AGE

	MALE		FEMALE	
	MARRIED	UNMARRIED	MARRIED	UNMARRIED
JUNIOR	N = 25 Ex = 232 M = 9 28	N = 25 Ex = 248 M = 9 92	N = 25 Ex = 212 M = 8 48	N = 25 Ex = 252 M = 10 08
SENIOR	N = 25 Ex = 250 M = 10 00	N = 25 Ex = 260 M = 10 40	N = 25 Ex = 224 M = 8 96	N = 25 Ex = 270 M = 10 80

Table No 37 shows that the result of analysis of variance where economic problem is dependent variable and sex, marital status and age are independent variables The `F' value for sex is 0 39 which is not significant at 0 05 level this means there is no significant difference in the means of male and female subjects on economic problems This implies that the perception of male and female subjects with regard to locus of control is similar or identical. In the light of these results, null hypothesis is retained. On the basis of this result, it can be said that there is no relation between sex and economic problem.

`F' values for marital status and age are 0 35 and 0 22 respectively Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level. This implies that married and unmarried subjects and junior and senior subjects do not differ significantly in the perceptions of economic problems. Here also the null hypothesis are retained It can be said that marital status and age are also not related to economic problems.

The `F' values for interaction effect of sex and marital status, sex and age; marital status and age are not significant. Thus, it can be said that sex, marital status and age in combination with each other do not give rise to differences in the perception of economic problems. The hypothesis pertaining to interaction effect are retained.

TABLE NO. 43

A 2 x 2 x 2 FACTORIAL DESIGN FOR RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS

SOURCE	DF	SS	MSS	F	SIG
SEX	1	7 49	7 49	0.19	N S
MARITAL STATUS	1	14.31	14 31	0 36	N S
AGE	1	12 62	12 62	0 32	N S
SEX x MARITAL STATUS	1	10 49	10 49	0 26	N S
SEX x AGE	1	11 64	11.64	0 29	N S
MARITAL STATUS x AGE	1	10 94	10 94	0 28	N S
SEX x MARITAL STATUS x AGE	1	13 76	13 76	0.35	N S
BETWEEN GROUPS	7	81.25	11 60		N S
WITHIN GROUPS	192	7481.23	38 96		N S
TOTAL	199	7562.48			N S

TABLE 44

NUMBER AND MEAN SCORES OF RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS

	N	TOTAL SCORE	MEAN SCORE
MALE	100	964	9.64
FEMALE	100	986	9.86
MARRIED	100	996	9.96
UNMARRIED	100	1022	10 22
JUNIOR	100	1028	10.28
SENIOR	100	1099	10 99

TABLE NO 45

SEX AND MARITAL STATUS

	MALE	FEMALE
MARRIED	N = 50 Ex = 462 M = 9 24	N = 50 Ex = 482 M = 9 64
UNMARRIED	N = 50 Ex = 502 M = 10 04	N = 50 Ex = 504 M = 10 08

TABLE NO. 46

SEX AND AGE

	MALE	FEMALE
JUNIOR	N = 50 Ex = 475 M = 9.50	N = 50 Ex = 475 M = 9 50
SENIOR	N = 50 Ex = 489 M = 9.78	N = 50 Ex = 511 M = 10.22

TABLE NO 47

MARITAL STATUS AND AGE

	MARRIED	UNMARRIED
JUNIOR	N = 50 Ex = 486 M = 9.72	N = 50 Ex = 456 M = 9.12
SENIOR	N = 50 Ex = 542 M = 10 84	N = 50 Ex = 660 M = 13 20

TABLE NO 48

SEX, MARITAL STATUS AND AGE

	MALE		FEMALE	
	MARRIED	UNMARRIED	MARRIED	UNMARRIED
JUNIOR	N = 25 Ex = 232 M = 9 28	N = 25 Ex = 243 M = 9 72	N = 25 Ex = 232 M = 9 28	N = 25 Ex = 243 M = 9 72
SENIOR	N = 25 Ex = 230 M = 9 20	N = 25 Ex = 259 M = 10 36	N = 25 Ex = 250 M = 10 00	N = 25 Ex = 261 M = 10.44

Table No 43 shows the result of analysis of variance where religious and social problems is dependent variable and sex, marital status and age are independent variables The `F' value for sex is 0 19 which is not significant at 0 05 level, this means there is no significant difference in the means of male and female subjects on religious and social problems This implies the perception of male and female subjects with regard to religious and social problems is similar. In the light of these results, null nypothesis is retained On the basis of this result, it can be said that there is no relation between sex and religious & social problems

The `F' values for marital status and age are 0 36 and 0 32 respectively Both the values are not significant at 0 05 level This implies the married and unmarried subjects and junior and senior subjects do not differ significantly in the perceptions of religious and social problems Here also the null hypothesis are retained It can be said that marital status and age are also not related to religious and social problems

The `F' values for interaction effect of sex and marital status, sex and age; marital status and age, sex, marital status and age re not significant. Thus, it can be said that sex, marital status and age in combination with each other do not give rise to differences in the perceptions of religious and social problem. The hypothesis pertaining to interaction effect are retained

TABLE NO 49

A 2 x 2 x 2 FACTORIAL DESIGN FOR PERSONALITY

SOURCE	DF	SS	MSS	F	SIG.
SEX	1	11 64	11 64	0 30	N S
MARITAL STATUS	1	13 92	13 92	0 35	N S
AGE	1	10 73	10 73	0 27	N S
SEX x MARITAL STATUS	1	9 64	9 64	0 24	N S
SEX x AGE	1	13 46	13 46	0 34	N S
MARITAL STATUS x AGE	1	11 60	11 60	0 29	N.S
SEX x MARITAL STATUS x AGE	1	14 21	14 21	0 36	N.S
BETWEEN GROUPS	7	85 20	12 17		
WITHIN GROUPS	192	7432 62	38 71		
TOTAL	199	7517.82			

TABLE 50

NUMBER AND MEAN SCORE OF PERSONALITY

	N	TOTAL SCORE	MEAN SCORE
MALE	100	976	9 76
FEMALE	100	988	9.88
MARRIED	100	996	9.96
UNMARRIED	100	1110	11.10
JUNIOR	100	1012	10.12
SENIOR	100	982	9.82

TABLE NO 51

SEX AND MARITAL STATUS

	MALE	FEMALE
MARRIED	N = 50 Ex = 472 M = 9 44	N = 50 Ex = 478 M = 9 56
UNMARRIED	N = 50 Ex = 504 M = 10 08	N = 50 Ex = 510 M = 10 20

TABLE NO 52

SEX AND AGE

	MALE	FEMALE
JUNIOR	N = 50 Ex = 472 M = 9 44	N = 50 Ex = 470 M = 9 40
SENIOR	N = 50 Ex = 504 M = 10 08	N = 50 Ex = 518 M = 10 36

TABLE NO 53

MARITAL STATUS AND AGE

	MARRIED	UNMARRIED
JUNIOR	N = 50 Ex = 478 M = 9 56	N = 50 Ex = 476 M = 9 52
SENIOR	N = 50 Ex = 534 M = 10 68	N = 50 Ex = 506 M = 10 12

TABLE NO 54

SEX, MARITAL STATUS AND AGE

	MALE		FEMALE	
	MARRIED	UNMARRIED	MARRIED	UNMARRIED
JUNIOR	N = 25 Ex = 229 M = 9.16	N = 25 Ex = 243 M = 9 72	N = 25 Ex = 227 M = 9 08	N = 25 Ex = 243 M = 9 72
SENIOR	N = 25 Ex = 243 M = 9.72	N = 25 Ex = 261 M = 10.44	N = 25 Ex = 251 M = 10.04	N = 25 Ex = 267 M = 10.68

Table No 49 shows that result of analysis of variance where personality as an old age problem is dependent variable and sex, marital status, and age are independent variables The `F' values for sex is 0 30 which is not significant at 0 05 level, this means that there is no significant difference in the means of male and female subjects on personality This implies that the perception of male and female subjects with regard to personality is identical In the light of these results, null hypothesis is retained On the basis of this result, it can be said that there is no relation between sex and personality

The `F' values for marital status and age are 0 35 and 0 27 respectively. Both the values are not significant at 0 05 level This implies that married and unmarried subjects and junior and senior subjects do not differ significantly in the perceptions of personality Here also the null hypothesis are retained It can be said that marital status and age are not related to personality

The `F' values for interaction effect of sex and age, marital status and age, sex and marital status, sex, marital status and age are not significant Thus, it can be said that sex, marital status and age in combination with each other do not give rise to differences in the perception of personality. The hypothesis pertaining to interaction effect are retained

TABLE NO 55

A 2 x 2 x 2 FACTORIAL DESIGN FOR PERSONAL BETTERMENT

SOURCE	DF	SS	MSS	F	SIG
SEX	1	12 97	12 97	0 31	N S
MARITAL STATUS	1	14 16	14 16	0 34	N S
AGE	1	11 75	11 75	0 28	N S
SEX x MARITAL STATUS	1	14 20	14 20	0 34	N S
SEX x AGE	1	16 12	16 12	0 38	N S
MARITAL STATUS x AGE	1	13 79	13 79	0 33	N S
SEX x MARITAL STATUS x AGE	1	14 76	14 76	0 35	N S
BETWEEN GROUPS	7	97 75			
WITHIN GROUPS	192	7992 81	41 62		
TOTAL	199				

TABLE 56

NUMBER AND MEAN SCORE OF PERSONAL BETTERMENT

	N	TOTAL SCORE	MEAN SCORE
MALE	100	968	9 68
FEMALE	100	1011	10.11
MARRIED	100	997	9 97
UNMARRIED	100	899	8.99
JUNIOR	100	971	9.71
SENIOR	100	1023	10 23

TABLE NO 57

SEX AND MARITAL STATUS

	MALE	FEMALE
MARRIED	N = 50 Ex = 463 M = 9 26	N = 50 Ex = 472 M = 9 44
UNMARRIED	N = 50 Ex = 505 M = 10 10	N = 50 Ex = 539 M = 10 78

TABLE NO 58

SEX AND AGE

	MALE	FEMALE
JUNIOR	N = 50 Ex = 485 M = 9 70	N = 50 Ex = 525 M = 10 50
SENIOR	N = 50 Ex = 530 M = 10 60	N = 50 Ex = 486 M = 9 72

TABLE NO 59

MARITAL STATUS AND AGE

	MARRIED	UNMARRIED
JUNIOR	N = 50 Ex = 448 M = 8 96	N = 50 Ex = 467 M = 9 34
SENIOR	N = 50 Ex = 549 M = 10 98	N = 50 Ex = 432 M = 8 64

TABLE NO 60

SEX, MARITAL STATUS AND AGE

	MALE		FEMALE	
	MARRIED	UNMARRIED	MARRIED	UNMARRIED
JUNIOR	N = 25 Ex = 212 M = 8 48	N = 25 Ex = 273 M = 10 92	N = 25 Ex = 244 M = 9.76	N = 25 Ex = 281 M = 11 24
SENIOR	N = 25 Ex = 251 M = 10 04	N = 25 Ex = 232 M = 9.28	N = 25 Ex = 228 M = 9 12	N = 25 Ex = 258 M = 10 32

Table No 55 shows the result of analysis of variance where personal betterment is dependent variable and sex, marital status and age are independent variables The `F' value for sex is 0.31 which is not significant at 0 05 level, this means there is no significant differences in the means of male and female subjects on personal betterment. This implies that the perception of male and female subjects with regard to personal betterment is similar In the light of this result, null hypothesis is retained On the basis of this result, it can be said that there is no relation between sex and personal betterment

`F' values for marital status and age are 0 34 and 0 28 respectively Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level. This implies that married and unmarried subjects and junior and senior subjects do not differ significantly in the perception of personal betterment Here also the null hypothesis are retained. It can be said that marital status and age are also not related to personal betterment

The `F' values for interaction of sex and marital status; sex and age; marital status and age, sex, marital status and age are not significant Thus it can be said that sex, marital status and age in combination with each other do not give rise to differences in the perception of personal betterment. The hypothesis pertaining to interaction effect are retained

TABLE NO 61

A 2 x 2 x 2 FACTORIAL DESIGN FOR LONELINESS

SOURCE	DF	SS	MSS	F	SIG
Rule of Residence	1	81 25	81 25	2 51	N S
Caste	1	29 64	29 64	0 91	N S
Educational Qualification	1	56 24	56 24	1 73	N S
Rule of Residence x Caste	1	42 82	42 82	1 32	N S
Rule of Residence x Eduational Qualification	1	14 70	14 70	0 45	N S
Caste x Edu Qualification	1	29 21	29 21	0 90	N S
Rule of Residence x Caste x Educational Qualification	1	68 19	68 19	2 10	N S
Between Groups	7	322 05			
Within Groups	192	6214 51	32 36		
TOTAL	199				

TABLE 62

NUMBER AND MEAN SCORES OF LONELINESS

	N	TOTAL SCORE	MEAN SCORE
RURAL	100	900	9.00
URBAN	100	999	9.99
LOWER CASTE	100	916	9.16
UPPER CASTE	100	974	9.74
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	100	948	9.48
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	100	1040	10 40

TABLE NO 63

RULE OF RESIDENCE AND CASTE

	RURAL	URBAN
LOWER CASTE	N = 50 Ex = 436 M = 8 72	N = 50 Ex = 517 M = 10 34
UPPER CASTE	N = 50 Ex = 464 M = 9 28	N = 50 Ex = 482 M = 9 64

TABLE NO 64

RULE OF RESIDENCE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION

	RURAL	URBAN
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 488 M = 9 76	N = 50 Ex = 501 M = 10 02
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 460 M = 9 20	N = 50 Ex = 539 M = 10 78

TABLE NO 65

CASTE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 472 M = 9 44	N = 50 Ex = 465 M = 9 30
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 444 M = 8 88	N = 50 Ex = 509 M = 10 18

TABLE NO 66

RULE OF RESIDENCE, CASTE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION

	RURAL		URBAN	
	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 25 Ex = 210 M = 8 40	N = 25 Ex = 236 M = 9 44	N = 25 Ex = 272 M = 10 88	N = 25 Ex = 237 M = 9 48
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 25 Ex = 226 M = 9 04	N = 25 Ex = 228 M = 9 12	N = 25 Ex = 245 M = 9 80	N = 25 Ex = 245 M = 9 80

Table No 61 shows that result analysis of variance where loneliness is dependent variable and rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications are independent variables. The `F' value for rule of residence is 2.51 which is not significant at 0 05 level, this means there is no significant difference in the means of rural and urban subjects on loneliness This implies the perception of rural and urban subjects with regard to alienation is similar. In the light of this result, null hypothesis is retained. On the basis of this result, it can be said there is no relation between rule of residence and alienation

`F' values for caste and educational qualifications are 0 91 & 1 73 respectively. Both the values are not significant at 0 05 level. This implies the lower and upper caste subjects and below intermediate and above intermediate subjects do not differ significantly in the perceptions of loneliness Here also the null hypothesis are retained It can be said that caste and educational qualifications are not related to loneliness

The `F' values for interaction effect of rule of residence and caste; rule of residence and educational qualifications, caste and educational qualifications, rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications are not significant Thus, it can be said that rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications in combination with each other do not give rise to difference in the perception of loneliness The hypothesis pertaining to interaction effect is retained.

TABLE NO 67

A 2 x 2 x 2 FACTORIAL DESIGN

LOCUS OF CONTROL

SOURCE	DF	SS	MSS	F	SIG
Rule of Residence	1	29 04	29 04	0 49	N S
Caste	1	56 84	56 84	0 96	N S
Educational Qualification	1	49 64	49 64	0 84	N S
Rule of Residence x Caste	1	52 29	52 29	0 89	N S
Rule of Residence x Eduational Qualification	1	61 36	61 36	1 04	N S
Caste x Edu Qualification	1	39 49	39 49	0 67	N S
Rule of Residence x Caste x Educational Qualification	1	44 61	44 61	0 76	N S
Between Groups	7	333 27	47 61		
Within Groups	192	11264 92	58.67		
TOTAL	199				

TABLE 68

NUMBER AND MEAN OF LOCUS OF CONTROL

	N	TOTAL SCORE	MEAN SCORE
RURAL	100	960	9.60
URBAN	100	996	9.96
LOWER CASTE	100	998	9.98
UPPER CASTE	100	958	9 58
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	100	974	9.74
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	100	941	9 41

TABLE NO 69

RULE OF RESIDENCE AND CASTE

	RURAL	URBAN
LOWER CASTE	N = 50 Ex = 494 M = 9 88	N = 50 Ex = 518 M = 10 36
UPPER CASTE	N = 50 Ex = 466 M = 9 32	N = 50 Ex = 478 M = 9 56

TABLE NO 70

RULE OF RESIDENCE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

	RURAL	URBAN
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 468 M = 9 36	N = 50 Ex = 506 M = 10 12
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 460 M = 9.20	N = 50 Ex = 481 M = 9.62

TABLE NO 71

CASTE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION

	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 511 M = 10 22	N = 50 Ex = 482 M = 9 64
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 487 M = 9 74	N = 50 Ex = 476 M = 9 52

TABLE NO 72

RULE OF RESIDENCE, CASTE & EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

	RURAL		URBAN	
	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 25 Ex = 263 M = 9 44	N = 25 Ex = 235 M = 9 40	N = 25 Ex = 270 M = 10.80	N = 25 Ex = 223 M = 8 92
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 25 Ex = 258 M = 10 32	N = 25 Ex = 231 M = 9 24	N = 25 Ex = 248 M = 9 92	N = 25 Ex = 255 M = 10 20

Table No 67 shows the result of analysis of variance where locus of control is dependent variable and rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications are independent variables The `F' value of rule of residence is 0.49 which is not significant at 0 05 level, this means there is no significant difference in the means of rural and urban subjects on locus of control This implies the perception of rural and urban subjects with regard to locus of control is similar In the light of these results, null hypothesis is retained On the basis of this results, it can be said that there is no relation between rule of residence and locus of control.

`F' value for caste and educational qualifications are 0 96 and 0 84 respectively Both the values are not significant at 0 05 level. This implies the lower caste and upper caste subjects and below intermediate and above intermediate do not differ significantly in the perception of locus of control Here also the null hypothesis are retained It can be said that caste and educational qualifications are also not related to locus of control

`F' values for interaction effect of rule of residence and caste, rule of residence and educational qualifications, caste and educational qualifications; rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications are not significant. Thus, it can be said that rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications in combination with each other do not give rise to differences in perception of locus of control The hypothesis pertaining to interaction effect are retained

TABLE NO 73

A 2 x 2 x 2 FACTORIAL DESIGN FOR DEATH ANXIETY

SOURCE	DF	SS	MSS	F	SIG
Rule of Residence	1	18 24	18 24	0 71	N S
Caste	1	85 29	85 29	3 33	N S
Educational Qualification	1	52 97	52 97	2 07	N S
Rule of Residence x Caste	1	57 87	57 87	2 26	N S
Rule of Residence x Eduational Qualification	1	13 76	13 76	0 53	N S
Caste x Edu Qualification	1	46 44	46 44	1 81	N S
Rule of Residence x Caste x Educational Qualification	1	14 72	14 72	0 57	N S
Between Groups	7	289			
Within Groups	192	4909 10	25 56		
TOTAL	199				

TABLE 74

NUMBER AND MEAN SCORES OF DEATH ANXIETY

	N	TOTAL SCORE	MEAN SCORE
RURAL	100	1570	15.70
URBAN	100	1621	16.21
LOWER CASTE	100	1644	16.44
UPPER CASTE	100	1690	16 90
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	100	1668	16.68
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	100	1581	15 81

TABLE NO 75

RULE OF RESIDENCE AND CASTE

	RURAL	URBAN
LOWER CASTE	N = 50 Ex = 816 M = 16 32	N = 50 Ex = 783 M = 15 66
UPPER CASTE	N = 50 Ex = 754 M = 15 08	N = 50 Ex = 838 M = 16 76

TABLE NO 76

RULE OF RESIDENCE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION

	RURAL	URBAN
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 795 M = 15 90	N = 50 Ex = 873 M = 17 46
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 839 M = 16.78	N = 50 Ex = 742 M = 14 84

TABLE NO 77

CASTE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 787 M = 15 74	N = 50 Ex = 839 M = 16 78
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 857 M = 17 14	N = 50 Ex = 851 M = 17 02

TABLE NO 78

RULE OF RESIDENCE, CASTE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

	RURAL		URBAN	
	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 25 Ex = 433 M = 17 32	N = 25 Ex = 352 M = 14.08	N = 25 Ex = 401 M = 16 04	N = 25 Ex = 427 M = 17.08
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 25 Ex = 383 M = 15 32	N = 25 Ex = 402 M = 16.08	N = 25 Ex = 382 M = 15 28	N = 25 Ex = 411 M = 16 44

Table No 73 shows the result of analysis of variance where death anxiety is dependent variable and rule of residence, caste, and educational qualifications are independent variables. The `F' value rule of residence is 0 71 which is not significant at 0 05 level, this means there is no significant differences in the means of rural and urban subjects on death anxiety This implies the perception of rural and urban subjects with regard to death anxiety is similar In the light of these results, null hypothesis is retained On the basis of this result, it can be said that there is no relation between rule of residence and death anxiety.

`F' value for caste and educational qualifications are 3 33 and 2 07 respectively Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level. This implies the lower caste and upper caste subjects and below intermediate and above intermediate do not differ significantly in the perception of death anxiety Here also the null hypothesis are retained It can be said that caste and educational qualifications are also not related to death anxiety

The `F' values for interaction effect of rule of residence and caste, rule of residence and educational qualifications; caste and educational qualifications, rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications are not significant. Thus, it can be said that rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications in combination with each other do not give rise to differences in perception of death anxiety The hypothesis pertaining to interaction effect are retained

TABLE NO 79

A 2 x 2 x 2 FACTORIAL DESIGN FOR MENTAL EFFICIENCY

SOURCE	DF	SS	MSS	F	SIG
Rule of Residence	1	48 76	48 76	1 66	N S
Caste	1	59 20	59 20	2 02	N S
Educational Qualification	1	63 71	63 71	2 17	N S
Rule of Residence x Caste	1	71 28	71 28	2 43	N S
Rule of Residence x Eduational Qualification	1	66 21	66 21	2 26	N S
Caste x Edu Qualification	1	51 26	51 26	1 75	N S
Rule of Residence x Caste x Educational Qualification	1	68 13	68 13	2 32	N S
Between Groups	7	428 55			
Within Groups	192		29 28		
TOTAL	199				

TABLE 80

NUMBER AND MEAN SCORES OF MENTAL EFFICIENCY

	N	TOTAL SCORE	MEAN SCORE
RURAL	100	736	7 36
URBAN	100	844	8 44
LOWER CASTE	100	776	7.76
UPPER CASTE	100	804	8.04
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	100	846	8.46
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	100	880	8 80

TABLE NO 81

RULE OF RESIDENCE AND CASTE

	RURAL	URBAN
LOWER CASTE	N = 50 Ex = 379 M = 7 58	N = 50 Ex = 401 M = 8 02
UPPER CASTE	N = 50 Ex = 357 M = 7 14	N = 50 Ex = 443 M = 8 86

TABLE NO 82

RULE OF RESIDENCE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION

	RURAL	URBAN
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 417 M = 8 34	N = 50 Ex = 457 M = 9 14
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 429 M = 8.58	N = 50 Ex = 423 M = 8 46

TABLE NO 83

CASTE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 369 M = 7.38	N = 50 Ex = 411 M = 8 22
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 407 M = 8 14	N = 50 Ex = 393 M = 7 86

TABLE NO 84

RULE OF RESIDENCE, CASTE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION

	RURAL		URBAN	
	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 25 Ex = 161 M = 6 44	N = 25 Ex = 195 M = 7.80	N = 25 Ex = 221 M = 8 84	N = 25 Ex = 207 M = 8.28
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 25 Ex = 218 M = 8.72	N = 25 Ex = 162 M = 6 48	N = 25 Ex = 180 M = 7 20	N = 25 Ex = 236 M = 9.44

Table No 79 shows the result of analysis of variance where mental efficiency is dependent variable and rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications are independent variables The `F' values for rule of residence is 1 66 which is not significant at 0 05 level, this means that there is no significant difference in the means of rural and urban subjects on mental efficiency. This implies the perception of rural and urban subjects with regard to mental efficiency is similar In the light of these results, null hypothesis is retained On the basis of this result, it can be said there is no relation between rule of residence & mental efficiency

The `F' values for caste and educational qualifications are 2 02 and 2.17 respectively. Both the values are not significant at 0 05 level. This implies the lower and upper caste subjects and below intermediate and above intermediate do not differ significantly in the perception of mental efficiency. Here also the null hypothesis are retained It can be said the caste and educational qualifications are also not related to mental efficiency

The `F' values for interaction effect of rule of residence and educational qualifications, caste and educational qualifications, rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications are not significant Thus, it can be said that rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications in combination with each other do not give rise to differences in the perception of mental efficiency The hypothesis pertaining to interaction effect are retained

TABLE NO 85

A 2 x 2 x 2 FACTORIAL DESIGN FOR HEALTH AS AN OLD AGE PROBLEM

SOURCE	DF	SS	MSS	F	SIG
Rule of Residence	1	39 49	39 49	1 10	N S
Caste	1	64 71	64 71	2 08	N S
Educational Qualification	1	46 13	46.13	1.48	N S
Rule of Residence x Caste	1	54 71	54 71	1 75	N S
Rule of Residence x Eduational Qualification	1	18 64	18 64	0 59	N S
Caste x Edu Qualification	1	39 17	39 17	1 25	N S
Rule of Residence x Caste x Educational Qualification	1	64 29	64.29	2 06	N S
Between Groups	7				
Within Groups	192	5972 19	31 10		
TOTAL	199				

TABLE 86

NUMBER AND MEAN SCORES OF HEALTH AS AN OLD AGE PROBLEM

	N	TOTAL SCORE	MEAN SCORE
RURAL	100	980	9.80
URBAN	100	1012	10.12
LOWER CASTE	100	976	9.76
UPPER CASTE	100	998	9.98
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	100	868	8.68
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	100	996	9.96

TABLE NO 87

RULE OF RESIDENCE AND CASTE

	RURAL	URBAN
LOWER CASTE	N = 50 Ex = 474 M = 9.48	N = 50 Ex = 481 M = 9.62
UPPER CASTE	N = 50 Ex = 506 M = 10 12	N = 50 Ex = 531 M = 10 62

TABLE NO 88

RULE OF RESIDENCE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION

	RURAL	URBAN
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 417 M = 8 34	N = 50 Ex = 473 M = 9 46
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 451 M = 9 02	N = 50 Ex = 523 M = 10 46

TABLE NO. 89

CASTE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 469 M = 9 38	N = 50 Ex = 473 M = 9.46
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 507 M = 10 14	N = 50 Ex = 525 M = 10 50

TABLE NO. 90

RULE OF RESIDENCE, CASTE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION

	RURAL		URBAN	
	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 25 Ex = 223 M = 8.92	N = 25 Ex = 239 M = 9.56	N = 25 Ex = 243 M = 9.72	N = 25 Ex = 271 M = 10.84
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 25 Ex = 251 M = 10.04	N = 25 Ex = 267 M = 10.68	N = 25 Ex = 238 M = 9 52	N = 25 Ex = 260 M = 10 40

Table No. 85 shows the result of analysis of variance where health as an old age problem is dependent variable and rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications are independent variables The `F' value for rule of residence is 1.10 which is not significant at 0.05 level, this means there is no significant difference in the means of rural and urban subjects on health as an old age problem. This implies the perception of rural and urban subjects with regard to health is identical In the light of these results, null hypothesis is retained On the basis of this result, it can be said that there is no relation between rule of residence and health

The `F' values for caste and educational qualifications are 2.08 and 1.48 respectively. Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level This implies that lower and upper caste subjects and below and above intermediate subjects do not differ significantly in the perception of health. Here also the null hypothesis are retained It can be said that caste and educational qualifications are not related to health of old subjects

The `F' vaues for interaction effect of rule of residence and caste, rule of residence and educational qualifications and caste and educational qualifications; rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications are not significant Thus it can be said that rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications in combination with each other do not give rise to difference in the perception of health The hypotheses pertaining to interaction effect are retained.

TABLE NO 91

A 2 x 2 x 2 FACTORIAL DESIGN FOR FAMILY AND ECONOMIC TIES

SOURCE	DF	SS	MSS	F	SIG
Rule of Residence	1	14 72	14 72	0 46	N S
Caste	1	29 64	29 64	0 92	N S
Educational Qualification	1	10 13	10 13	0 31	N S
Rule of Residence x Caste	1	11 64	11 64	0 36	N S
Rule of Residence x Eduational Qualification	1	16 82	16 82	0 52	N S
Caste x Edu Qualification	1	28 19	28 19	0 88	N S
Rule of Residence x Caste x Educational Qualification	1	32 96	32 96	1 03	N S
Between Groups	7	144 10			
Within Groups	192	6129 20	31 92		
TOTAL	199				

TABLE 92

NUMBER AND MEAN SCORES OF FAMILY AND EMOTIONAL TIES

	N	TOTAL SCORE	MEAN SCORE
RURAL	100	780	7.80
URBAN	100	704	7 04
LOWER CASTE	100	810	8.10
UPPER CASTE	100	782	7 82
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	100	649	6 49
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	100	732	7 32

TABLE NO 93

RULE OF RESIDENCE AND CASTE

	RURAL	URBAN
LOWER CASTE	N = 50 Ex = 371 M = 7.42	N = 50 Ex = 361 M = 7 22
UPPER CASTE	N = 50 Ex = 409 M = 8 18	N = 50 Ex = 343 M = 6 86

TABLE NO. 94

RULE OF RESIDENCE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION

	RURAL	URBAN
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 313 M = 6 26	N = 50 Ex = 373 M = 7.46
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 336 M = 6.72	N = 50 Ex = 359 M = 7.18

TABLE NO 95

CASTE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 417 M = 8 34	N = 50 Ex = 369 M = 7 38
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 393 M = 7 86	N = 50 Ex = 413 M = 8 26

TABLE NO. 96

RULE OF RESIDENCE, CASTE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION

	RURAL		URBAN	
	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 25 Ex = 209 M = 8 36	N = 25 Ex = 187 M = 7 48	N = 25 Ex = 190 M = 7.60	N = 25 Ex = 186 M = 7.44
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 25 Ex = 162 M = 6 48	N = 25 Ex = 222 M = 8.88	N = 25 Ex = 171 M = 6.84	N = 25 Ex = 157 M = 6.28

Table No 91 shows the result of analysis of variance where family and emotional ties as an old age problem is dependent variable and rule of residence, caste and educational qualification are independent variables The `F' value of rule of residence is 0 46 which is not significant at 0 05 level, this means that there is no difference in the means of rural and urban subjects on family and emotional ties as an old age problems. This implies the perception of rural and urban subjects with regard to family and emotional ties is identical In the light of these results, it can be said that there is no relation between rule of residence and family & emotional ties

The `F' values for caste and educational qualifications are 0.92 and 0.31 respectively Both the values are not significant at 0 05 level This implies that lower caste and upper caste subjects and below and above intermediate subjects do not differ significantly in the perception of family and emotional ties. Here also the null hypotheses are retained. It can be said the caste and educational qualifications are not related to family and emotional ties

The `F' values for interaction effect of rule of residence and caste; rule of residence and educational qualifications, and caste and educational qualifications; rule of residence, caste, educational qualifications are not significant. Thus, it can be said rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications in combination with each other do not give rise to difference in the perception of family and emotional ties. The hypotheses pertaining to interaction effect are retained

TABLE NO. 97

A 2 x 2 x 2 FACTORIAL DESIGN FOR ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

SOURCE	DF	SS	MSS	F	SIG
Rule of Residence	1	32 39	32 39	1 34	N.S
Caste	1	23.16	23.16	0 96	N.S.
Educational Qualification	1	49 29	49 29	2 05	N S.
Rule of Residence x Caste	1	36 17	36 17	1 50	N S
Rule of Residence x Eduational Qualification	1	29 64	29 64	1.23	N S.
Caste x Edu Qualification	1	42 70	42 70	1 77	N S
Rule of Residence x Caste x Educational Qualification	1	30 17	30.17	1 25	N S
Between Groups	7	243 52			
Within Groups	192	4612 04	24 02		
TOTAL	199				

TABLE 98

NUMBER AND MEAN SCORE OF ECONOMIC PROBLEM

	N	TOTAL SCORE	MEAN SCORE
RURAL	100	684	6.84
URBAN	100	861	8.61
LOWER CASTE	100	763	7.63
UPPER CASTE	100	701	7.01
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	100	812	8.12
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	100	782	7.82

TABLE NO 99

RULE OF RESIDENCE AND CASTE

	RURAL	URBAN
LOWER CASTE	N = 50 Ex = 327 M = 6 54	N = 50 Ex = 416 M = 8 32
UPPER CASTE	N = 50 Ex = 357 M = 7 14	N = 50 Ex = 445 M = 8 90

TABLE NO. 100

RULE OF RESIDENCE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

	RURAL	URBAN
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 365 M = 7 30	N = 50 Ex = 385 M = 7 70
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 447 M = 8 94	N = 50 Ex = 397 M = 7 94

TABLE NO 101

CASTE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 373 M = 7 52	N = 50 Ex = 339 M = 6 78
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 387 M = 7 74	N = 50 Ex = 362 M = 7 24

TABLE NO 102

RULE OF RESIDENCE, CASTE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION

	RURAL		URBAN	
	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 25 Ex = 145 M = 5 80	N = 25 Ex = 161 M = 6 44	N = 25 Ex = 193 M = 7.72	N = 25 Ex = 213 M = 8 52
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 25 Ex = 182 M = 7.28	N = 25 Ex = 196 M = 7 84	N = 25 Ex = 223 M = 8.92	N = 25 Ex = 232 M = 9.28

Table No 97 shows the result of analysis of variance where economic problem is a dependent variable and rule of residence, caste, and educational qualifications are independent variables. The `F' value for rule of residence is 1.34 which is not significant at 0 05 level, this means there is no significant difference in the means of rural and urban subjects on economic problem This implies the perception of rural and urban subjects with regard to economic problems are similar In the light of these results, null hypothesis is retained On the basis of this result, it can be said there is no relation between rule of residence and economic problem

The `F' values for caste and educational qualifications are 0 96 and 2.05 respectively Both the values are not significant at 0 05 level This implies the lower and upper caste subjects and below and above intermediate subjects do not differ significantly in the perception of economic problems Here also the null hypotheses are retained It can be said that caste and educational qualifications are not related to elderly subjects.

The `F' values for interaction effect of rule of residence and caste; rule of residence and educational and caste and educational qualifications, rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications are not significant Thus, it can be said rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications in combination with each other do not give rise to differences in the perceptions of economic problems. The hypotheses pertaining to interaction effect are retained

TABLE NO. 103

A 2 x 2 x 2 FACTORIAL DESIGN FOR RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS

SOURCE	DF	SS	MSS	F	SIG
Rule of Residence	1	39 64	39.64	1 90	N S
Caste	1	43 12	43 12	2 07	N S.
Educational Qualification	1	32.79	32 79	1 57	N.S.
Rule of Residence x Caste	1	28.46	28 46	1 37	N.S
Rule of Residence x Eduational Qualification	1	23.69	23 69	1 14	N S
Caste x Edu Qualification	1	36 18	36 18	1 74	N S.
Rule of Residence x Caste x Educational Qualification	1	50 12	50 12	2 41	N S
Between Groups	7	254.00			
Within Groups	192	3986.12	20 76		
TOTAL	199				

TABLE 104

NUMBER AND MEAN SCORES OF RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS

	N	TOTAL SCORE	MEAN SCORE
RURAL	100	721	7.21
URBAN	100	689	6.89
LOWER CASTE	100	692	6.92
UPPER CASTE	100	680	6.80
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	100	739	7.39
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	100	693	6.93

TABLE NO. 105

RULE OF RESIDENCE AND CASTE

	RURAL	URBAN
LOWER CASTE	N = 50 Ex = 338 M = 6 76	N = 50 Ex = 327 M = 6 54
UPPER CASTE	N = 50 Ex = 383 M = 7 66	N = 50 Ex = 362 M = 7.24

TABLE NO 106

RULE OF RESIDENCE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

	RURAL	URBAN
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 352 M = 7.04	N = 50 Ex = 337 M = 6 74
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 387 M = 7 74	N = 50 Ex = 356 M = 7.12

TABLE NO 107

CASTE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 331 M = 6.62	N = 50 Ex = 325 M = 6 50
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 361 M = 7 22	N = 50 Ex = 355 M = 7 10

TABLE NO. 108

RULE OF RESIDENCE, CASTE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION

	RURAL		URBAN	
	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 25 Ex = 154 M = 6 16	N = 25 Ex = 176 M = 7.04	N = 25 Ex = 152 M = 6 08	N = 25 Ex = 169 M = 6.76
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 25 Ex = 184 M = 7 36	N = 25 Ex = 207 M = 8 28	N = 25 Ex = 175 M = 7,00	N = 25 Ex = 193 M = 7 72

Table No 103 shows the result of analysis of variance where religious and social problem is dependent variable and rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications are independent variables The `F' value for rule of residence is 1 90 which is not significant at 0 05 level, this means there is no significant differerice in the means of rural and urban subjects on religious and social problems. This implies that the perception of rural and urban subjects with regard to religious and social problem is similar In the light of this results, null hypothesis is retained On the basis of this result there is no relation between rule of residence and religious and social problem

The `F' values for caste and educational qualifications are 2.08 and 1.48 respectively Both the values are not significant at 0 05 level This implies that lower and upper caste subjects and below and above intermediate subjects do not differ significantly in the perception of health Here also the null hypothesis are retained. It can be said that caste and educational qualifications are not related to health of old subjects.

The `F' values for interaction effect of rule of residence and caste; rule of residence and educational qualifications; and caste and educational qualifications; rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications are not significant. Thus, it can be said that rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications in combination with each other do not give rise to difference in the perceptions of health. The hypothesis pertaining to interaction effect are retained

TABLE NO. 109

A 2 x 2 x 2 FACTORIAL DESIGN FOR PERSONALITY

SOURCE	DF	SS	MSS	F	SIG
Rule of Residence	1	41.64	41.64	1.89	N S
Caste	1	36 23	36 23	1 65	N S
Educational Qualification	1	19 72	19 72	0.89	N.S
Rule of Residence x Caste	1	18.62	18.62	0 84	N S
Rule of Residence x Eduational Qualification	1	29 19	29 19	1 32	N S
Caste x Edu Qualification	1	32 69	32 69	1 48	N S
Rule of Residence x Caste x Educational Qualification	1	38 10	38 10	1 73	N.S
Between Groups	7	216 19			
Within Groups	192	4216.09	21 95		
TOTAL	199				

TABLE 110

NUMBER AND MEAN SCORES OF PERSONALITY

	N	TOTAL SCORE	MEAN SCORE
RURAL	100	687	6.87
URBAN	100	732	7.32
LOWER CASTE	100	693	6.93
UPPER CASTE	100	689	6.89
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	100	722	7.22
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	100	697	6.97

TABLE NO 111

RULE OF RESIDENCE AND CASTE

	RURAL	URBAN
LOWER CASTE	N = 50 Ex = 329 M = 6 58	N = 50 Ex = 351 M = 7 02
UPPER CASTE	N = 50 Ex = 358 M = 7 16	N = 50 Ex = 381 M = 7 62

TABLE NO. 112

RULE OF RESIDENCE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

	RURAL	URBAN
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 345 M = 6.90	N = 50 Ex = 331 M = 6 62
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 377 M = 7.54	N = 50 Ex = 366 M = 7.32

TABLE NO. 113

CASTE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 328 M = 6 56	N = 50 Ex = 352 M = 7.04
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 365 M = 7.30	N = 50 Ex = 337 M = 6 74

TABLE NO 114

RULE OF RESIDENCE, CASTE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION

	RURAL		URBAN	
	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 25 Ex = 152 M = 6 08	N = 25 Ex = 162 M = 6 48	N = 25 Ex = 157 M = 6.28	N = 25 Ex = 171 M = 6 84
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 25 Ex = 177 M = 7.08	N = 25 Ex = 196 M = 7 84	N = 25 Ex = 194 M = 7 76	N = 25 Ex = 210 M = 8 40

Table No 109 shows the result of analysis of variance where personality problem is dependent variable and rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications are independent variables The `F' value for rule of residence is 1.89 which is not significant at 0 05 level, this means there is no significant difference in the means of rural and urban subjects on personality problem This implies the perception of rural and urban subjects with regard to personality problem is similar In the light of this results null hypothesis is retained On the basis of this result it can be said there is no relation between rule of residence and personality.

The `F' values for caste and educational qualifications are 1 65 and 0 89 respectively Both the value are not significant at 0 05 level This implies that lower and upper caste and below and above intermediate subjects do not differ significantly in the perception of personality problems Here also the null nypotheses are retained. It can be said that caste and educational qualifications are not related to personality of old subjects

The `F' values for interaction effect of rule of residence and caste, rule of residence and educational qualifications and caste and educational qualifications; rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications are not significant. Thus, it can be said that rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications in combination with each other do not give rise to difference in the perceptions of personality The hypotheses pertaining to interaction effects are retained

TABLE NO. 115

A 2 x 2 x 2 FACTORIAL DESIGN FOR PERSONAL BETTERMENT

SOURCE	DF	SS	MSS	F	SIG
Rule of Residence	1	36 42	36 42	1 36	N.S.
Caste	1	27 29	27 29	1 02	N.S
Educational Qualification	1	24.42	24 42	0 91	N S
Rule of Residence x Caste	1	33.62	33.62	1 25	N S
Rule of Residence x Eduational Qualification	1	21 21	21.21	0 79	N S
Caste x Edu Qualification	1	25 79	25 79	0 96	N S.
Rule of Residence x Caste x Educational Qualification	1	32 19	32 19	1 20	N S
Between Groups	7	200 94			
Within Groups	192	5129.67	26 71		
TOTAL	199				

TABLE 116

NUMBER AND MEAN SCORES OF PERSONAL BETTERMENT

	N	TOTAL SCORE	MEAN SCORE
RURAL	100	698	6.98
URBAN	100	687	6 87
LOWER CASTE	100	702	7.02
UPPER CASTE	100	692	6.92
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	100	721	7.21
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	100	699	6.99

TABLE NO 117

RULE OF RESIDENCE AND CASTE

	RURAL	URBAN
LOWER CASTE	N = 50 Ex = 327 M = 6 54	N = 50 Ex = 331 M = 6 62
UPPER CASTE	N = 50 Ex = 371 M = 7.42	N = 50 Ex = 356 M = 7 12

TABLE NO. 118

RULE OF RESIDENCE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION

	RURAL	URBAN
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 346 M = 6.92	N = 50 Ex = 320 M = 6.40
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 375 M = 7.50	N = 50 Ex = 349 M = 6.98

TABLE NO. 119

CASTE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 336 M = 6 72	N = 50 Ex = 329 M = 6.58
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 50 Ex = 366 M = 7 32	N = 50 Ex = 363 M = 7.26

TABLE NO 120

RULE OF RESIDENCE, CASTE AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

	RURAL		URBAN	
	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE	LOWER CASTE	UPPER CASTE
BELOW INTERMEDIATE	N = 25 Ex = 147 M = 5.88	N = 25 Ex = 168 M = 6 72	N = 25 Ex = 151 M = 6 04	N = 25 Ex = 163 M = 6 52
ABOVE INTERMEDIATE	N = 25 Ex = 180 M = 7.20	N = 25 Ex = 203 M = 8.12	N = 25 Ex = 180 M = 7.20	N = 25 Ex = 193 M = 7 72

Table No. 115 shows the result of analysis of variance where personal betterment is dependent variable and rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications are independent variables The `F' value for rule of residence is 1 36 which is not significant at 0.05 level, this means there is no significant difference in the means of rural and urban subjects on personal betterment This implies the perception of rural and urban subjects with regard to personal betterment is similar. In the light of this result it can be said there is no relation between rule of residence and personal betterment.

`F' values for caste and educational qualifications are 1.02 and 0 91 respectively Both the values are not significant at 0.05 level. This implies that lower and upper caste subjects and below and above intermediate subjects do not differ significantly in the perception of personal betterment. Here also the null nypothesis are retained. it can be said caste and educational qualifications are not related to personal betterment of old subjects

`F' values for interaction effect of rule of residence and caste; rule of residence and educational qualifications and caste and educational qualifications, rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications are not significant. Thus, it can be said rule of residence, caste and educational qualifications in combination with each other do not give rise to difference in the perception of personal betterment. The hypotheses pertaining to interaction effect are retained